MINUTES
Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting
Held on Tuesday, 17 July 2012 at 4:00pm
City of Rockingham Boardroom
# Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Minutes

**Tuesday 17 July 2012**

## CONTENTS

1. Declaration of Opening 4
2. Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence 4
3. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice 5
4. Public Question Time 5
5. Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Meeting 6
6. Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes 6
7. Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion 6
8. Declaration of Member’s and Officer’s Interest 6
9. Petitions/Deputations/Presentations/Submissions 6
10. Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed 6
11. Bulletin Items 6
   - Corporate and General Management Services Information Bulletin – July 2012 6
   - Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – July 2012 8
12. Agenda Items – Corporate and Engineering Committee
   - Corporate Services 11
     - CS-021/12 Agreement to Consent Orders - Minister for Local Government v City of Rockingham 11
     - CS-022/12 Material Variance Level for the 2012/13 Statements of Financial Activity 15
     - CS-023/12 Bowls Safety Bay Incorporated - Request for Self Supporting Loan 17
     - CS-024/12 Monthly Financial Management Report for May 2012 21
   - Governance and Councillor Support 23
     - GCS-009/12 Delegation of Authority to Chief Executive Officer for the 2012-2013 Financial Year 23
   - Human Resources 26
     - HR-005/12 Amendment to Light Vehicle Fleet Policy 26
   - Engineering and Parks Services 31
     - EP-055/12 Tender T12/13-22 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in the City of Rockingham 31
     - EP-056/12 Tender T12/13-05 – Supply and/or Supply and Delivery of Sand 34
     - EP-057/12 Recommendations from the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee Meeting held on 11 June 2012 40
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Reports of Councillors</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Addendum Agenda</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Motions of which Previous Notice has been Given</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Notices of Motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Matters Behind Closed Doors</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Date and Time of Next Meeting</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EP-059/12** Variation and Extension of Bowls Safety Bay Inc Lease

**EP-060/12** Living Waters Lutheran College Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for Shared Facilities

**EP-061/12** Western Australian Natural Disaster and Relief Recovery Arrangements (WANDRRA)

**EP-062/12** Tender T11/12-65 – Supply, delivery and licensing of one rear loading refuse truck with optional trade of the City's existing rear loading refuse truck RO 1987 and / or outright purchase of City's existing rear loading refuse truck RO 1987
City of Rockingham
Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday 17 July 2012 - Council Boardroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Declaration of Opening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Chairman declared the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting open at 4.01 pm and welcomed all present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Councillors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Cr Barry Sammels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Engineering and Parks Services</td>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Corporate Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the Public:</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Apologies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Hammond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Approved Leave of Absence:</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Allan Hill noted that he will be absent for the next meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Mr Dennis Howe, Waikiki – Removal of Trees at Breaden Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td>Request for Council to consider the removal of extremely large native trees at the rear of the Breaden Reserve backing onto properties at the Waikiki Villas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>An arboriculture report was prepared for the trees on the eastern edge of Breaden Reserve, Waikiki, in October 2009 following concerns raised by neighbouring residents regarding the structural safety of the trees on their boundary. Further, the City received input from other adjoining residents concerned that the City would unnecessarily remove trees to which their retention was supported. The objective was to assess the trees, the damage to property and their suitability within the overall management of the park and to make recommendations governed by the principles of sustainable Arboriculture and relevant Australian Standards. The recommendations dealt with the level of overcrowding and the need for a removal strategy along with appropriate remedial pruning to prolong the safe useful life expectancy of the trees recommended for retention. More than 20 trees were subsequently removed from the residential boundaries; however, several trees were also identified as being suitable for long term retention without significant restoration or maintenance. While it is acknowledged that the larger healthier specimens are retained at a reasonable distance from the residential boundary there are some deadwood portions in the canopy of some of the trees, although its appearance may be occurring as part of the natural growth process as opposed to any pest/disease factor. There may also be a requirement to remove some of the trees closer to the park perimeter which were retained but have poor structural integrity. The removal should increase the distance from property boundaries and the reduction in density will improve the overall health of all the remaining trees. There are always limitations to any recommendation made within an arboriculture assessment and community input and consultation should help guide the ongoing management of any park land. The inspection of any tree is often limited to a visual inspection and will have no guarantee that issue may arise in the future in relation to tree failure. It is considered advisable to carry out an additional tree survey on Breaden Reserve as the existing structure of the trees could pose an element of risk to adjoining properties. Coupled with the litter issues and a ‘perceived psychological hazard’ that large trees often present to properties within their likely fall range, action may be required to reduce the size of the canopies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Public Question Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:02pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting

Moved Cr Hill, seconded Cr Dunkling:

That Council CONFIRM the Minutes of the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting held on 19 June 2012, as a true and accurate record subject to the following amendment:

*Item EP-051/12 Disability Access Reference Group meeting Minutes 2 May*

The Committee Recommendation should read:

That Council RECEIVE the minutes of the Disability Access Reference Group Meeting held 2 May 2012 for information.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Nil

7. Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion

4:03pm The Chairman announced to all present that decisions made at Committees of Council are recommendations only and may be adopted in full, amended or deferred when presented for consideration at the next Council meeting.

8. Declarations of Members and Officers Interests

4:04pm The Chairman asked if there were any interests to declare. There were none.

9. Petitions/Deputations/Presentations/Submissions

Nil

10. Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed

Nil

11. Bulletin Items

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

**Corporate Services**

1. Corporate Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Customer Request Management System
   3.2 Mobile Computing (AIM) Licensing Fees
   3.3 Disaster Recovery Solution
4. Information Items
   4.1 List of Payments

**Governance and Councillor Support**

1. Governance and Councillor Support Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Advisory Committees – Review of Community Membership
   4.2 National Sea Change Taskforce Newsletter

**Human Resources**
1. Human Resources Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Employee Wellness Programme
   3.2 Corporate Training Programme
   3.3 Advanced Diploma of Management (CoR)
   3.4 Leadership & Management Programme
   3.5 Values Programme
   3.6 Safety Achievement Programme
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 3.5 Tourism Strategy
   3.6 Global Friendship
4. Information Items
   4.1 World Triathlon Corporation - Iron Man Event
   4.2 Retail Trading Hours
   4.3 Film Applications
   4.3 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 2011 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 Plan
   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 – July 2012 and the contents be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0

### Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – July 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 2011/12
   - 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 Shoalwater Beach Access Replacement Project
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 Sustainable Cities Award  
4.6 Delegated Subdivision Public Open Space Handovers  
4.7 Delegated Public Open Space Approvals  
4.8 Memorial Seat Approvals

**Asset Management**  
1. Asset Management Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3. Project Status Reports  
4. Information Items  
   4.1 Asset Management Improvement Strategy  
   4.2 Asset Systems Management  
   4.3 Lease Management  
   4.4 Engineering and Parks Financial Control

**Building Maintenance**  
1. Building Maintenance Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3. Project Status Reports  
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)  
   3.5 Hymus Street Erosion Strategy  
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  
   4.8 Waikiki Foreshore Protection Works - RLGIP  
   4.9 Aqua Jetty – Replace/Upgrade HVAC Services  
   4.10 Bert England Lodge - Compliance  
   4.11 Bell Park Toilet – Replacement including Curfew Lockout System  
   4.12 Aquatic Centre – Renewal of Toilets/Unisex/Change Rooms  
   4.13 Baldivis Library - Design  
   4.14 Aqua Jetty – Solar Heating  
   4.15 Baldivis Old School - Redevelopment
**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 (domestic only)
   4.5 Landfill statistics
   4.6 Education and promotion
   4.7 Landfill power station
   4.8 T11/12-65 Supply, delivery and licensing of one rear loading refuse truck with optional trade of Council's existing rear loading refuse truck 1987
   4.9 T12/13-24 Period supply and delivery of mobile garbage bins, recycle bins, skips and associated accessories

**Committee Recommendation**

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

Committee Voting – 4/0
## 12. Agenda Items

### Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate and Engineering Services</th>
<th>Corporate Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong></td>
<td>CS-021/12 Agreement to Consent Orders - Minister for Local Government v City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>File No:</strong></td>
<td>GVR/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proponent/s:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong></td>
<td>Mr John Pearson, Director Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Contributors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Committee Meeting:</strong></td>
<td>17 July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously before Council:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of Interest:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</strong></td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Purpose of Report

To adopt a position regarding conciliation over an application made by the Minister for Local Government against the City of Rockingham through the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) regarding the quashing of general UV rates in the 2011/12 financial year.

### 2. Background

The City of Rockingham adopted the 2011/12 Annual Budget on 5 July 2011 at a special meeting. As part of the budget deliberations Council resolved rates in the dollar for all properties in the City of Rockingham.

In late 2011 the City received correspondence from the Department of Local Government noting an error in the 2011/12 Annual Budget associated with the minimum number of UV ratepayers exceeding the statutory limit of 50% of total UV ratepayers by 13. This error was noted and acknowledged.
In April 2012 the Minister for Local Government lodged an application with SAT for general rates for the City of Rockingham to be quashed within the 2011/12 financial year.

During May and June 2012 officers of the City attended SAT sittings in an attempt to resolve this matter.

3. **Details**

SAT has been asked to quash the UV rates because the minister for Local Government believes that the City of Rockingham cannot fix the problem with UV rates until they have been quashed.

In his view, the effect of section 6.32 of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act) is that any local government can only impose a rate (including a minimum payment) or a specified area rate:

- when adopting the annual budget for your local government for that financial year; or
- in an emergency; or
- after a court or the Tribunal has quashed the rate or specified area rate.

It follows, in his view, that even if the City agrees that it has imposed an invalid rate, it cannot do anything about it until the rate has been quashed. Once the affected rate has been quashed, the Act enables a local government to impose a new and valid rate to replace the quashed rate.

Any new rate must be imposed, in his view, in the course of adopting a new budget “in a form and manner similar to the annual budget with such modifications as are necessary to meet the case … where required to do so in consequence of the quashing of … a rate … by the State Administrative Tribunal” (see section 6.3 of the Act). The minister considers that, as a result of this requirement, any new rate can only be different from the quashed rate to the extent that it is necessary for the rate to be different to correct the problem.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
   Nil

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   
   Extensive liaising with the Department of Local Government has occurred to ensure that anything that is proposed meets both the State and City requirements.

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**

   Nil at this stage. A substantial procedure has been commenced which will result in a new 2011/12 budget being prepared and modified to accommodate the changes made as a result of the UV rates being quashed.

   This budget will be adjusted by $5,967 to accommodate the adjusted/refunded UV rates.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

   Under section 6.32(1) of the Act, a local government must impose a general rate which can be imposed uniformly or differentially.
Section 6.32(2) of the Act requires the general rate being imposed separately for rateable land valued on its gross rental value (GRV) and rateable land valued on its unimproved value (UV). This will be so even if the general rate is imposed uniformly.

Section 6.82 of the Act allows any person to refer the matter of whether a rate was imposed in accordance with the Act to the SAT for resolution. The SAT may make resolution to quash the rate which in its opinion has been raised invalidly.

Section 6.32 of the Act states that any local government can only impose a rate (including a minimum payment) or a specified area rate:

(a) when adopting the annual budget for your local government for that financial year; or

(b) in an emergency; or

(c) after a court or the Tribunal has quashed the rate or specified area rate.

Section 6.3 of the Act requires a local government to adopt a budget in a form and manner similar to the annual budget with such modifications as are necessary to meet the changes required.

5. Comments

At both the directions hearing and the mediation at SAT, discussions focussed upon finding a resolution which will ensure that:

(a) City of Rockingham rates are valid; and

(b) the costs in time and resources for City of Rockingham to correct the problems are kept as low as possible.

The solution agreed to is as follows:

First, a minute of consent orders should be signed on behalf of the Minister and the City of Rockingham requesting the Tribunal quash the affected rates. The Tribunal will then have to make orders in terms of the minute.

Second, City of Rockingham officers will prepare a set of officer recommendations and amended budget papers for Council’s consideration.

Finally, the Council would be required to endorse the officer recommendations and thereby validate its rates for the 2011/2012 financial year.

The minute of consent orders

In the minute of consent orders, the minute proposes two kinds of orders.

First, the minute proposes orders that would quash the affected rates.

Secondly, the minute proposes that there be no order as to costs. If this order is made, no party will have to pay any other party’s costs.

It is officer opinion, given the circumstances, that this is the best way forward and it has been agreed to by the State.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple majority

7. Officer Recommendation

In the State Administrative Tribunal proceedings “Minister for Local Government v City of Rockingham”, Council SUPPORT the following orders by consent:

1. The general rate imposed by the City of Rockingham upon rateable land with its district to be rated on unimproved value for the 2011/12 financial year pursuant to section 6.32(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 (WA) is quashed pursuant to section 6.82 of that Act.

2. There is no order as to costs.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

In the State Administrative Tribunal proceedings “Minister for Local Government v City of Rockingham”, Council **SUPPORT** the following orders by consent:

1. The general rate imposed by the City of Rockingham upon rateable land with its district to be rated on unimproved value for the 2011/12 financial year pursuant to section 6.32(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 (WA) is quashed pursuant to section 6.82 of that Act.

2. There is no order as to costs.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
Corporate and Engineering Services
Corporate Services

Reference No & Subject: CS-022/12 Material Variance Level for the 2012/13 Statements of Financial Activity
File No: FLM/88
Proponent/s: Mr Allan Moles, Manager Financial Services
Author: Mr Allan Moles, Manager Financial Services
Other Contributors: Other Contributors:
Date of Committee Meeting: 17 July 2012
Previously before Council: 17 July 2012
Disclosure of Interest: Executive Function
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:

1. Purpose of Report
To adopt the materiality level for variances required to be reported in the 2012/13 Statements of Financial Activity.

2. Background
The City is required to prepare a Statement of Financial Activity for each month which includes, in part, details of the budget and actual revenue/expenditure to the end of the relevant month and 'material' variances between the budget and actual.

Each year Council is required to adopt the level considered 'material' for the purposes of reporting these variances.

The adopted material variance level for 2011/12 was $250,000.

3. Details
The Australian Accounting Standards (AAS) state that “materiality means, in relation to information, that information which if omitted, misstated or not disclosed has the potential to adversely affect decisions about the allocation of scarce resources made by users of the financial report or the discharge of accountability by the management or governing body of the entity”.

CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 21 AUGUST 2012
PRESIDING MEMBER
Essentially the smaller the entity the lower the materiality level, as it is the relative impact that is important. Variances of $10,000 may be considered material to an individual but when considered in the context of the City, which is an entity with a total expenditure of over $150 million, this limit would not be considered material.

4. **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 15**: Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

   d. **Policy**
      
      Nil

   e. **Financial**
      
      Nil

   f. **Legal and Statutory**
      
      Regulation 34(5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 requires that each financial year, a local government is to adopt a percentage or value, calculated in accordance with the AAS, to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances.

5. **Comments**

   The material variance level adopted for 2011/12 was $250,000 and this value is still considered appropriate for the 2012/13 financial year.

6. **Voting Requirements**

   Simple majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

   That Council **ADOPT** $250,000 as the value to be used in Statements of Financial Activity for reporting material variances for the 2012/13 financial year.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

   That Council **ADOPT** $250,000 as the value to be used in Statements of Financial Activity for reporting material variances for the 2012/13 financial year.

   Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation**

   Not applicable

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

    Not applicable
1. **Purpose of Report**

   To consider an application from Bowls Safety Bay Incorporated for a self-supporting loan to a maximum value of $65,000 for the purposes of replacing the existing surface of its bowling green.

2. **Background**

   Bowls Safety Bay Incorporated is located at Gloucester Crescent in Safety Bay. The club was founded in 1951 and currently has in excess of 500 members in varying capacities.

   The club was first originated to accommodate lawn bowls but now also supports other activities such as bingo, pool, darts and handicraft etc. The club also offers the facilities for hire to the wider community for events such as seminars, team building etc.

   The club’s business plan, which was finalised in January 2012, has listed the “D” green as a high priority project for the club. The green needs to be replaced prior to September/October, before the bowling season.

   The club has not applied for the City’s infrastructure Planning and Development Grant (IDPG) and the Community Sport and Recreation Facility Funding Program (CSRFF) as the funding outcome for the IDPG will not be known until August 2012 and the CSRFF in October/November 2012. The IDPG program only allows up to a maximum of $30,000 and the CSRFF is only up to one-third of the project costs, therefore the uncertainty of receiving the full amount of the request could impact the project. The club has obtained CSRFF funding previously and although it is eligible for further funding, this could possibly impact the success of its application.
The estimated total cost of the replacing “D” green is $125,000 inclusive of GST.

On 15 May 2012 the City received formal correspondence from Bowls Safety Bay Incorporated requesting a loan of $65,000 to replace its existing greens. This was formally endorsed at its Annual General Meeting of Bowls Incorporated held on 12 May 2012.

3. Details

The club’s request has been assessed using Council’s Self Supporting Loans by Incorporated Associations Policy, as follows:

Club’s Financial Capacity

The club has confirmed its ability to contribute $50,000 from its current surplus funds to the total project cost and the balance will be financed from the City’s advance to the club.

The club has provided audited financial statements for the previous three years, as per Council’s Self-Supporting Loan Policy. Although the documents are of a standard that reflects a small community group, it would appear that the club is capable of maintaining an advance given its current financial mix and membership makeup. Current cash and asset balances also reflect this view.

Club and Community Benefits

It is considered that the club plays an important role within the Safety Bay and Shoalwater communities providing a venue for both physical activity and socialisation. The club is an important part of the community hub at Gloucester Crescent, Shoalwater and it is considered that the replacement of the “D” green will benefit both the club members and the wider community through the provision of a quality facility that is accessible for a broad range of abilities.

4. 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

Council Policy- Self Supporting Loans by Incorporated Associations

**Specific Self-Supporting Loan Policy Requirements**

The following information demonstrates the club’s adherence and/or non-adherence to the general principles within Council’s Self-Supporting Loans Policy that shall be the basis for assessing the club’s loan request:

a) The club has produced written documentation providing evidence of the past and future financial viability, and its ability to meet the repayments of the loan.

b) The club has provided the previous three years’ audited financial statements and future financial forecasts for the duration of the loan.

c) The club has investigated alternative funding options including CSRFF and CGCG, and has now also demonstrated its capacity to raise a significant amount of funds from its own members.
d) The club currently has no funds outstanding with the Council

e) The club has met all previous loan obligations, and has made all repayments by the due date.

f) Given the club has agreed to provide security on the loan, a bank guarantee will not be required. The club has provided the names of five members who will provide personal guarantees.

g) The club has confirmed that three persons are willing to provide guarantee/security for the loan liability, and shall sign documentation prepared by Council to this effect.

e. Financial

Although the City does not have a specific allocation in the current budget, the City would identify funds through the budget review process to cover an advance to the Bowls Safety Bay Incorporated for $65,000.

There will also be costs involved in creating documentation through legal advisors to ensure appropriate debentures are accounted for which is recoverable from the club. This is likely to cost less than $3,000.

f. Legal and Statutory

Section 6.20 of the Local Government Act 1995 refers to the requirements in relation to borrowing funds by the City.

Advice has been sought from the Department of Local Government in relation to the ability of the City to provide an advance or loan to the Club rather than a self-supporting loan and if this transaction would be considered an investment and therefore subject to the provisions of Section 6.14(1) of the Local Government Act 1995.

Section 6.14(1) provides that “… money held in the municipal fund or trust fund of a local government that is not, for the time being, required by the local government for any other purpose may be invested …”

In the circumstance proposed the City would include the expenditure in the budget to be paid to the sporting/community group. There would be revenue from repayment of principal and interest budgeted over the next 5 years. This is not investing in terms of section 6.14 as you would have a specific expense budget allocation for the value of the advance, whereas investing would not have any budget allocation but merely be an administrative activity under delegation whereby surplus funds are used to maximise revenue for the local government while not required for another purpose.

5. Comments

Bowls Safety Bay Incorporated appears to be a vibrant and successful bowling club. The club’s Strategic Business Plan is indicative that is focussed on achieving its goals over the next three to five years. The club has endeavoured to provide as much information as is available and possible to allow assessment of its application. On assessment it appears that the club meets Council requirements and has confirmed security for the loan. It has requested the loan be over a five-year period.

Although assessed as a self-supporting loan, given the relatively small amount and the short repayment period it is recommended that the City advance the amount to the Club without the need to raise a self-supporting loan. The City will still recover the principal and interest over the term of the agreement from the club.

6. Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority
### 7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** an advance to Bowls Safety Bay Incorporated for the value of $65,000 with repayments of principal and interest over five years, and
2. **DELEGATE** authority to the Chief Executive Officer to finalise the contractual terms and conditions regarding the repayment of the advance.

### 8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** an advance to Bowls Safety Bay Incorporated for the value of $65,000 with repayments of principal and interest over five years, and
2. **DELEGATE** authority to the Chief Executive Officer to finalise the contractual terms and conditions regarding the repayment of the advance.

Committee Voting – 4/0

### 9. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable

### 10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable
Corporate and Engineering Services
Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-024/12 Monthly Financial Management Report for May 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>FLM/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Ms Vanisha Govender, Financial Accountant</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>17 July 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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:**

**Lot Area:**

**Attachments:**


1. **Purpose of Report**

   To receive the monthly Financial Management Report for May 2012

2. **Background**

   Nil

3. **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.

4. **Implications to Consider**

   a. **Consultation with the Community**
      
      Not Applicable
   b. **Consultation with Government agencies**
      
      Not Applicable
CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 21 AUGUST 2012
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**

5. **Comments**

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

6. **Voting Requirements**

   Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**


8. **Committee Recommendation**


   Committee Voting – 4/0

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

   Not applicable

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>GCS-009/12 Delegation of Authority to Chief Executive Officer for the 2012-2013 Financial Year</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>Mrs Jelette Edwards, Governance Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>17 July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>27 July 2010 Item CES126/7/10, 28 September 2010 Item CES161/9/10 and 28 June 2011 Item ES-020/11</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>City of Rockingham Delegated Authority 2012 – 2013, Local Government to Chief Executive Officer and Other Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Purpose of Report**

   To enable Council to delegate its powers to the Chief Executive Officer and other relevant officer under various Acts and Regulations.

2. **Background**

   Section 5.42 to 5.44 of the Local Government Act 1995 (the Act) states that Council can delegate to the Chief Executive Officer any of its powers or discharge any of its duties.

   Section 5.46 of the Act requires that the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) keeps a register of delegations made by the Local Government to the CEO and delegations from the CEO to other officers. All the delegations are to be reviewed at least once every financial year.

3. **Details**

   The Delegated Authority register was reviewed by Directors and relevant officers. It is proposed that Council revoke all the previous delegations for the 2011-2012 financial year reviewed in June 2011 and replace them with the delegations for the 2012-2013 financial year.
4. **Implications to Consider**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Consultation with the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.</th>
<th>Consultation with Government Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d.</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e.</th>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f.</th>
<th>Legal and Statutory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In accordance with Sections 5.42 to 5.44 of the Local Government Act 1995.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Comments**

The Delegated of Authority to the Chief Executive was amended in May 2012 due to the introduction of the Building Act 2011, Building Regulations 2012 and other relevant Acts and Regulations.

There were some minor typographical corrections made to the delegations as well as some minor amendments. Some of the amendments include:

- Replacing Manager Executive Services to Manager Governance and Councillor Support;
- Replacing Executive Services to Governance and Councillor Support;
- Replacing Manager Executive Services with Manager Community Safety in all delegations under the Bush Fire Act 1954 as the Fire and Emergency Officers now sit under the Community Safety Department;
- Remove the Delegation Write Off Rates as this has now been included in the Delegation Write Off Monies Owing;
- Amend the Delegation Acceptance Of Tender – For Supply of Goods and Services by increasing the value that the Chief Executive Officer can accept tenders from $100,000 to $500,000;
- Minor amendment to the Delegation under the Planning and Development Act 2005 to include the Residential Design Codes; and
- Delete Delegation for Planning Services regarding Overtime Payments to Staff as it is no longer required.

Where the Chief Executive Officer exercises his delegation with regards to tenders, this will be noted in the relevant section of the Council Bulletin.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Absolute Majority

---

CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 21 AUGUST 2012

__________________________
PRESIDING MEMBER
7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **REVOKE** the delegation of Powers to the Chief Executive Officer for the period 2011-2012 financial year.

2. **DELEGATE** its powers under the following sections of the Local Government Act 1995, Bushfire Act 1954, Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1960, the Building Act 2011, Planning Development Act 2005, Food Act 2008 and other relevant Acts and Regulations to the Chief Executive Officer and other employees listed for a period of 12 months, at which time they will be reviewed under the requirements of the relevant Acts and Regulations as per attachment - City of Rockingham Delegated Authority 2012 – 2013, Local Government to Chief Executive Officer and Other Employees.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **REVOKE** the delegation of Powers to the Chief Executive Officer for the period 2011-2012 financial year.

2. **DELEGATE** its powers under the following sections of the Local Government Act 1995, Bushfire Act 1954, Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1960, the Building Act 2011, Planning Development Act 2005, Food Act 2008 and other relevant Acts and Regulations to the Chief Executive Officer and other employees listed for a period of 12 months, at which time they will be reviewed under the requirements of the relevant Acts and Regulations as per attachment - City of Rockingham Delegated Authority 2012 – 2013, Local Government to Chief Executive Officer and Other Employees.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
1. **Purpose of Report**

To make amendments to the Light Vehicle Fleet Policy particularly in regard to the valuation of the remuneration benchmarking vehicle standards.

2. **Background**

At the November 2008 Ordinary Council Meeting, Council adopted a Light Vehicle Fleet Policy to ensure that Council's light fleet is managed in a contemporary and environmentally suitable manner. The policy objectives were:

- To provide a fleet of cost effective and functional light vehicles for operational purposes.
- To provide vehicles as part of remuneration packages that are competitive within the Local Government employment market.
- To continually improve the environmental performance of the light vehicle fleet with the objective of achieving a 4 Star Australian Government Green Vehicle Guide rating across the entire fleet.

3. **Details**

---

1 Contributor added.
The City provides motor vehicles to the Chief Executive Officer, Directors and Managers for private use as part of an overall remuneration package in line with professional and employment market requirements. The valuation of the remuneration component of salary packages is based upon the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) revision of the Mercer formula which is purchase price (ex GST) x 30% plus $3,000.

Vehicles identified as a standard and their state government contract prices that prevail from time to time, form the benchmark of remuneration packaging. These vehicles are a remuneration guide only. Vehicles will be supplied of similar standard and level of appointment after evaluation of operating cost, resale value, safety rating and environmental performance.

The values of the benchmark vehicle vary from time to time as a result of exchange rates, general economic conditions, and the marketing and pricing strategies of the manufacturers and suppliers. These variations mean that the City has no control of the benchmark pricing of vehicles which in turn can provide either unreasonable benefit or disadvantage to staff and the City dependent upon market conditions.

To overcome this inequity it is recommended that the remuneration value amount for vehicles be based upon the values assigned to vehicles as at the inception of the policy and then subject to annual CPI adjustment.

4. 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 15:** Governance – Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. Policy
   Will amend the Light Vehicle Fleet Policy.

e. Financial
   Nil

f. Legal and Statutory
   Nil

5. Comments

It is considered prudent to review Council policies from time to time to ensure currency and relevance. In this instance only minor changes are needed.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council **AMEND** the Light Vehicle Fleet Policy adopted by Council at a meeting on 25 November 2005 to enable adjustment of the value of the remuneration benchmark vehicles on an annual basis by the prevailing consumer price index (CPI) as from the date of adoption.
8. Committee Recommendation

That Council AMEND the Light Vehicle Fleet Policy adopted by Council at a meeting on 25 November 2005 to enable adjustment of the value of the remuneration benchmark vehicles on an annual basis by the prevailing consumer price index (CPI) as from the date of adoption as follows:

**Light Vehicle Fleet Policy**

**Policy Objective**

- To provide a fleet of cost effective and functional light vehicles for operational purposes
- To provide vehicles as part of remuneration packages that are competitive within the Local Government employment market.
- To continually improve the environmental performance of the light vehicle fleet with the objective of achieving a 4 Star Australian Government Green Vehicle Guide rating across the entire fleet.

**Policy Statement**

**Provision of Vehicles**

Motor vehicles will be provided to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Directors and Managers for private use as part of an overall remuneration package in line with professional and employment market requirements. The CEO and Directors have the option of receiving a motor vehicle allowance in line with principles of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal framework. The Mayor has the option of being provided with a similar vehicle to the CEO in accordance with Regulation 34AD of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996.

The valuation of the remuneration component of salary packages will be based upon the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) revision of the Mercer formula which is purchase price (ex GST) x 30% plus $3,000.

Vehicles will be allocated to other staff on an operational needs basis only, however those staff, subject to certain conditions, will have access to restricted private use upon the payment as specified in the Supply and Use of Passenger Vehicle Fleet and Fuel Card Guidelines, adjustable from time to time.

Commuting use will be provided for all other vehicles to qualifying staff.

**Vehicle Standards**

All vehicles must achieve at least a 3.5 star, and where possible a 4 star rating as assessed by the Australian Government Green Vehicle Guide.

All vehicles must have an Australasian New Car Assessment Program (ANCAP) safety rating of at least 4 stars.

Purchasing decisions must be based upon operating cost and estimated residual value.

The vehicles identified in the Supply and Use of Passenger Vehicle Fleet Guidelines, which may be reviewed from time to time, and their accompanying State Government contract prices that prevail from time to time will form the benchmark of remuneration packaging.

These vehicles are a remuneration guide only. Vehicles will be supplied of similar standard and level of appointment after evaluation of operating cost, resale value, safety rating and environmental performance. CEO, Directors and Managers wishing to vary the standards of the supplied vehicle may do so provided that:

- The variation from State Government Contract price does not exceed plus/minus 20% of the benchmark price.
- The vehicle is operationally suitable and appropriate as approved by the CEO.
- An adjustment in the cash component of the salary is made to reflect the variation.
Remuneration benchmarks for vehicle standards:

CEO / Mayor – Holden Statesman V8
Directors - Holden Calais
Managers – Holden Commodore Omega

The value of these vehicles will be subject to annual adjustment of the consumer price index (CPI) as from the date of adoption of this policy (25 November 2008).

The specification and standard of general usage vehicles will be based on operational need.

Environmental Footprint

Council is keen to improve the environmental footprint of the light vehicle fleet and will use Australian Government Green Vehicle Guide star ratings as an indicator of overall reduction in fuel consumption, carbon emissions and air pollution.

The current range of functional and effective 4 star vehicles is somewhat limited however the motor vehicle industry is gradually responding to the environmental challenge. In time it is hoped that the market will expand to provide an extensive range of cost competitive and functional 4 star vehicles.

Subject to the availability of a cost effective and functional fleet range, all vehicles purchased in the future must achieve at least a 3.5 star rating as provided in the Green Vehicle Guide. The provision of 4 star vehicles is encouraged provided that vehicles are functional and cost effective.

Vehicle Usage

The private use of the City’s motor vehicles is subject to users maintaining their vehicle in a clean and orderly manner and adhering at all times to insurance policy requirements. Non-staff members may only drive City vehicles with the express permission of the staff member concerned and in absolute compliance with the City’s insurance policy. It is the responsibility of the staff member to verify insurance compliance.

Misuse, abuse, neglect of vehicles or non-compliance with insurance conditions will result in private use rights being withdrawn.

All vehicles are to be car pooled and available for operational use during business hours.

Allocation Categories

CEO / Mayor - Unrestricted private use of fully serviced vehicle throughout Australia.
Directors – Unrestricted private use of fully serviced vehicle throughout Western Australia.
Managers – Restricted private use of vehicle limited to 500 kilometre radius of the municipal boundary. Must provide fuel whilst on periods of annual, purchased leave, and long service leave. In cases of personal leave the City shall continue to provide for the purchase of fuel.
General usage – Restricted private use of vehicle limited to 500 kilometre radius of the municipal boundary. Unavailable for private use during any periods of leave other than periods of personal leave of up to a maximum of 48 hours.
Commuting use – Strictly restricted to direct carriage between workplace and residence.

The CEO is authorised to amend vehicle usage categories for Directors, Managers and General usage provided there is no impact on organisational operational requirements.

Implementation

The Supply and Use of Passenger Vehicle Fleet Guidelines is reviewed on an annual basis to ensure currency.

Committee Voting – 4/0
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-22 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in the City of Rockingham, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

### 2. Background

The Tender was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 12 May 2012 for Tender T12/13-22 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in the City of Rockingham; the tender closed at 2pm, Wednesday, 30 May 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
3. Details

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastline Lawn Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochness Landscape Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gecko Contracting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Property Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Manager Parks Operations, Parks Operations Contracts Coordinator and Parks Operations Contracts Officer undertook tender evaluations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Coastline Lawn Services</th>
<th>Lochness Landscape Services</th>
<th>Gecko Contracting</th>
<th>LD Total</th>
<th>Programmed Property Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenders Resources and Delivery / Availability</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The period of the contract shall be from the date of award until the 30th June 2014. 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.

4. 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 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 11 (1) Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless subregulation (2) states otherwise.

e. Financial
Funding has been allocated in the 2012/13 parks operational budget for the maintenance of reserves and streetscapes within the City of Rockingham.

f. Legal and Statutory
In accordance with Local Government Act 1995 Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, Regulation 11 (1). Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless subregulation (2) states otherwise.

5. Comments
Lochness Landscape Services currently hold maintenance contracts with the City for The Rivergum’s Estate, The Ridge Estate, Harrington Waters Estate and have met the performance requirements for these contracts.

Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender assessment criteria all companies demonstrated a capacity to undertake the works, however, the submission received from Lochness Landscape Services is considered the best value to the City and therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer.

6. Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation
That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted from Lochness Landscape Services, 13 Savery Way, Rockingham WA 6178, for Tender T12/13-22 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2014.

8. Committee Recommendation
That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted from Lochness Landscape Services, 13 Savery Way, Rockingham WA 6178, for Tender T12/13-22 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2014.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation
Not applicable

10. 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-056/12 Tender T12/13-05 – Supply and/or Supply and Delivery of Sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>T12/13-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Adam Johnston, Manager Parks Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Cyril Sharrock, A/Parks Operations Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Glen Hornby, A/Parks Operations Turf Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>17 July 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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:**
- Lot Area:
- Attachments:
- Maps/Diagrams:

### 1. Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-05 – Supply and/or Supply and Delivery of Sand, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

### 2. Background

The Tender was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-05 – Supply and/or Supply and Delivery of Sand; the tender closed at 2pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

### 3. Details

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclipse Soils Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Composts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holcim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising Manager Parks Operations, A/Parks Operations Coordinator and A/Parks Turf Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

Amazon Soils specified in their tender pricing that the unit prices submitted were per cubic metre not per tonne. Amazon clarified that this was undertaken as the bulk density of organic matter changes with moisture content, therefore the volume received will change with the weight of the product if the tonnage measurement was used. On assessing Amazon’s rate and applying a calculation to convert their cubic metre rate to an estimate tonnage rate.

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>Amazon Soils</th>
<th>Eclipse Soils Pty Ltd</th>
<th>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</th>
<th>WA Limestone</th>
<th>Custom Composts</th>
<th>Holcim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The period of the contract shall be from the date of award until the 30th June 2014.

The Tender T12/13-05 – Supply and/or Supply and Delivery of Sand tender documentation and price mechanism provided for a variety of sand and soil products to be delivered to the City’s depot, directly to site and for pick up ex pit. The following table identifies the tenderers and the items tendered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Amazon Soils</th>
<th>Eclipse Soils Pty Ltd</th>
<th>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</th>
<th>WA Limestone</th>
<th>Custom Composts</th>
<th>Holcim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of clean filling sand to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of clean filling sand to Council’s Millar Road landfill facility</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1.3</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of clean filling sand to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1.4</td>
<td>Supply only (ie ex pit) of clean filling sand</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Amazon Soils</td>
<td>Eclipse Soils Pty Ltd</td>
<td>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</td>
<td>WA Limestone</td>
<td>Custom Composts</td>
<td>Holcim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of screened filling sand to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of screened filling sand to Council's Millar Road landfill facility</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.3</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of screened filling sand to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.4</td>
<td>Supply only (ie ex pit) of screened filling sand</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Cream Lawn sand to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Cream Lawn sand to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of Cream Lawn sand</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Brickies Sand to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Brickies Sand to Council’s Millar Road landfill facility</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4.3</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Brickies Sand to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4.4</td>
<td>Supply only (ie ex pit) of Brickies Sand</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Paving Sand to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Paving Sand to Council’s Millar Road landfill facility</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5.3</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Paving Sand to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Amazon Soils</th>
<th>Eclipse Soils Pty Ltd</th>
<th>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</th>
<th>WA Limestone</th>
<th>Custom Composts</th>
<th>Holcim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5.4</td>
<td>Supply only (ie ex pit) of Paving Sand</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.6.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Landscape Soil Mix to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.6.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Landscape Soil Mix to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.6.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of Landscape Soil Mix</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.7.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Washed White Playground sand to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.7.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Washed White Playground sand to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.7.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of Washed White Playground sand</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.8.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Premium Soil Conditioner to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.8.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of Premium Soil Conditioner to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.8.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) Premium Soil Conditioner</td>
<td>Tonne</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.8.4</td>
<td>Supply of 50:50 Sand to Premium Comp Blend (additional Item added by Amazon)</td>
<td>m3</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. 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 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 11 (1) Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless subregulation (2) states otherwise.

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 operational budget.

f. Legal and Statutory

In accordance with Local Government Act 1995 Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, Regulation 11 (1). Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless subregulation (2) states otherwise.

5. Comments

There are essentially two categories of materials being tendered for; one being siliceous sand materials and the other landscape/compost materials.

All Earth Group Pty Ltd, WA Limestone and Holcim submitted pricing for all or some of the sand material category. All three of these tenderers demonstrated the required capacity to provide the products requested, however it was considered that All Earth Group and WA Limestone provided better value across the range of sand products.

In the landscape/compost materials category, Amazon Soils, Eclipse Soils Pty Ltd, All Earth Group and Custom Composts submitted pricing for all or some of the products requested. Again all demonstrated capacity to provide the products for which they tendered; however Amazon Soils, All Earth Group and Custom Composts provided better value across the range of landscape /compost products.

Given the diversity of sand and landscape/compost products requested, awarding the contract to more than one tenderer is recommended to enable the City to source the full range of products tendered.

Therefore, Amazon Soils, All Earth Group Pty Ltd, WA Limestone and Custom Composts are recommended as the preferred tenderers for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2014. Product orders will be allocated based on price, level of service and product suitability.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority
7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted from Amazon Soils, 22 Hoskin Road, Landsdale, WA 6065, All Earth Group Pty Ltd, 42 Kelvin Road, Maddington, WA 6109, WA Limestone, 41 Spearwood Avenue, Bibra Lake, WA 6163, Custom Composts, 139 Nambeelup Road, Nambeelup, WA 6207 for Tender T12/13-05 – Supply and/or Supply and Delivery of Sand in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2014.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted from Amazon Soils, 22 Hoskin Road, Landsdale, WA 6065, All Earth Group Pty Ltd, 42 Kelvin Road, Maddington, WA 6109, WA Limestone, 41 Spearwood Avenue, Bibra Lake, WA 6163, Custom Composts, 139 Nambeelup Road, Nambeelup, WA 6207 for Tender T12/13-05 – Supply and/or Supply and Delivery of Sand in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2014.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation**

Not applicable

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation**

Not applicable
1. **Purpose of Report**

That Council consider the recommendations arising from the 11 June 2012 RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting.

2. **Recommendations to the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee**

2.1 **Advisory Committee Recommendation 1: Assessing Development Applications**

That Council *DIRECT* the Chief Executive Officer to ensure that all new structure plan and subdivision applications be assessed using the ‘Safe Systems Approach’ during the approval processes.

**Background**

‘Safe Systems’ is the framework incorporated within the National, State and City of Rockingham Road Safety Strategies. The guiding vision behind Safe Systems is that no person should be killed or seriously injured on Australian roads. Using a safe system approach has a benefit to all road users and has four essential elements:

- Safe road use (behaviour)
- Safe roads and roadsides
- Safe speeds
- Safe vehicles
The most important elements within a Safe System Approach with regard to development proposals are ‘safe roads/roadsides’ and ‘safe speeds’. Proponents proposing developments within the City should do so under the clear understanding that the final development product should attain the highest practicable level of safety available. Too often it has been left to the City to fund retrospective works aimed to reduce vehicle speeds and improve road safety within and around completed developments and subdivisions.

### Implications to Consider

a. **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.

b. **Policy**
   
   Existing planning policies followed when undertaking assessment of development proposals may require amending to include the safe system framework.

c. **Financial**
   
   Nil

d. **Legal and Statutory**
   
   The State road safety strategy ‘Toward Zero 2008-2020’ was adopted by the State Government 2008. The Safe Systems Approach is a major cornerstone within the strategy.

e. **Voting Requirements**
   
   Simple Majority

### Officer Recommendation if Different to Advisory Committee Recommendation

Nil

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

Nil

#### 2.2 Advisory Committee Recommendation 2:

**Western Australian Local Government Act to lobby WA Planning Commission (WAPC)**

That Council **DIRECT** the Chief Executive Officer to request that Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) lobby the WA Planning Commission (WAPC) to incorporate the ‘Safe System Approach’ into the planning policies used to assess development applications.

### Background

‘Safe Systems’ is the framework incorporated within the National, State and City of Rockingham Road Safety Strategy’s. The guiding vision behind Safe Systems is that no person should be killed or seriously injured on Australian roads. Using a Safe System approach benefits all road users and has four essential elements:

- Safe road use (behaviour)
- Safe roads and roadsides
- Safe speeds
- Safe vehicles
The most important elements within a Safe System approach with regard to development proposals are ‘safe roads/roadsides’ and ‘safe speeds’.

WAPC has established several levels of policy documents that set the framework for the assessment of development proposals. The most relevant policies are the Operational Policies that are used in the design and approval of urban developments within Western Australia. Examples of these policies are ‘Liveable Neighbourhoods’, Development control policy 2.2 – Residential Subdivision and 2.6 – Residential Road Planning.

In order to obtain a completely consistent approach to development within Western Australia and provide direction for developers, it is important that the relevant safe system elements from the State Road Safety Strategy are incorporated within these policies as soon as practicable. It is no longer satisfactory that a development is approved on the basis that it doesn’t make road safety worse during its implementation. It is now demanded by the community that a positive contribution is made towards providing as safe a road network as currently possible.

### Implications to Consider

a. **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.

b. **Policy**
   
   Changes to WAPC policies will impact on the City’s internal Planning Policies which may result in the need for further amendments.

c. **Financial**
   
   Nil

d. **Legal and Statutory**
   
   WAPC Policies work under the Planning and Development Act 2005

e. **Voting requirements**
   
   Simple majority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Recommendation if Different to Advisory Committee Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Officer’s Reason for Varying the Advisory Committee Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **DIRECT** the Chief Executive Officer to ensure that all new structure plan and subdivision applications be assessed using the ‘Safe Systems Approach’ during the approval processes.

2. **DIRECT** the Chief Executive Officer to request that Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) lobby the WA Planning Commission (WAPC) to incorporate the ‘Safe System Approach’ into the planning policies used to assess development applications.

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

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

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for T12/13-24 – Period Supply and Delivery of Mobile Garbage Bins, Recycling Bins, Skips and Associated Accessories, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding the award of the Tender.

2. Background

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 2 June 2012 for T12/13-24 – Period Supply and Delivery of Mobile Garbage Bins, Recycling Bins, Skips and Associated Accessories. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 20 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

3. Details

Trident Plastics submitted an alternative tender advising that if the City purchased the entire expected annual quantity of bins as one purchase or purchased full container lots of bins then Trident Plastics would provide a discounted price for the 240L mobile garbage bins. The assessment panel considered the alternative tender to be acceptable and assessed their submission.
Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mastec Australia Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gray &amp; Co Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.C Sales (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trident Plastics (SA) Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Manager Waste and Landfill Services, Waste Services Coordinator and Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>David Gray &amp; Co Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Mastec Aust Pty Ltd</th>
<th>GC Sales WA Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Trident Plastics (SA) Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Trident Plastics (SA) Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tender</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The period of the contract shall be from the date of award until the 30th June 2014.

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.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not Applicable

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Not Applicable

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

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

d. Policy
   Purchasing policy 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 11 (1) Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless subregulation (2) states otherwise.
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5. Comments

The 240L bins of the two highest scoring tenderers were inspected and the assessment panel considered that for the City’s rubbish collection purposes the bin supplied by David Gray Pty Ltd would provide a better long term benefit to the City. David Gray Pty Ltd have been the City’s supplier of 240L bins for the last five years, and have proven to meet all required performance criteria.

Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender assessment criteria all companies demonstrated a capacity to complete the works, however, the submission received from David Gray & Co Pty Ltd is considered the best value to the City and therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted from David Gray & Co Pty Ltd, 2 Rawlinson Street, O’Connor for Tender T12/13-24 – Period Supply and Delivery of Mobile Garbage Bins, Recycling Bins, Skips and Associated Accessories in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2014.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted from David Gray & Co Pty Ltd, 2 Rawlinson Street, O’Connor for Tender T12/13-24 – Period Supply and Delivery of Mobile Garbage Bins, Recycling Bins, Skips and Associated Accessories in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2014.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
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**Figure 1 – Bows Safety Bay Inc. Leased Area**

The southern car park excluded area is highlighted in blue.
1. **Purpose of Report**

To provide Council with details of a variation and extension of the existing Lease with Bowls Safety Bay Inc. (BSB), for the premises known as the Safety Bay Bowling Club (SBBC), Gloucester Crescent, Shoalwater WA.

2. **Background**

BSB have held a lease over Lot 72 Gloucester Crescent, Shoalwater WA since 1980. A new lease was signed between BSB and the City in 2001 for a term of 10 years expiring in 2011.

3. **Details**

The Extension of Lease signed in 2011 did not include the club’s correct name so SBBC has requested that their official name, “Bowls Safety Bay” (BSB) replace the existing name of “Safety Bay Bowling Club Inc.”. This change of name required a variation to the lease extension.

Due to seasonal parking demand at the Mersey Point Visitors Centre, the dedicated parking area is regularly full and as such, patrons have been parking along the verges of Arcadia Drive and Penguin Road. To help resolve this issue, City Officers have proposed utilising the bowling club’s southern car park adjacent to Penguin Road as an over flow parking area. Signs will be posted at the Mersey Point Kiosk/Shoalwater Visitors Centre car park advising that additional parking is available 180m down Penguin Road at the Bowling Club.

As the car park is part of the BSB leased premises the club reserved the right to restrict public access. In order to allow full public access the car park must be removed from the leased area which requires a further variation to be made to the lease extension.

The car park is currently being refurbished by the City, including resurfacing, line marking, drainage, new driveway access and some landscaping. Should the proposal to exclude the car park from the lease be approved by Council, eighteen (18) parking spaces will be made fully available for public use. The remaining spaces will be marked and sign posted as Bowling Club parking only.

The BSB committee have agreed to the proposal to remove the 2615m² car park from the leased area. In exchange for the loss of BSB’s largest private car park, the City has agreed to re-line mark the western car park, adjacent to Gloucester Crescent and include the resurfacing of the northern car park situated on the corner of Seaforth Road and Mersey Road in future asset renewal projects subject to the availability of funding.

All other clauses, conditions and details will remain the same as in the original lease. This includes:

- Lease Extension expiration date- 20 March 2021.
- Purpose - Bowling Club.
- Administration fee $1000.00 +GST reviewed annually in accordance with CPI increases.
- Insurance requirements.
- Maintenance requirements.
- Outgoing expenses—electricity, telephone, gas and water.
- Agreement termination and early determination.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

City Officers have held discussions with members of the BSB Committee. Two options were presented, the first option was to excise the entire car park from the lease and mark over 50% of the bays as BSB only parking and refurbishment of the clubs two other car parks. The second option was to leave the car park within the leased area, scale down the planned refurbishments and create verge parking by cutting into the verge surrounding the leased property. The BSB Committee voted and agreed to accept the proposed car park excision providing that the two (2) remaining car parks are refurbished as soon as the City’s budget permits.
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:** Community facilities and services delivered in a timely manner, able to meet expectations and serve new and growing neighbourhoods.

d. **Policy**
   Nil

e. **Financial**
   BSB pays an administration fee of $1000 per annum plus GST, which is reviewed annually in accordance with CPI increase. This will not be affected by the variation.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   Section 3.58 of the Local Government Act 1995 deals with the disposal (including a lease) of property and covers the requirement to give public notice and the consideration of submissions in respect of proposals.

   As the original lease has previously disposed of the land there is no requirement to give public notice again.

5. **Comments**

   Excising the car park from the BSB leased area will create more parking bays for use by Mersey Point/Shoalwater Visitors Centre patrons and may also reduce the public liability insurance premiums paid by the club. Whilst BSB may be losing a private car park, they are happy with the fact that they will retain some bowling club only parking bays and that the City will include the refurbishment of the remaining car park areas as the City’s budget allows.

6. **Voting Requirements**

   Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

   That Council APPROVE the variation and extension of lease with Bowls Safety Bay Inc., with a reduction in lease boundary, at Lot 72 Gloucester Cres, Shoalwater, for the remaining term of the original ten (10) year lease extension expiring in July 2022.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

   That Council APPROVE the variation and extension of lease with Bowls Safety Bay Inc., with a reduction in lease boundary, at Lot 72 Gloucester Cres, Shoalwater, for the remaining term of the original ten (10) year lease extension expiring in July 2022.

   Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation**

   Not applicable

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

    Not applicable
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1. Purpose of Report

For Council to adopt the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the City of Rockingham and Living Waters Lutheran College, Warnbro, for the maintenance of the shared Community Oval.

2. Background

In February 2000 the City of Rockingham (City) and Living Waters Lutheran College (School), entered into an agreement for the development and maintenance of a shared oval space located on City land.

The City agreed to be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the entire oval and surrounds and the School agreed to contribute to specific proportions of such maintenance and to other charges.

3. Details

Development of the senior oval at the school has provided a facility that serves the Waikiki/Warnbro community and complements the adjacent Aqua Jetty aquatic facility on Warnbro Sound Avenue.

To date, the maintenance costs have been reconciled per activity at the end of each financial year; however, it is proposed to replace the current fiduciary process with an agreed baseline rate, inclusive of all the maintenance activities, which can then be calculated on a percentage basis.

City of Rockingham 60%
Living Waters Lutheran College 40%

4. 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 5: Community facilities and services delivered in a timely manner, able to meet expectations and serve new and growing neighbourhoods.

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
   Not Applicable

e. Financial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency (per annum)</th>
<th>Hours / Hectares</th>
<th>Unit Rate $</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mowing Broadacre - Tractor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular Fertiliser Application 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular Fertiliser Application 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$235.00</td>
<td>$822.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funds are allocated in the Parks Operations budget for expenditure relating to the overall reserve maintenance.

Work Order 20660

A cost recovery contribution of $32,541.95 including GST from the School will be required to cover the 40% share of the maintenance cost for the prescribed area identified in the MoU.

f. Legal and Statutory

The MoU is not a legally binding document.

5. Comments

The final draft has been vetted by City Officers and is considered to represent good value when compared with equivalent expenditure for sports oval maintenance across the City.

In addition, the agreement does not negate any potential changes to existing land uses for future development of the Aqua Jetty precinct.

It is therefore recommended the Chief Executive Officer sign the Memorandum of understanding.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority
### 7. Officer Recommendation

That Council **APPROVE** the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the City of Rockingham and Living Waters Lutheran College for the maintenance of the shared space located on Lot 3000 DP: 47591 RES: 39592.

### 8. Committee Recommendation

That Council **APPROVE** the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the City of Rockingham and Living Waters Lutheran College for the maintenance of the shared space located on Lot 3000 DP: 47591 RES: 39592.

Committee Voting – 4/0

### 9. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
**1. Purpose of Report**

To seek Council approval of the use of urgent and unbudgeted expenditure, to meet costs directly related to the recent storm events of 10 and 12 June 2012 and endorse the CEO seeking financial assistance through the Western Australian Natural Disaster and Relief Recovery Arrangements – (WANDRRA), to enable the City to recover costs associated with the emergency repairs, clean up and damage directly related to the storm events.

**2. Background**

As a result of the recent storm events on 10 and 12 June 2012 the City sustained damage to buildings fences and public infrastructure and significant erosion along the coast with some damage to coastal infrastructure. In addition, the storms resulted in a significant number of trees being uprooted or severely damaged. An immediate and major clean-up mobilisation has taken place since that time to remove the extensive amount of debris and tree branches on roads and other public areas in order to ensure public safety and allow for the resumption of normal community function as quickly as possible.
3. **Details**

The above storm event has been proclaimed an eligible disaster under the Western Australian Natural Disaster Relief Arrangements (WANDRRA). The State Government will provide immediate financial assistance to those affected through joint State and Commonwealth disaster relief and recovery arrangements.

WANDRRA provides assistance to costs for counter disaster type activities e.g. clean up of debris such as fallen trees and branches and for the restoration or replacement (to pre disaster standard) of essential public assets.

Assistance under the WANDRRA is not designed to supplant, or operate as a disincentive for self-help through insurance claims.

The extensive clean up works required as a result of the storm is continuing. Separate accounts have been established in order for the costs associated with the clean-up work to be clearly identified and quarantined from normal operating costs.

The City’s landfill operations along with facilities such as the Aqua Jetty and the Administration Centre were affected predominantly through the loss of power that occurred as a result of the storm events The administrators of the landfill were required to urgently arrange for the installation of a generator to ensure that the landfill was able to continue to operate following the storms. Power to the administration center was restored on the morning of the 11th allowing the resumption of normal services soon after.

A review of the eligibility documentation for the natural disaster relief funding would indicate that the City has capacity to seek 100% of all costs directly related to any emergency and necessary clean up works caused as a direct result of the storms.

In respect to infrastructure repairs and other costs that would not be able to be claimed through the City’s insurers, the City may be able to claim up to 75% of these costs. There is a contribution cap established for each local authority which is based upon 1% of total rates levied by the respective LGAs. In review of the WANDRRA documentation it would appear that the contribution cap for the City of Rockingham is $322,132.

Officers are presently correlating all the necessary information including all repair costs for all works directly attributed to the storm damage.

Prior to submitting a claim through WANDRRA Senior Officers will arrange to meet with the WANDRRA administrator to ensure that the City’s claim is consistent with the requirements of the relief arrangements.

4. **Implications to Consider**

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

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   
   The administrator of WANDRRA is based with Fire, Emergency Services Administration (FESA) and Senior City Officers will meet with the administrator prior to submitting any claim for cost recovery.

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**

   Nil
e. **Financial**

Costs related to the storm event are currently being met through the City’s municipal funds. A reserve account for emergency relief funding is included in the City’s 2012/13 budget.

Separate work orders have been established in order for the City to ascertain actual costs related to clean up and repairs associated with the storm damage. An insurance claim will be lodged for all insurable assets. A claim to WANDRRA will be submitted once all costs are identified over the next four weeks.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

Section 4.2 of the Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements Determination 2011 version 1, issued by the Commonwealth Government Attorney General.

### 5. Comments

The Storm had a widespread impact throughout the City and the clean-up effort of the parks and engineering teams that have worked in difficult circumstances over an extended period of time has been tremendous. This work has been ongoing since the storm events and has enabled the community to resume its normal functions as soon as possible.

The risks posed by severe storms and the potential operating problems faced by the City as a result of the loss of essential services, highlights the need for the City to develop a Business Continuity Plan. Long term climate predictions are for more frequent major storm events occurring in the future and a business continuity plan will form part of the City’s overall risk management strategy and will be essential for the City’s future response to such events.

At the meeting with the WANDRRA administrators for FESA, clarification will be sought in respect to the eligibility of the City of claim for costs such as coastal rehabilitation works necessary as a result of the erosion that occurred during the storm events as well as repairs to beach access paths and other coastal infrastructure. In addition all other infrastructure repair costs that are not eligible for an insurance claim will be costed and included within the City’s claim to WANDRRA.

### 6. Voting Requirements

**Absolute Majority**

### 7. Officer Recommendation

That Council **APPROVE** the use of urgent and unbudgeted expenditure, to meet costs directly related to the storm events of 10\(^{th}\) and 12\(^{th}\) June 2012, including an amount of $30,000 for the purchase and installation of a generator for the landfill, for use as an emergency power supply.

### 8. Committee Recommendation

That Council **APPROVE** the use of urgent and unbudgeted expenditure, to meet costs directly related to the storm events of 10\(^{th}\) and 12\(^{th}\) June 2012, including an amount of $30,000 for the purchase and installation of a generator for the landfill, for use as an emergency power supply.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
## Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T11/12-65 – Supply, delivery and licensing of one rear loading refuse truck with optional trade of the City’s existing rear loading refuse truck RO 1987 and / or outright purchase of City’s existing rear loading refuse truck RO 1987 and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

## Background

The tenders was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 14 April 2012 for Tender T11/12-65 supply, delivery and licensing of one rear loading refuse truck with optional trade of the City’s existing rear loading refuse truck RO 1987 and / or outright purchase of City’s existing rear loading refuse truck RO 1987.

Tenders closed at 2.00pm Wednesday, 9 May 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after closing time.
3. Details

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Price for Supply, Delivery and Licencing of Rear Loading Refuse Truck Excluding GST</th>
<th>Trade In Value for the City’s existing Rear Loading Refuse Truck Excluding GST</th>
<th>Total Change-Over Cost Excluding GST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV Truck Services Pty Ltd (Dennis Eagle - Superior Pak)</td>
<td>$310,696</td>
<td>$68,181</td>
<td>$242,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Truck Services Pty Ltd (Dennis Eagle - MacDonald Johnston)</td>
<td>$349,175</td>
<td>$68,181</td>
<td>$280,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daimler Trucks Perth (UD Fighter - MacDonald Johnston)</td>
<td>$312,390</td>
<td>$54,550</td>
<td>$257,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Hino (Hino - Superior Pak)</td>
<td>$275,434</td>
<td>$49,091</td>
<td>$226,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Hino (Hino - MacDonald Johnston)</td>
<td>$302,599</td>
<td>$49,091</td>
<td>$253,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Hino (Hino - Garwood)</td>
<td>$276,651</td>
<td>$49,091</td>
<td>$227,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Motors Pty Ltd (Isuzu - Superior Pak)</td>
<td>$289,830</td>
<td>$59,091</td>
<td>$230,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Motors Pty Ltd (Isuzu - MacDonald Johnston)</td>
<td>$316,820</td>
<td>$59,091</td>
<td>$257,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigold Pty Ltd (Outright Purchase)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$70,555</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald Johnston (Body Only)</td>
<td>$173,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$173,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>WA Hino Superior Pak</th>
<th>WA Hino Garwood</th>
<th>Major Motors Superior Pak</th>
<th>Major Motors MJE</th>
<th>AV Truck Service Superior Pak</th>
<th>WA Hino MJE</th>
<th>Daimler Trucks MJE</th>
<th>AV Truck Service MJE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Implications to Consider

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

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

c. **Strategic**
   - **Community Plan**
     - This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-
     
     **Aspiration 12:** Carbon footprint reduction and waste minimisation programs centred upon public awareness and the use of new technologies.

d. **Policy**
   - Purchasing policy 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 11 (1) Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless subregulation (2) states otherwise.

e. **Financial**
   - Expenditure of $415,000 has been allocated for the purchase of one new side loading refuse truck in the 2012/2013 budget account (GL 410117.1) – Plant and Equipment Purchases with an estimate trade in value for the City’s existing refuse truck RO1987 of $40,000.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   - In accordance with Local Government Act 1995 Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, Regulation 11 (1). Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $100,000 unless subregulation (2) states otherwise.

### 5. Comments

Brigold Pty Ltd tender submission was for the outright purchase of the City’s existing rear loading waste compactor unit RO1987.

No tenderers were able to provide complete refuse trucks for testing.

City Officers undertook test drives and mechanical assessments of available Truck Cab Chassis and Rear Loading Compactor units in accordance with the advertised tender selection criteria, performance and experience of tenderer.

Following assessment of the submissions received including the above mechanical and operating assessments being undertaken, the assessment panel considered that the tender submissions received from Major Motors for the supply of the truck and from Brigold Pty Ltd for the outright purchase of the City’s existing refuse truck represents best value for money to the City. Therefore Major Motors and Brigold Pty Ltd are recommended as the preferred tenderers.

The existing refuse truck RO1987 will not be released until delivery of the new rear loading refuse truck.

### 6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority
7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Major Motors 789 Abernethy Road Forrestfield, for Tender T11/12-65 for the supply, delivery and licensing of one rear loading refuse truck fitted with the 14 cubic metre MacDonald Johnston rear loading compactor for a total cost of $316,820 excluding GST, and Brigold Pty Ltd 1280 Hume Highway Kalkallo Victoria for the outright purchase of the City’s existing rear loading refuse truck RO 1987 for $70,555 excluding GST resulting in a net change over of ($316,820 - $70,555) $246,265 in accordance with the tender documentation.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Major Motors 789 Abernethy Road Forrestfield, for Tender T11/12-65 for the supply, delivery and licensing of one rear loading refuse truck fitted with the 14 cubic metre MacDonald Johnston rear loading compactor for a total cost of $316,820 excluding GST, and Brigold Pty Ltd 1280 Hume Highway Kalkallo Victoria for the outright purchase of the City’s existing rear loading refuse truck RO 1987 for $70,555 excluding GST resulting in a net change over of ($316,820 - $70,555) $246,265 in accordance with the tender documentation.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reports of Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addendum Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motions of which Previous Notice has been given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notices of motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matters Behind Closed Doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and Time of Next Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting will be held on Tuesday 21 August 2012 in the Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The meeting will commence at 4:00pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There being no further business, the Chairman thanked those persons present for attending the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee meeting, and declared the meeting closed at 4:25pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>