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1. **Declaration of Opening**

The Chairman declared the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting open at 4:00pm and welcomed all present.

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

   2.1 **Councillors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cr Barry Sammels</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Lorraine Dunkling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Allan Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Ron Pease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   2.2 **Executive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Andrew Hammond</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson</td>
<td>Director Engineering and Parks Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Pearson</td>
<td>Director Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Scott Lambie</td>
<td>A/Manager Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gary Rogers</td>
<td>Manager Procurement and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Stuart McCarthy</td>
<td>Manager Engineering Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kelton Hincks</td>
<td>Manager Asset Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr James Henson</td>
<td>Manager Parks Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Cadell Buss</td>
<td>Manager Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ben Searcy</td>
<td>Manager Human Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Karin Strachan</td>
<td>Manager Strategy Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Allan Moles</td>
<td>Manager Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter Varris</td>
<td>Manager Governance and Councillor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Jelette Edwards</td>
<td>Governance Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sue Langley</td>
<td>Secretary Governance and Councillor Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Members of the Public:** 6

   **Press:** 1

   2.3 **Apologies:** Nil

   2.4 **Approved Leave of Absence:** Nil
3. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice

Nil

4. Public Question Time

4:02pm The Chairman invited members of the Public Gallery to ask questions.

4.1 Mr Dennis Howe, Waikiki – Removal of Trees at Braeden Reserve

The Mayor invited Mr Howe to present his question to the Corporate and Engineering Services Standing Committee. Mr Howe asked the following question:

1. Request for Council to consider the removal of extremely large native trees at the rear of the Braeden Reserve backing onto properties at the Waikiki Villas?

The Chairman advised that the Engineering Department will investigate and the question will be taken on notice.

4:05pm There being no further questions the Chairman closed Public Question Time.

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

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hill:

That Council CONFIRM the Minutes of the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting held on 15 May 2012, as a true and accurate record.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Nil

7. Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion

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

8.1 Item CS-019/12 Proposed Changes to the Policy of Investment of Surplus Funds

Councillor: Cr Allan Hill
Type of Interest: Financial Interest
Nature of Interest: Has shares in the Bendigo Bank
Extent of Interest (if applicable): Not Applicable
8.2 Item ED-007/12 Tender for the Provision of Printing and Graphic Design Services  
Councillor: Cr Barry Sammels  
Type of Interest: Financial Interest  
Nature of Interest: Wife works for Parkin Print  
Extent of Interest (if applicable): Not Applicable

8.3 Item CS-019/12 Vietnam Veterans Memorial for Waterfront Village Green  
Councillor: Cr Allan Hill  
Type of Interest: Impartiality Interest  
Nature of Interest: Hoping to install this memorial as a volunteer of the RSL  
Extent of Interest (if applicable): Not Applicable

9. Petitions/Deputations/Presentations/Submissions

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

The Presiding Member advised in accordance with section 5.23(2)(a)(b) and (c) of the Local Government Act 1995 – if there were any questions or debate on Confidential Items GM-003/12 – Provision of Legal Services to the City and EP-029/12 - Southern Metropolitan Regional Council – City of Canning Withdrawal Deed of Settlement, then the Committee will need to go behind closed doors.

### General Management

**CONFIDENTIAL ITEM**

**NOT FOR PUBLIC ACCESS**

Section 5.95(3) Local Government Act 1995 (the Act)

This item may be discussed behind closed doors as per Section 5.23(2)(a) and (b) of the Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>GM-003/12 Provision of Legal Services to the City</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>Mr Andrew Hammond, Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>19 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hill:

That this matter be deferred to Item 18 – Matters Behind Closed Doors.

Carried – 4/0
CONFIDENTIAL ITEM
NOT FOR PUBLIC ACCESS
Section 5.95(3) Local Government Act 1995 (the Act)
This item may be discussed behind closed doors as per Section 5.23(2)(c) of the Act

Corporate and Engineering Services
Engineering and Parks Services

Reference No & Subject: EP-029/12 Southern Metropolitan Regional Council – City of Canning Withdrawal Deed of Settlement

File No: Southern Metropolitan Regional Council
Proponent/s: Mr Chris Thompson, Director Engineering and Parks Services
Author:
Other Contributors:
Date of Committee Meeting: 19 June 2012
Previously before Council:
Disclosure of Interest: Executive Function
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:

Site:
Lot Area:
Attachments: Deed of Settlement dated 8 June 2012
Maps/Diagrams:

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hill:
That this matter be deferred to Item 18 – Matters Behind Closed Doors.

Carried – 4/0
## 11. Bulletin Items

### Corporate and General Management Services Information Bulletin – June 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 Change of Basis of Rates
   4.2 List of Payments

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

**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 Printing and Graphic Design Services
   3.2 Leadership Forum
   3.3 Collateral Print and Distribution Audit
   3.4 Social Media
   3.5 Tourism Strategy
4. Information Items
   4.1 Communication of Severe Weather Event
   4.2 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 – June 2012 and the contents be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0

Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – June 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)
   4.10 Correspondence received

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 2011/12
   4.2 Road Construction Program Main Roads Direct Grant 2011/12
   4.3 Road Construction Program Main Roads Grant 2011/12
   4.4 Road Construction Program Federal Black Spot 2011/12
4.5 Road Construction Program State Black Spot 2011/12
4.6 Road Construction Program Municipal Works 2011/12
4.7 Road Resurfacing Program Municipal Works 2011/12
4.8 Footpath Construction Program Municipal Works 2011/12
4.9 Road Maintenance Program 2011/12
4.10 Passenger Vehicle Fleet Program 2011/12
4.11 Light Commercial Vehicles Program 2011/12
4.12 Heavy Plant Program 2011/12

**Parks Development**
1. Parks Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Warnbro Dunes Car Park Shoring
4. Information Items
   4.1 Groundwater Monitoring
   4.2 Kent Street Community Arts Centre Landscape Project
   4.3 Lake Richmond Heritage Listing
   4.4 Delegated Subdivision Public Open Space Handovers
   4.5 Delegated Public Open Space Approvals
   4.6 Memorial Seat Approvals

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

**Building Maintenance**
1. Building Maintenance Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
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 Museum Roof Replacement
   4.10 Aqua Jetty – Replace/Upgrade HVAC Services
   4.11 Bent England Lodge - Compliance
   4.12 Bell Park Toilet – Replacement including Curfew Lockout System
   4.13 Francis Street Toilets – Internal/External Renovations
   4.14 Aquatic Centre – Renewal of Toilets/Unisex/Change Rooms
   4.15 Challenger Court – Master Metering and Replacement Distribution Boards
   4.16 Baldivis Library - Design
   4.17 Aqua jetty – Solar Heating
   4.18 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 T11/12-56 Supply, delivery and licensing of one rear loading refuse truck with optional trade of Council’s existing rear loading refuse truck 1987

**Committee Recommendation**

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

Committee Voting – 4/0
1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is for the adoption of the 2012/13 financial year budget and gives explanation on its content and detail. A detailed budget document for the 2012/13 financial year has been prepared and supplied to each Councillor for consideration.

2. Background

The Major Capital items contained in the budget document were included in the City of Rockingham City Business Plan 2012/13-2020/21, which was adopted on 24 April 2012.

Councillors have also been briefed on items to be included with the budget and two briefings related directly to the City Business Plan.

The City of Rockingham Rates Model adopted on 22 May 2012 and proposed Fees and Charges were adopted “in principle” on 24 April 2012.

---

1 Replacement pages issued for Section 8 ‘Fees and Charges’, pages 25 and 26 to correct Various Cemetery Charges.
3. Details

The budget document is indexed into various categories to give details of various budget expenditures.

Of most interest will be the new items included, and these are listed in Section 3 of the budget document. Of further interest will be section 3.4, which gives details of the expected sources of funding for the various capital items.

The largest single new capital item is that of Mundijong Road. It is estimated to cost $15.7 million to construct. Reserve transfers will occur this year to the value of $12 million, with further expenditure to occur in future years which will be funded by reserve transfers and a loan if necessary. No loan has been catered for in the City Business Plan but will be included in the next version. Federal funding was receive a number of years ago totalling $6.7 million.

Baldivis Library and Community Centre is due to commence construction totalling $12.6 million. Grants associated with this facility total $6.875 million.

The projected operating incomes and expenses are included in section 2 of the budget. Total operating revenue is expected to be $121.7 million. Total operating expenditure is expected to be $118.4 million. Total capital expenditure is expected to be $55 million. Rate revenue is anticipated to be $52.3 million.

The proposals for rates are included in section 5 of the budget document, as per those adopted by Council at its meeting of 22 May 2012. The rate yield will represent some 43% of Council's overall official operating income. Operating surplus from landfill is predicted to be approximately $6 million with only $2 million being transferred to reserves to protect the landfill asset. In the 2012/13 financial year $4 million is being used to support City operations and capital construction program.

Fees and Charges included within the budget are as per those adopted by Council 'in principle' on 24 April 2012. Fees and Charges are listed in section 8 of the budget document.

Various supporting notes are included in section 7 of the budget.

The Statutory Statements are included in section 6 of the budget. The most important of these is the Rate Setting Statement. The Statutory version is item 6.1.2, however we have also included a "Flowchart" version (item 6.1.1), which we believe is more informative.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

Consultation has occurred consistently with the community in the lead up to the adoption of the budget. The City of Rockingham Community Plan engaged a significant number of ratepayers in its preparation. The Community Infrastructure Plan has been publicly advertised and endorsed by Council. These documents sought public comment. All these documents feed through to the Annual Budget document.

The 2012/13 rates model was publically advertised seeking submissions on differential rates. To date no submission has been received. Submission closing date occurs on 19 June and further updates on this matter will be provided as needed.

An intensive information program is underway to ensure that reasons for budgets and rates increases are clearly communicated.

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.
The budget has been prepared in accordance with the City Business Plan, having regard to the City of Rockingham Community Plan.

It is of critical strategic importance that the City of Rockingham maintains a solid rate foundation that is above natural growth. Given the City’s current low rate revenue and the enormous need for infrastructure in the future, it is imperative that revenue be created to ensure the City’s prosperity.

It is also strategically and legislatively important that the City remove itself from the reliance on Millar Road Landfill to maintain City operations.

d. Policy

Nil

e. Financial

The budget is the Council’s most important annual financial document and details what is proposed for the forthcoming year. It lists all matters of an operational nature, as well as capital items and various sources of income. The budget is the basis for Council striking its rates for the new financial year.

It is considered important that Councillors understand the financial make-up of various items within the budget for the forthcoming year. The most important items are those of a "new" nature, and these are included in section 3 of the budget document. Section 3.4 lists the proposed new capital projects, and gives details of the expected sources of finances. While brief explanations are included throughout the budget document, Councillors have been involved and briefed consistently over the preceding six months related to the budget contents.

History has seen that construction of new assets and delivery of new operational services has been funded by either debt or landfill revenue. Both these methods of asset creation and service delivery are problematic and unsustainable. The situation the City currently has with landfill revenue means that land rates need to make the shortfall or fixed expenditure needs to be reduced. Reduction in fixed costs means reduced service delivery and Council has previously indicated its desire to not see services reduce, however other options are limited unless greater revenue is sourced.

Whist the finances within the City of Rockingham are not dire, unless continued action is taken to address the situation major problems are likely to be encountered within the medium term. The City has supported this view and has adopted rates increases with attempt to correct historical financial matters. The approach taken will take at least eight years to ensure security. Staff will investigate rating options and utilise greater differential rating methods to assist in resolving the revenue imbalance. As the useful life of landfill reduces, so does the time available to build suitable revenue buffers to address post closure rehabilitation or major catastrophic issues associated with landfill emergency closure. It is officer opinion that the practice of utilising landfill revenue to subsidise rate increases needs to cease immediately.

Carbon pricing is now a reality and the City landfill will need to receive an extra $2 million a year in revenue to cover the costs associated with the carbon generation. It is imperative that these funds are not used for any other purpose apart for carbon permits and taxes. It commences the provision the financial resources to purchase carbon permits for the next 80 years.

Recent Council deliberation at the Ordinary April Council Meeting resolved in principle to support the adoption of a 9.9% rate increase. This increase has been included in the budget document. $2 million is proposed to be transferred from Landfill revenue to cash backed reserve, in accordance with the City Business Plan.

The Federal Government Financial Assistance Grants remains steady at $3.97 million and the local roads component of the amount is $1.76 million. The City of Rockingham is a minimum grant Council which means the City receives a fixed sum of money from the Federal government based on population. Therefore there is an upward trend in this number and it is unlikely to reduce unless there are changes in Federal legislation.
The City can expect general increases in costs associated with carbon pricing. An allocation of approximately $500,000 has occurred, spread across all budgets to try to mitigate these changes.

Staff increases are in line with presented Team Plans and are related directly to growth areas, generally Engineering and Parks (i.e. gardeners and the like).

Given the early budget adoption, assumptions have been made related to opening balances. The March 2011 Quarterly Budget Review indicated a surplus opening balance of approximately $154,000, excluding carry over works and restricted funding. The 2012/13 Annual Budget opening balance is $7,575,265. This figure is inclusive of uncompleted prior year works. In essence we are anticipating an untied cash opening position of $1.37 million. Should there be any variance to this figure budget adjustments through the quarterly review process will occur accordingly. Council will need to be mindful of any further changes or requests for additional items throughout the coming financial year, as it currently appears that there is little capacity to accommodate any new large costs unless there are other positive movements to Council’s end-of-year balance position. Adoption of new items beyond that which are now included in the budget could mean that some of the adopted projects may have to be “dropped off” or be delayed until future years. This process may even still need to occur should there be any large decreases in any of the projected income sources.

It is considered important that Council continues to ‘live within its means’ and to stay focused on the important task of following good financial management practices, especially over the next seven years.

Once again contingency funds are limited so various incomes and expenditures will be closely monitored throughout the year, and variations will be processed at the Quarterly Budget Review stages.

1. Legal and Statutory

Preparation and adoption of the budget has occurred in accordance with all legislative requirements.

It is a requirement under section 6.36 of the Local Government Act 1995 that where a Council elects to utilise differential rates then it shall advertise its intention to do so, and call for submissions for a period of least 21 days before any further action occurs. This has occurred. No submissions have been received to date. Further updates, if needed, will be provided at the meeting. In accordance with prescribed legislation, Council is to consider any submission received and may impose the proposed rates with or without modification.

5. Comments

Officers have presented to Council a long term Business Plan that integrates suitable financial models for the purpose of planning. The Annual Budget as presented represents the first year of the City Business Plan.

The rates incentive scheme as run in prior years is planned to occur again with prizes anticipated to be in the vicinity of $7,000. These prizes are generally sponsored by Council suppliers. Residents are eligible should they pay their rates in full by the due date. Payment of full rates by the due date assists Council’s cash flow as well as enabling better interest yields on short term investments.

There is also a State Government requirement for Councils to levy an Emergency Services Levy (ESL). This charge is shown separately on the rate notices. These funds are remitted to FESA for their distribution.

In adopting the budget, there always remains the difficulty that the opening balance may need adjusting as not all figures may have been processed by the adoption date. Staff have attempted to cross check as many items as possible, however, later changes can remain necessary. This is generally corrected at the next Quarterly Budget Review process.

Much commentary has occurred about the City of Rockingham proposed rate increases. In further explanation of proposed future increases, the City is faced with ageing community infrastructure and the needs of a rapidly increasing population. The additional revenue is vital to simply maintain
existing infrastructure, such as public toilets, roads, parks, footpaths and recreation centres. We also need to meet the expectations of our community and ensure facilities such as the Baldivis Library are constructed to serve new residents.

In comparison with other local governments, Rockingham’s rates are the second lowest in the Perth Metropolitan area.

The City also needs to establish cash reserves to support the long term risks and responsibilities involved in managing its commercial and environmental obligations. It is estimated that $15 million will be needed in reserve to cover these contingencies and protect ratepayers from potential future liabilities resulting from an incident at the landfill or unpredicted closure and remediation costs.

The draft budget as presented is recommended to Council for adoption.

6. Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **ADOPT** the proposed budget (as amended by Council where deemed appropriate) for the 2012/2013 year and the levels of income and expenditures, as presented within the Budget document, be authorised.

2. **ADOPT** the following rate levels for the 2012/2013 year;

   2.1 For all Residential, Commercial/Business, Light Industry and General Industry rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 6.56103 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.

   2.2 For all Broadacre Residential Unimproved rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 11.2098 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.

   2.3 For all Broadacre Development rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 11.2098 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.

   2.4 For all Residential Unimproved Rural rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 11.2098 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.

   2.5 For all Residential Rural Improved rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 6.56103 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.

   2.6 For all Rural Improved rateable properties where Unimproved Values are applied, a rate of .093 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $400 to apply.

   2.7 For all Urban Farmland rateable properties where Unimproved Values are applied, a rate of .075 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $400 to apply.

   2.8 For all Urban Unimproved rateable properties where Unimproved Values are applied, a rate of .075 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $400 to apply.

   2.9 For all properties located within the Harrington Waters Precinct, a specified area rate apply of .0032 cents in the dollar for the purposes of maintaining public grounds within the area at a higher than average standard.

   2.10 For all properties receiving underground power, in the Palm Beach Underground Power Project, a specified area rate apply of .081275 cents in the dollar for the purpose of supplying the underground power.
3. That where payments are received after the prescribed time and penalty charges apply, then a penalty interest rate for all Gross Rental Value outstanding Rates is set at ten (10%) per cent per annum, to be calculated on a daily basis.

4. That where payments for the Emergency Services Levy (ESL) are received after the prescribed time and penalty charges apply, then a penalty interest rate for all outstanding ESL is set at eleven (11%) per cent per annum, to be calculated on a daily basis.

5. That for those ratepayers not paying by instalments, the penalty interest will commence to be calculated 36 days after the rates notice issue date.

6. That the following Rates Instalment Payment Options be adopted:

   **Option 1**
   To pay the total amount of rates and charges included on the rate notice in full by the 35th day after the Rates Notice issue.

   **Option 2**
   Payments to be made by two (2) instalments as will be detailed on the Rates Notices with the following anticipated dates:
   - First Instalment 17th August, 2012
   - Second Instalment 14th December, 2012

   **Option 3**
   Payments to be made by four (4) instalments, as will be detailed on the Rates Notices with the following anticipated dates:
   - First Instalment 17th August, 2012
   - Second Instalment 17th October, 2012
   - Third Instalment 14th December, 2012
   - Fourth Instalment 14th February, 2013

7. That where payments are made by instalment, an administration charge of $3.50 for each instalment after the first instalment shall apply and interest to be set at five point five (5.5%) per cent per annum, to be calculated on a daily basis.

8. That the transfers/movements to and from the Reserve Accounts, as detailed within the budget document and in accordance with Council’s adopted policies, be authorised.

9. That the Fees and Charges, as listed in Section 8 of this budget document, be imposed for the 2012/2013 year.

**8. Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **ADOPT** the proposed budget (as amended by Council where deemed appropriate) for the 2012/2013 year and the levels of income and expenditures, as presented within the Budget document, be authorised.

2. **ADOPT** the following rate levels for the 2012/2013 year;
   2.1 For all Residential, Commercial/Business, Light Industry and General Industry rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 6.56103 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.
   2.2 For all Broadacre Residential Unimproved rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 11.2098 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.
2.3 For all Broadacre Development rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 11.2098 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.

2.4 For all Residential Unimproved Rural rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 11.2098 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.

2.5 For all Residential Rural Improved rateable properties where Gross Rental Valuations are applied, a rate of 6.56103 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $799 to apply.

2.6 For all Rural Improved rateable properties where Unimproved Values are applied, a rate of .093 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $400 to apply.

2.7 For all Rural Unimproved rateable properties where Unimproved Values are applied, a rate of .075 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $400 to apply.

2.8 For all Urban Farmland rateable properties where Unimproved Values are applied, a rate of .075 cents in the dollar with a Minimum Rate of $400 to apply.

2.9 For all properties located within the Harrington Waters Precinct, a specified area rate apply of .0032 cents in the dollar for the purposes of maintaining public grounds within the area at a higher than average standard.

2.10 For all properties receiving underground power, in the Palm Beach Underground Power Project, a specified area rate apply of .081275 cents in the dollar for the purpose of supplying the underground power.

3. That where payments are received after the prescribed time and penalty charges apply, then a penalty interest rate for all Gross Rental Value outstanding Rates is set at ten (10%) per cent per annum, to be calculated on a daily basis.

4. That where payments for the Emergency Services Levy (ESL) are received after the prescribed time and penalty charges apply, then a penalty interest rate for all outstanding ESL is set at eleven (11%) per cent per annum, to be calculated on a daily basis.

5. That for those ratepayers not paying by instalments, the penalty interest will commence to be calculated 36 days after the rates notice issue date.

6. That the following Rates Instalment Payment Options be adopted:

   **Option 1**
   To pay the total amount of rates and charges included on the rate notice in full by the 35th day after the Rates Notice issue.

   **Option 2**
   Payments to be made by two (2) instalments as will be detailed on the Rates Notices with the following anticipated dates:
   - First Instalment: 17th August, 2012
   - Second Instalment: 14th December, 2012

   **Option 3**
   Payments to be made by four (4) instalments, as will be detailed on the Rates Notices with the following anticipated dates:
   - First Instalment: 17th August, 2012
   - Second Instalment: 17th October, 2012
   - Third Instalment: 14th December, 2012
   - Fourth Instalment: 14th February, 2013
7. That where payments are made by instalment, an administration charge of $3.50 for each instalment after the first instalment shall apply and interest to be set at five point five (5.5%) per cent per annum, to be calculated on a daily basis.

8. That the transfers/movements to and from the Reserve Accounts, as detailed within the budget document and in accordance with Council’s adopted policies, be authorised.

10. That the Fees and Charges, as listed in Section 8 of this budget document, be imposed for the 2012/2013 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
4:19pm  Cr Hill departed the meeting as he has a financial interest in Item CS-019/12.

Corporate and Engineering Services
Corporate Services

Reference No & Subject: CS-019/12  Proposed Changes to the Policy of Investment of Surplus Funds

File No: FLM/277

Proponent/s: Mr John Pearson, Director, Corporate Services

Author: Ms Vanisha Govender, Financial Accountant

Other Contributors: Mr Allan Moles, Manager, Financial Services.

Date of Committee Meeting: 19 June 2012

Previously before Council: 19 June 2012

Disclosure of Interest: Executive Function

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

1. Purpose of Report

To present the updated Policy on Investment of Surplus Funds.

2. Background

As a result of Local Government Amendment (Financial Management) Regulations 2012, gazetted on the 20 April 2012, there were changes to section 6.14(2)(a) of the Local Government Act 1995 which needed to be incorporated in to City of Rockingham’s current Investment Policy.

3. Details

The current policy has been updated as per amendments to the Local Government (Financial Management Regulations 2012, gazetted on the 20 April 2012. The policy has been updated to incorporate the Fitch and Moody’s as rating agents.

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**

The policy is written to be conservative by nature to ensure there are no losses on investments held. The aim in not to be speculative; however the policy requires an assessment to be made regarding return on investment verses risk.

e. **Financial**

Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**

Sections 6.14 of the Local Government Act 1995 (the Act) relates to the investment of funds, granting permission for funds held within the municipal or trust accounts to be invested.

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, Regulation 19C provides specific details regarding how money can and cannot be invested. Specifically these requirements include the requirement to invest with authorised deposit-taking institution as defined in the Banking Act 1959 (Commonwealth) section 5; or The Western Australian Treasury Corporation established by the Western Australian Treasury Corporation Act 1986.

Further when investing money a local government may not do any of the following:

a) deposit with an institution except an authorised institution
b) deposit for a fixed term of more than 12 months
c) invest in bonds that are not guaranteed by the Commonwealth Government, or a State or Territory government
d) invest in bonds with a term to maturity of more than 3 years
e) invest in foreign currency

5. **Comments**

Recent years events have seen concerns in global banking markets and much attention has been placed on investment portfolios of local governments. The current global economy has still not settled from the Global Financial Crisis which commenced in 2008/09. The City of Rockingham’s previous investment policy was appropriately very conservative and ensured that all City funds were secure. Essentially any changes made to the current policy should be made to ensure the conservative nature and update requirements in accordance with recent statutory changes.

The proposed policy is increasing the requirement to use independent credit rating agencies. As such any investment made will need to be rated by Standard and Poor’s, Fitch and Moody’s and with the lower rate of all three agencies holding the priority when making investment choices.

It is also proposed to ensure that a minimum allocation occur with Bendigo Bank to the value of $2,000,000. This was previously capped at $2,000,000. Essentially this ensures that Bendigo Bank has a minimum deposit at all time but further investments will be made according to prevailing rates or return versus risk. The ability access and use systems provided by any institution will also be taken into consideration (i.e. ease of functionality).

The proposed policy provides greater clarity with regards to maximum and minimum investment percentages both with any one institution or any one credit rating.
Independent advice has been considered in the preparation of this policy, much of which has been formed within the policy document.

### 6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

### 7. Officer Recommendation

That Council **ADOPT** the Policy - Investment of Surplus Funds

**INVESTMENT OF SURPLUS FUNDS**

#### Policy Objective

To:

- Adopt a conservative approach to investments but with a focus to add value through the prudent investments of funds taking into consideration risk, the favourable rate of interest and also ensuring liquidity requirements are met.
- Achieve a high level of security by using recognised ratings criteria, specifically rating agencies Standard and Poors, Fitch and Moody’s;
- Maintain an adequate level of diversification; and
- Funds being readily accessible for day-to-day requirements without incurring penalty charges.

#### Policy Scope

The Policy affects all investments made by the City of Rockingham.

#### Policy Statement

**Legislative Requirements**

All investments are to be made in accordance with:

- Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996
- Australian Accounting Standards

**Delegation of Authority**

For information purposes, delegated authority has been provided to the CEO in accordance with section 5.42 of Local Government Act 1995 for investment of surplus funds.

**Prudent Person Standard**

The investment will be managed with the care, diligence and skill that a prudent person would exercise. Officers are to manage the investment portfolios in accordance with the spirit of this Investment Policy, and not for speculative purposes.

**Approved Institutions**

Investments shall be made only in the name of the City of Rockingham and all investments shall be made only with institutions which meet this policy’s requirements on Authorised Investments, Diversification and Credit Risk.

**Authorised Investments**

Authorised investments shall be limited to the following types:

- an Authorised Deposit-Taking Institution (ADI) as defined in the Banking Act 1959 (Commonwealth) section 5; or
- The Western Australian Treasury Corporation established by the Western Australian Treasury Corporation Act 1986; and
any securities which have a short term Standard and Poor's Investors credit rating of A1+, A1 or A2; or a Moody's short term rating of P-1 or P2; or a Fitch short term rating of F1+, F1 or F2 rating.

Prohibited Investments

When investing money under section 6.14(1), a local government may not do any of the following:

- deposit with an institution except an authorised institution
- deposit for a fixed term of more than 12 months
- invest in bonds that are not guaranteed by the Commonwealth Government, or a State or Territory government
- invest in bonds with a term to maturity of more than 3 years
- invest in foreign currency

Investment Quotations

Not less than three quotations should be requested and at least 2 be received. These shall be obtained from authorised institutions whenever an investment is proposed.

Selection of Investment

The criteria to be applied in making the investment choice will take into account:

- The rate of return offered for the respective investment.
- The relative risk of the respective investments, taking into account the Standard and Poor's, Fitch or Moody's ratings.
- The requirement that no more than 50% of Council's total investment portfolio will be invested at any one time with one financial institution.
- Council's future estimated cash flow requirements.
- An investment of a minimum amount of $2million will be maintained with Bendigo Bank.

Diversification and Credit Risk

Investments made shall be within the percentage limits set out below. When placing investments, consideration should be given to the relationship between credit rating and interest rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Ratings Standards &amp; Poors</th>
<th>Short Term Rating Moody's</th>
<th>Short Term Rating Fitch</th>
<th>Maximum Percentage of Total Investments</th>
<th>Minimum Percentage Total Investment</th>
<th>Maximum Percentage with any one Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1+</td>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>F1+</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above, it is to apply upon the commencement of individual investments.

This Policy requires the use of Standard and Poors, Fitch & Moody's credit ratings. Any one institution is required to have a rating from all three credit rating institutions. The lowest rating from any one institution will be deemed to be the credit rating for any Authorised Institution

Reporting and Record Keeping

Documentary evidence must be held for each investment and details thereof maintained in an Investment Register.

Certificates must be obtained from the financial institutions confirming the amounts of investments held on Council's behalf as at 30 June each year and reconciled to the Investment Register.

The status and performance of the investment portfolio to be reported to council on a monthly basis.
Definitions

ADI - Authorised Deposit-Taking Institutions (ADI) are corporations that are authorised under the Banking Act 1959 to take deposits from customers.

Investment Portfolio – A collection of investments.

Liquidity risk - Liquidity risk is the risk an investor is unable to realise at a fair price within a timely period.

Risk Aversion - Risk aversion is the reluctance of an individual to invest in a product with a higher risk compared to a product with lower risk, but possibly lower returns.

Rating Agencies – Credit Rating Agencies such as Standard and Poor’s, Moody’s and Fitch are professional organisations that provide opinion on the general credit worthiness of an obligor with respect to a particular debt security or other financial obligations. Credit ratings are based, in varying degrees, on the following considerations:
- likelihood of payment
- nature and provisions of the obligation
- protection afforded by, and relative position of, the obligation in the event of bankruptcy, reorganisation or other laws affecting creditor rights.

Speculative - A speculative deal involves deliberately taking a higher risk, in the hope of making an extraordinary gain.

Legislation


Other Relevant Policies/ Key Documents

Department of Local Government and Regional Development Investment Policy, Local Government Operational Guidelines - Number 19 February 2008.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ADOPT the Policy - Investment of Surplus Funds

INVESTMENT OF SURPLUS FUNDS

Policy Objective

To:
- Adopt a conservative approach to investments but with a focus to add value through the prudent investments of funds taking into consideration risk, the favourable rate of interest and also ensuring liquidity requirements are met.
- Achieve a high level of security by using recognised ratings criteria, specifically rating agencies Standard and Poors, Fitch and Moody’s;
- Maintain an adequate level of diversification; and
- Funds being readily accessible for day-to-day requirements without incurring penalty charges.

Policy Scope

The Policy affects all investments made by the City of Rockingham.

Policy Statement

Legislative Requirements

All investments are to be made in accordance with:
- Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996
CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING
SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 JULY 2012

- Australian Accounting Standards

Delegation of Authority
For information purposes, delegated authority has been provided to the CEO in accordance with section 5.42 of Local Government Act 1995 for investment of surplus funds.

Prudent Person Standard
The investment will be managed with the care, diligence and skill that a prudent person would exercise. Officers are to manage the investment portfolios in accordance with the spirit of this Investment Policy, and not for speculative purposes.

Approved Institutions
Investments shall be made only in the name of the City of Rockingham and all investments shall be made only with institutions which meet this policy’s requirements on Authorised Investments, Diversification and Credit Risk.

Authorised Investments
Authorised investments shall be limited to the following types:
- an Authorised Deposit-Taking Institution (ADI) as defined in the Banking Act 1959 (Commonwealth) section 5; or
- The Western Australian Treasury Corporation established by the Western Australian Treasury Corporation Act 1986; and
- any securities which have a short term Standard and Poor’s Investors credit rating of A1+, A1 or A2; or a Moody’s short term rating of P-1 or P2; or a Fitch short term rating of F1+, F1 or F2 rating.

Prohibited Investments
When investing money under section 6.14(1), a local government may not do any of the following:
  k) deposit with an institution except an authorised institution
  l) deposit for a fixed term of more than 12 months
  m) invest in bonds that are not guaranteed by the Commonwealth Government, or a State or Territory government
  n) invest in bonds with a term to maturity of more than 3 years
  o) invest in foreign currency

Investment Quotations
Not less than three quotations should be requested and at least 2 be received. These shall be obtained from authorised institutions whenever an investment is proposed.

Selection of Investment
The criteria to be applied in making the investment choice will take into account:
- The rate of return offered for the respective investment.
- The relative risk of the respective investments, taking into account the Standard and Poor’s, Fitch or Moody’s ratings.
- The requirement that no more than 50% of Council’s total investment portfolio will be invested at any one time with one financial institution.
- Council’s future estimated cash flow requirements.
- An investment of a minimum amount of $2million will be maintained with Bendigo Bank.
Diversification and Credit Risk

Investments made shall be within the percentage limits set out below. When placing investments, consideration should be given to the relationship between credit rating and interest rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Ratings Standards &amp; Poors</th>
<th>Short Term Rating Moody’s</th>
<th>Short term Rating Fitch</th>
<th>Maximum Percentage of Total Investments</th>
<th>Minimum Percentage Total Investment</th>
<th>Maximum Percentage with any one Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1+</td>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>F1+</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above, it is to apply upon the commencement of individual investments.

This Policy requires the use of Standard and Poors, Fitch & Moody’s credit ratings. Any one institution is required to have a rating from all three credit rating institutions. The lowest rating from any one institution will be deemed to be the credit rating for any Authorised Institution.

Reporting and Record Keeping

Documentary evidence must be held for each investment and details thereof maintained in an Investment Register.

Certificates must be obtained from the financial institutions confirming the amounts of investments held on Council’s behalf as at 30 June each year and reconciled to the Investment Register.

The status and performance of the investment portfolio to be reported to council on a monthly basis.

Definitions

**ADI** - Authorised Deposit-Taking Institutions (ADI) are corporations that are authorised under the Banking Act 1959 to take deposits from customers.

**Investment Portfolio** – A collection of investments.

**Liquidity risk** - Liquidity risk is the risk an investor is unable to realise at a fair price within a timely period.

**Risk Aversion** - Risk aversion is the reluctance of an individual to invest in a product with a higher risk compared to a product with lower risk, but possibly lower returns.

**Rating Agencies** – Credit Rating Agencies such as Standard and Poor’s, Moody’s and Fitch are professional organisations that provide opinion on the general credit worthiness of an obligor with respect to a particular debt security or other financial obligations. Credit ratings are based, in varying degrees, on the following considerations:

- likelihood of payment
- nature and provisions of the obligation
- protection afforded by, and relative position of, the obligation in the event of bankruptcy, reorganisation or other laws affecting creditor rights.

**Speculative** - A speculative deal involves deliberately taking a higher risk, in the hope of making an extraordinary gain.

**Legislation**

Other Relevant Policies/ Key Documents
Department of Local Government and Regional Development Investment Policy, Local Government Operational Guidelines - Number 19 February 2008.

Committee Voting – 3/0

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

4:22pm  Cr Hill returned to the meeting.
Corporate and Engineering Services
Corporate Services

Reference No & Subject: CS-020/12 Monthly Financial Management Report for April 2012
File No: FLM/88
Proponent/s: Ms Vanisha Govender, Financial Accountant
Author: Author:
Other Contributors: Author:
Date of Committee Meeting: 19 June 2012
Previously before Council: 19 June 2012
Disclosure of Interest: Executive Function
Nature of Council's Role in this Matter:

Site:
Lot Area:
Maps/Diagrams:

1. **Purpose of Report**
To receive the monthly Financial Management Report for April 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

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 will be reviewed within the current budget review.

6. **Voting Requirements**
   Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**
   That Council **ACCEPT** the monthly Financial Management Report for April 2012 (unaudited) in accordance with Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

8. **Committee Recommendation**
   That Council **ACCEPT** the monthly Financial Management Report for April 2012 (unaudited) in accordance with Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

   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
Advisory and Occasional Committee Minutes
Governance and Councillor Support Services

Reference No & Subject: GCS-007/12 Civic Catering Occasional Committee Meeting Minutes held 8 May 2012

File No: COM/86

Author: Mr Peter Varris, Manager Governance and Councillor Support

Other Contributors: 19 June 2012

Date of Committee Meeting: To develop and review standards of service for catering at civic functions, meeting and events.

Terms of Reference: Three (3) Councillors.

Composition: Governance Support: Manager Governance and Councillor Support.

Disclosure of Interest: Executive Function

Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:

Attachments: Minutes of the Civic Catering Occasional Committee meeting held 8 May 2012

Maps/Diagrams:

1. **Receipt of Minutes**

   That Council receive the minutes of the Civic Catering Occasional Committee meeting held on 8 May 2012 for information.

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

   There are no recommendations arising from the Civic Catering Occasional Committee meeting.

3. **Committee Recommendation**

   That Council **RECEIVE** the minutes Civic Catering Occasional Committee meeting held on 8 May 2012 for information.

   Committee Voting - 4/0

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

   Not applicable

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

   Not applicable
1. **Purpose of Report**

To advise Council of a request by the Local Government Advisory Board to complete a review of its wards and representation to rectify current imbalances in representation.

2. **Background**

The Local Government Advisory Board (LGAB) has requested the City of Rockingham to complete a review of its wards and representation in accordance with clause 6(3) of Schedule 2.2 of the Local Government Act 1995 (the Act).

Clause 6(3) states –

‘A local government is to carry out a review described in subclause (1) or (2) at any time if the Advisory Board requires the local government in writing to do so.’

Subclause (1) states –

‘A local government the district of which is divided into wards is to carry out reviews of —

(a) its ward boundaries; and

(b) the number of offices of councillor for each ward,

from time to time so that not more than 8 years elapse between successive reviews.’
At its Ordinary Meeting held 26 August 2008, Council considered the options in respect of a review of ward boundaries and Councillor representation and resolved by absolute majority the following:

That Council take the following action:

1. Record having completed a review of its ward boundaries and the number of offices of councillor for each ward within an eight year period of the previous review, as required by clause 6 of Schedule 2.2 of the Local Government Act 1995 and in accordance with the procedures as specified by clauses 7 and 8 of that Schedule.

2. In accordance with clause 9 of Schedule 2.2 of the Act, present a report to the Local Government Advisory Board proposing that no changes be made to the existing ward boundaries or the number of offices of councillor for the following reasons:
   a) No support from the community through submissions to change the current ward boundaries or representation had been received.
   b) The factors assessed in accordance with clause 8 subclauses (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) of Schedule 2.2 of the Act, as detailed in option 1 of the Discussion Paper prepared for the review, support maintaining the current position.
   c) The councillor elector ratio determined by elector numbers for the October 2007 ordinary election is continuing to rapidly change due to high growth rates being experienced in the Baldivis and Coastal wards and this growth rate is anticipated to continue as detailed within the Discussion Paper. This projected growth rate will be a significant factor in addressing councillor to elector ratios, which indicates that the current representations in these wards are improving and will become more closely aligned with the required representation by the time that the next review is due in 2010 (for the 2011 election).
   d) The cost and disruption in changing ward boundaries and representation to satisfy the Board’s current elector to ratio requirements is not warranted in light of the projected high growth rates in the Baldivis and Coastal wards which is likely to result in a further change at the time of the next review, possibly reverting to the present position.

The LGAB sought the City to reconsider its position however due to the Minister for Local Government initiating the local government reform program in early 2009 the LGAB chose to take no further action.

Significant growth in the number of electors in Baldivis Ward and Coastal Ward since that time has exacerbated the imbalance in representation. The following tables provided by the LGAB demonstrate the Councillor to elector ratios for the City of Rockingham for the 2009 and 2011 local government elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Number of Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldivis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Bay</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The LGAB has requested that the timeline of the ward and representation review should ensure that any proposed changes can be implemented in time for the 2013 ordinary local government elections, therefore the review documentation must be submitted to the LGAB by 31 March 2013.

The LGAB has indicated that Board Members and Officers are available to meet with the City to discuss the review if required.

3. Details

The Ward Boundary Working Party (WBWP) has been established by Council comprising of four Councillors with the Terms of Reference ‘To undertake a review of ward boundaries and representation in accordance with Schedule 2.2 (6) of the Local Government Act 1995’. The current members of the Working Group are Cr Liley, Cr Prince, Cr Elliott and Cr Smith.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

In accordance with clause 7 of Schedule 2.2 of the Local Government Act 1995, submissions are to be invited from the public prior to conducting a review or ward boundaries and representation.

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

A review of the ward boundaries and Councillor representation will require research and public consultation. A provision of funds will be allocated in the 2013/2014 budget for the purpose.

f. Legal and Statutory

Schedule 2.2 of the Local Government Act 1995 (the Act) specifies the requirements for ward boundary and Councillor representation reviews.

In particular, clause 6(3) of the Act stipulates that a local government is to carry out a review at any time when requested by the Advisory Board.

As a consequence the City is now legislatively required to undertake the review.

5. Comments

A sound approach to the review is to convene a meeting of the WBWP and invite the LGAB to attend. The review could then be conducted with a clear understanding of the LGAB’s expectations.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority
### 7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **DIRECT** the Chief Executive Officer to initiate a review of the City's ward boundaries and representation in accordance with clause 6(3) of Schedule 2.2 of the Local Government Act 1995.

2. **REQUEST** that the Ward Boundaries Working Party meet with representatives of the Local Government Advisory Board regarding the review of ward boundaries and representation for the City of Rockingham.

### 8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **DIRECT** the Chief Executive Officer to initiate a review of the City's ward boundaries and representation in accordance with clause 6(3) of Schedule 2.2 of the Local Government Act 1995.

2. **REQUEST** that the Ward Boundaries Working Party meet with representatives of the Local Government Advisory Board regarding the review of ward boundaries and representation for the City of Rockingham.

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
Economic Development

4:26pm Cr Sammels vacated the Chair and departed the meeting as he has a financial interest in Item ED-007/12.

The Chief Executive Officer called for nominations to the Chair. Cr Dunkling was elected as Acting Chairperson.

Corporate and Engineering Services
Economic Development Services

Reference No & Subject: ED-007/12 Tender for the Provision of Printing and Graphic Design Services
File No: T12/13-17
Proponent/s: Mr Cadell Buss, Manager Economic Development
Author: Other Contributors:
Date of Committee Meeting: 19 June 2012
Previously before Council:
Disclosure of Interest:
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive Function
Site: Lot Area:
Attachments:
Maps/Diagrams:

1. Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the submissions received for T12/13-17 – Period Provision of Printing and Graphic Design Services Tender, document the results of the assessment and make recommendations regarding the award of contract.

2. Background

In July 2010, Council endorsed the City of Rockingham Brand Development Program and a new tagline. As part of the program, a Re-Branding Project Activity Guide was developed. Key activities include:

Activity 2: Develop a comprehensive style guide that directs the implementation and maintenance of the City of Rockingham brand. (The style guide was completed and implemented in February 2011.)
Activity 5: Develop a Media and Public Relations Strategy; a) Tender all graphic design and printing work.

The purpose for a printing and graphic design tender is to have continuity of printed collateral across the City’s operations and reduce the City’s expenditure by utilising the City’s purchasing power and using one preferred supplier. For example, in 2010/11 the City used 5 different graphic designers, spending $219,000 on graphic design fees. By using one supplier and adhering to the updated style guide, design fees reduced to approx. $60,000 in the current financial year, saving just over $150,000 in design fees alone, excluding printing savings.

During the 2011/12 financial year, Marketforce Ltd was awarded the contract for a period of twelve months.

Tenders for this period were advertised in The West Australian on Saturday, 31 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-17 Period Provision of Printing and Graphic Design Services for the City of Rockingham. Tenders closed at 2:00pm on Tuesday, 24 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

### 3. Details

In preparation of the tender document, an internal collateral audit was conducted by the Economic Development team on all of the City’s printed material. The audit enabled the tender document to be very specific relative to printing quality and quantity. Tenderers were required to quote on approximately 40 separate line items. This extensive process ensured that all tenderers were quoting on a similar basis.

Thirteen tenders were received, of those one did not comply and one was a late submission.

A panel comprising the Manager Economic Development, Manager Customer & Corporate Support, Manager Community Capacity Building, Manager Capital Works, Media and Communications Officer and Economic Development Officer carried out the tender assessments. In accordance with the advertised tender assessment criteria the following weighted scores were produced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Media Engine/Scott Printing</th>
<th>Marketforce</th>
<th>EC Print</th>
<th>Printstuf</th>
<th>Print Smart Online P/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tender</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>83.1%</strong></td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Greenlea Print</th>
<th>Footprint (WA) P/L</th>
<th>Artype Media</th>
<th>Parkin Print</th>
<th>10 Fold</th>
<th>Pilpel Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tender</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The period of the contract will be for 12 months commencing on 1 July 2012 and completion will be 30 June 2013 with the option to renew for a further 12 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 14: Economic Development opportunities that make visiting, living working and investing in the City of Rockingham an attractive proposition.**

d. Policy
   In accordance with Council’s purchasing policy to deliver a best practice approach and procedures to internal purchasing for the City and to ensure that integrity over the whole of the purchasing process is maintained, and that the calling of tenders is a transparent process, demonstrating fairness and equity.

e. Financial
   While the tender price is valued at $143,655 it is important to note two significant points:
   1. The schedule of work quoted has been developed from activity of the previous year and is already budgeted for in each department's team plan. Therefore this is NOT an additional spend.
   2. The main reason for the implementation of this tender is to SAVE money by using one supplier.
   The utilisation of the City’s comprehensive style guide has further reduced design fees and the implementation of the social media strategy should further reduce the need for printed collateral.

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

Using one supplier has enabled a greater consistency and a higher standard of collateral being produced, as opposed to when a number of suppliers were engaged. The provision of one preferred supplier has benefited the City by reducing costs and having a desired result of uniformity of printed collateral.

There has also been an indirect cost by saving staff time and effort by using one graphic designer that conforms to the style guide when producing new material.

Based on actual work completed to the month of May, the current tender has saved the City approximately $250,000 on the material produced compared to the 2009/10 financial years spend for similar activities.

Media Engine and Scott Print have partnered, providing both graphic design and print management solutions. Media Engine is based in Rockingham and currently work with a number of local governments.
6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council *ACCEPT* the tender submitted by Media Engine/Scott Print for Tender T12/13-17, Provision of Printing and Graphic Design Services for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013 with the option to renew for a further 12 months to the City of Rockingham in accordance with the contract terms and conditions.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *ACCEPT* the tender submitted by Media Engine/Scott Print for Tender T12/13-17, Provision of Printing and Graphic Design Services for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013 with the option to renew for a further 12 months to the City of Rockingham in accordance with the contract terms and conditions.

Committee Voting – 3/0

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

4:27pm  Cr Sammels returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.
Corporate and Engineering Services
Advisory and Occasional Committee Minutes
Economic Development Services

Reference No & Subject: ED-008/12

File No: ECD/74

Author: Mr Cadell Buss, Manager Economic Development

Other Contributors: Ms Nollaig Baker, Economic Development Officer

Date of Committee Meeting: 19 June 2012

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

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

Composition:
3 Councillors, 6 Committee members

Disclosure of Interest:
Executive Support – Economic Development Team

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

Attachments:
Minutes of the Global Friendship Committee meeting held on 17 June 2012

Maps/Diagrams:

1. Receipt of Minutes

That Council receive the minutes of Global Friendship Committee meeting held on 19 May 2012 for information.

2. Recommendations to the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee

There are no recommendations arising from the Global Friendship Committee meeting.
3. Committee Recommendation

That Council RECEIVE the minutes Global Friendship Committee meeting held on 19 May 2012 for information.

Committee Voting - 4/0

4. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
**Reference No & Subject:**

- **File No:** WSM/3
- **Proponent/s:** AGL Energy Services Ltd
- **Author:** Ms Renee Sinclair-Deane, Leasing Administration Officer

**Date of Committee Meeting:** 19 June 2012

**Previously before Council:** September 2003 (CES331/9/03), May 2002 (CES164/5/02), September 2000 (9CO/00-13.4.13), December 1999 (12CE/99-8.3.27)

**Disclosure of Interest:**

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

**Site:** City of Rockingham Landfill Facility

**Lot Area:** A 1406.25sqm portion of Lot 2170 Millar Road, Baldivis

**Attachments:**

1. Power Generation Plant Site Plan.
2. Location Plan

**Maps/Diagrams:**

1. Power Generation Plant Site Plan.
2. Location Plan

---

**CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 JULY 2012**

---

**PRESIDING MEMBER**
Figure 1 Power Generation Plant site plan.
Outlined in red is the existing leased area. Outlined in blue is the requested area variation encompassing the existing plant site and the proposed new plant site.

Figure 2 – Location Plan
1. **Purpose of Report**

To provide Council with details of a proposed variation to the existing lease with AGL Energy Services Ltd (AGL) for a 1406.25sqm portion of Lot 2170 Millar Road, Baldivis, due to AGL requesting to expand their production capacity.

2. **Background**

In August 2002 the City signed an agreement with AGL Energy Services Limited relating to the extraction of Landfill facility gasses and the planned construction of a Power Generation Plant.

In 2003 the City entered into both an Access Licence Agreement and Lease. The Licence agreement provides AGL with the ability to access all areas of the landfill as required for their Landfill Gas Extraction. The lease agreement provides AGL with a portion of land accessible only by the Lessee for the purpose of a power generation plant.

In March 2012 AGL provided a draft Deed of Variation requesting the City grant permission for expansion of their leased area in order to accommodate an additional Power Generation Plant.

3. **Details**

The variations being made to the lease will affect the leased area which will be increasing in size from 677sqm to 1406.25sqm.

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

- Lease expiration date - 19 February 2018
- Purpose - Power Generation Plant
- Rent $1.00
- Insurance requirements
- Maintenance requirements
- Outgoing expenses - electricity, telephone (AGL) and water (City of Rockingham)
- Agreement termination and early determination

The AGL Power Generation site is situated adjacent to the Millar Road boundary fence and 25m South West of the Landfill Millar Road exit.

Planning and Building approvals will be necessary and are currently being prepared.

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 foot print reduction and waste minimisation programs centred upon public awareness and the use of new technologies.

d. **Policy**

   Nil
e. **Financial**
   Rent $1.00 per annum. AGL is required to pay the City 5% of the revenue (exclusive of GST) from the sale of renewable electricity.
   The operating revenue received from AGL in 2011 totalled $30,927.61.
   The operating revenue received from AGL in 2012 to date has totalled $22,358.57.

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**
Entering into a Lease Variation with AGL will allow them to effectively double the size of their power generation plant and in turn their power output resulting in higher revenue to the City from royalties.
AGL’s production of power through the burning of landfill gasses not only reduces the City’s Greenhouse gas emissions, but it also reduces the smell generally associated with Landfill facilities, therefore it is recommended that the City enters into the proposed variation to the existing leasing agreement.

6. **Voting Requirements**
Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**
That Council **APPROVE** a lease variation with AGL Energy Services Ltd for a portion of Lot 2170 Millar Road, Baldivis for the remaining term of the original 16 year lease, expiring on 19 February 2018.

8. **Committee Recommendation**
That Council **APPROVE** a lease variation with AGL Energy Services Ltd for a portion of Lot 2170 Millar Road, Baldivis for the remaining term of the original 16 year lease, expiring on 19 February 2018.

   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></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>T11/12-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Adam Johnston, Manager Parks Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Alan Hawkins, Parks Operations Contracts Coordinator Mr Greg Conroy, Parks Operations Contracts Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>19 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Highbury, Settlers Hills – Precinct J and Avalon Estates reserves site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of Report**

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T11/12-68 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in Highbury Estate, Settlers Hills Estate – Precinct J and Avalon Estate, Baldivis and 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, 14 April 2012 for Tender T11/12-68 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in Highbury Estate, Settlers Hills Estate – Precinct J and Avalon Estate, Baldivis; the tender closed at 2pm, Wednesday, 9 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>Cobey Maintenance Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochness Pty Ltd</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:
Weighted Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Cobey Maintenance Services</th>
<th>LD Total</th>
<th>Landscape Elements</th>
<th>Lochness Pty Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Experience of Tender</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenders Resources and Delivery / Availability</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>72%</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 draft budget for the maintenance of reserves and streetscapes in Highbury Estate, Avalon Estate and Settlers Hills Estate -Precinct J.
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

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

Cobey Maintenance Services currently hold maintenance contracts with the City for the Anchorage Estate, Settlers Hills Estate and The Chase Estate and have met the performance requirements for these contracts.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted from Cobey Maintenance Services, 37 Roscoe Street, Henderson WA 6166, for Tender T11/12-68 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in Highbury Estate, Settlers Hills Estate – Precinct J and Avalon Estate, Baldivis 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 Cobey Maintenance Services, 37 Roscoe Street, Henderson WA 6166, for Tender T11/12-68 – Period Maintenance of Various Reserves and Streetscape Areas in Highbury Estate, Settlers Hills Estate – Precinct J and Avalon Estate, Baldivis 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
Advisory and Occasional Committee Minutes
Engineering and Parks Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-032/12</th>
<th>Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee Meeting held Monday 7 May 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>RDS/15-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Scott Lambie, A/Manager Engineering Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>19 June 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference:</td>
<td>To provide input and advice into road safety matters with the outcome of having a safe and efficient transport network in the City of Rockingham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>1 Councillor, 6 Community Representatives</td>
<td>Executive Support: Engineering and Parks Division – Traffic Services Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Minutes of Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on 7 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Receipt of Minutes**

   That Council receive the minutes of the RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on Monday 7 May 2012 for information.

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

   There are no recommendations arising from the RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting to the Committee.

3. **Committee Recommendation**

   That Council *RECEIVE* the minutes of RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on Monday 7 May 2012 for information.

   Committee Voting - 4/0

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

   Not applicable

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

   Not applicable
Corporate and Engineering Services
Engineering and Parks Services

Reference No & Subject: EP-033/12

Tender T12/13-01 – Period Eduction, Cleaning & Maintenance of Installed Drainage Products at Various Locations within the City of Rockingham

File No: T12/13-01

Proponent/s: Mr Aulad Hossain, Senior Maintenance Coordinator

Author: Mr Stuart McCarthy, Manager Engineering Operations

Other Contributors: Mr Darren Dropulich, Construction Engineer

Date of Committee Meeting: 19 June 2012

Previously before Council:

Disclosure of Interest:

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

Site:

Lot Area:

Attachments:

Maps/Diagrams:

1. Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-01 - Period Eduction, Cleaning & Maintenance of Installed Drainage Products at Various Locations within the City of Rockingham, 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, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-01 – Period Eduction, Cleaning & Maintenance of Installed Drainage Products at Various Locations within the City of Rockingham. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
3. **Details**

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allpipe Technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIS Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tox Free Solutions: non conforming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverjet Pipeline Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tox Free Solution's tender submission was considered non conforming by the assessment panel as it did not comply with the Tender requirements.

A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tenders, 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>Allpipe Technologies</th>
<th>KIS Environmental Services</th>
<th>Riverjet Pipeline Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>90%</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 6:** Civic building, 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 3.37 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 for this tender will be in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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

Due to the diverse nature of the engineering works, together with the understanding that at times no one contractor would be available to carry out the required tasks on demand, the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City to award to KIS Environmental Services and Riverjet Pipeline Solutions with works to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Riverjet Pipeline Solutions and KIS Environmental Services are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

### 6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

### 7. Officer Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted by Riverjet Pipeline Solutions, Unit 4, 12 Alice Street, Bassendean, WA, 6054, and KIS Environmental Services, Suite 9, 22 Gibberd Road, Balcatta, WA, 6021 for Tender T12/13-01 – Period Education, Cleaning & Maintenance of Installed Drainage Products at Various Locations within the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

### 8. Committee Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted by Riverjet Pipeline Solutions, Unit 4, 12 Alice Street, Bassendean, WA, 6054, and KIS Environmental Services, Suite 9, 22 Gibberd Road, Balcatta, WA, 6021 for Tender T12/13-01 – Period Education, Cleaning & Maintenance of Installed Drainage Products at Various Locations within the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 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

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-02 Supply and Delivery of Drainage Products, 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, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-02 – Supply and Delivery of Drainage Products. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

3. Details

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocla Pipeline Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icon-Septech Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agcrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Tech Steel Pressing Company (Drainage Division) : non conforming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Added Tech Steel Pressing Company (Drainage Division)’s tender submission was deemed non-conforming by the assessment panel as it did not comply with the specification requirements.

A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tenders, 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>Rocla Pipeline Products</th>
<th>Icon-Septech Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Agcrete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tenderer</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>70.1%</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 6:** Civic building, 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 City Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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

The broad nature of drainage product can not be sourced from a single supplier therefore the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City to award the contract to Rocla Pipeline, Icon-Septec Pty Ltd and Agcrete with product orders to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Rocla Pipeline, Icon-Septec Pty Ltd and Agcrete are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014. Product orders will be allocated based on price, level of service, proven experience and suitability.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by Rocla Pipeline Products, 3 Casella Place, Kewdale, WA 6105, Icon-Septech Pty Ltd, Lot 265 Valencia Way, Maddington, WA 6109 and Agcrete, 37 Roundhay Street, Gledhow, WA 6330 for Tender T12/13-02 - Supply and Delivery of Drainage Products in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by Rocla Pipeline Products, 3 Casella Place, Kewdale, WA 6105, Icon-Septech Pty Ltd, Lot 265 Valencia Way, Maddington, WA 6109 and Agcrete, 37 Roundhay Street, Gledhow, WA 6330 for Tender T12/13-02 - Supply and Delivery of Drainage Products in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 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

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-06 - Supply and Delivery of Aggregate, 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, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-06 – Supply and Delivery of Aggregate. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

3. Details

Mineral Haulage & Earthmoving’s tender submission was deemed non conforming by the assessment panel as it did not comply with the specification requirements.

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Haulage &amp; Earthmoving : non conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Bluemetal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations. Evaluation of the tenders, 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>Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd</th>
<th>WA Bluemetal</th>
<th>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>78.3%</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 6:** Civic building, 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 Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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**

All conforming tenderers demonstrated they have the ability and capacity to undertake the requirements of Tender T12/13-06 – Supply and Delivery of Aggregate. It should be noted that WA Bluemetal is the City’s current supply and delivery of Aggregate contractor and has provided good levels of service.

WA Bluemetal is therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted by WA Bluemetal, 41 Spearwood Ave, Bibra Lake, WA 6163, for Tender T12/13-06 - Supply and Delivery of Aggregate in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted by WA Bluemetal, 41 Spearwood Ave, Bibra Lake, WA 6163, for Tender T12/13-06 - Supply and Delivery of Aggregate in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 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

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-09 - Supply and Laying of Hot Asphalt, 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, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-09 Supply and Laying of Hot Asphalt. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

3. Details

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Hogan Industries Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads 2000 Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tenders, 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>Fulton Hogan Industries Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Roads 2000 Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Downer Australia</th>
<th>Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tender</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>85.5%</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 6:** Civic building, 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 Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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

The quantity of works required to undertake the annual road construction and renewal program will require the services of multiple contractors to deliver, therefore the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City to award the contract to Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd, Roads 2000 Pty Ltd and Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd) with asphalt works to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

It should be noted that Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd, Roads 2000 Pty Ltd and Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd) are current contractors with the City and have provided good levels of service.

Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd, Roads 2000 Pty Ltd and Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd) are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd, Lot 88 Cocos Drive, Bibra Lake, WA 6163, Roads 2000 Pty Ltd, Unit 8/88 Walters Drive, Osborne Park, WA 6017 and Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd), 90 McDowell Street, Welshpool, WA 6106 for Tender T12/13-09 - Supply and Laying of Hot Asphalt in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd, Lot 88 Cocos Drive, Bibra Lake, WA 6163, Roads 2000 Pty Ltd, Unit 8/88 Walters Drive, Osborne Park, WA 6017 and Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd), 90 McDowell Street, Welshpool, WA 6106 for Tender T12/13-09 - Supply and Laying of Hot Asphalt in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 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

Reference No & Subject: EP-037/12
Tender T12/13-10 – Bituminous Sealing and Resealing Services, Including the Supply of Bituminous Products

File No: T12/13-10
Proponent/s: Mr Aulad Hossain, Senior Maintenance Coordinator
Author: Mr Stuart McCarthy, Manager Engineering Operations
Other Contributors: Mr Darren Dropulich, Construction Engineer

Date of Committee Meeting: 19 June 2012
Previously before Council: 19 June 2012
Disclosure of Interest:
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive Function

1. Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-10 – Bituminous Sealing and Resealing Services, Including the Supply of Bituminous Products, 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, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-10 – Bituminous Sealing and Resealing Services, Including the Supply of Bituminous Products. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

3. Details

RNR Contracting Pty Ltd.’s tender submission was deemed non conforming by the assessment panel as it did not comply with the specification requirements.
Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Hogan Industries Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitumen Surfacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNR Contracting Pty Ltd : <strong>non conforming</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tenders, 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>Fulton Hogan Industries Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Bitumen Surfacing</th>
<th>Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd)</th>
<th>Downer Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>70%</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 6:** Civic building, 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 City Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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
To deliver all works under the annual road construction, road resurfacing and renewal program will require multiple contractors often working simultaneously, therefore the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City to award the contract to Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd, Roads 2000 Pty Ltd and Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd) with asphalt works to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Asphalt Surfaces Pty Ltd, Roads 2000 Pty Ltd and Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd) are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

6. Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation
That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted by Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd), 90 McDowell Street, Welshpool, WA 6986, for Tender T12/13-10 - Bituminous Sealing and Resealing Services, Including the Supply of Bituminous Products in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

8. Committee Recommendation
That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted by Boral Asphalt (Boral Resources WA Pty Ltd), 90 McDowell Street, Welshpool, WA 6986, for Tender T12/13-10 - Bituminous Sealing and Resealing Services, Including the Supply of Bituminous Products in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 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

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-11 - Supply and Installation of Traffic Management Services, Road Spotting, Line Marking and Road Safety Barriers, 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, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-11 – Supply and Installation of Traffic Management Services, Road Spotting, Line Marking and Road Safety Barriers. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

3. Details

No Tenders were received for Separable Portion “C” Road Safety Barriers. Works of this nature will be sourced by obtaining quotes.
Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

### Separable Portion “A” Traffic Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Weighted Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Response Group Pty Ltd</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Force</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer Australia</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadsafe Traffic Management</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carringtons Traffic Services</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Traffic Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Traffic Management Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warp Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Separable Portion “B” Pavement Markings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Weighted Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Response Group Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Traffic Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Road Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Separable Portion “C” Road Safety Barriers

No tenders received

A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

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

### Separable Portion “A” Traffic Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Traffic Response Group Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Traffic Force</th>
<th>Downer Australia</th>
<th>Roadsafe Traffic Management</th>
<th>Carringtons Traffic Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 JULY 2012

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 6:** Civic building, 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 City Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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**

Due to the broad range and complexity of the operational works, together with the acknowledgement that at times no one contractor would be available to carry out the required tasks on demand, the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City to award the contract to Contraflow and Warp Pty Ltd (for Separable Portion “A” Traffic Management) and Weston Road Systems (for Separable Portion “B” Pavement Markings) with works to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Contraflow and Warp Pty Ltd (for Separable Portion “A” Traffic Management) and Weston Road Systems (for Separable Portion “B” Pavement Markings) are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by Contraflow, 18 Emerald Road, Maddington WA 6109 and Warp Pty Ltd, 22-24 Eva Street, Maddington, WA 6109 for Tender T12/13-11 - Supply and Installation of Traffic Management Services, Road Spotting, Line Marking and Road Safety Barriers, Separable Portion “A” and Weston Road Systems, 20 Bulbey Street, Bellevue, WA 6056 for Tender T12/13-11 - Supply and Installation of Traffic Management Services, Road Spotting, Line Marking and Road Safety Barriers, Separable Portion “B” in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by Contraflow, 18 Emerald Road, Maddington WA 6109 and Warp Pty Ltd, 22-24 Eva Street, Maddington, WA 6109 for Tender T12/13-11 - Supply and Installation of Traffic Management Services, Road Spotting, Line Marking and Road Safety Barriers, Separable Portion “A” and Weston Road Systems, 20 Bulbey Street, Bellevue, WA 6056 for Tender T12/13-11 - Supply and Installation of Traffic Management Services, Road Spotting, Line Marking and Road Safety Barriers, Separable Portion “B” in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 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**

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-14 – Period Maintenance of Roller Shutter Doors, Automatic Gates, Automatic Doors and Security Grilles for the City of Rockingham and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

2. **Background**

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-14 – Period Maintenance of Roller Shutter Doors, Automatic Gates, Automatic Doors and Security Grilles for the City of Rockingham. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were 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>Kone Elevators Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorma Automatics Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors, Doors, Doors Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Manager Asset Services, Building Maintenance Coordinator and Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Doors, Doors, Doors</th>
<th>Kone Elevators</th>
<th>Dorma Automatics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tender</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>44%</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 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**
   Operating works expenditure will be in accordance with the Operational Building Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget. Expenditure to date on this service in 2011/12 is $58,495.

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**
   Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the advertised selection criteria all companies demonstrated capacity to undertake the works, however, the submission received from Doors, Doors, Doors is considered the best value to the City and are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer.

6. **Voting Requirements**
   Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**
   That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Doors, Doors, Doors Pty Ltd, Unit 1/18 Ernest Clark Road, Canning Vale, for Tender T12/13-14 – Period Maintenance of Roller Shutter Doors, Automatic Gates, Automatic Doors and Security Grilles for the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation with the contract period being from the date of award to 30 June 2014.

8. **Committee Recommendation**
   That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Doors, Doors, Doors Pty Ltd, Unit 1/18 Ernest Clark Road, Canning Vale, for Tender T12/13-14 – Period Maintenance of Roller Shutter Doors, Automatic Gates, Automatic Doors and Security Grilles for the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation with 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
### Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-04 Supply and Delivery of Road Base Materials, Including Crushed Limestone, Bitumen Stabilised Crushed Limestone and Recycled Road Base Materials, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding the award of the tender.

### Background

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-04 – Supply and Delivery of Road Base Materials, Including Crushed Limestone, Bitumen Stabilised Crushed Limestone and Recycled Road Base Materials. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
3. Details

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Haulage &amp; Earthmoving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinci Gravel Supplies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</th>
<th>WA Limestone</th>
<th>Mineral Haulage &amp; Earthmoving</th>
<th>Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Vinci Gravel Supplies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tenderer</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Weighted Scores: All Earth Group Pty Ltd 100%, WA Limestone 84.6%, Mineral Haulage & Earthmoving 97.8%, Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd 93.0%, Vinci Gravel Supplies 84.2%, 66.9%

The Tender T12/13-04 - Supply and Delivery of Road Base Materials, Including Crushed Limestone, Bitumen Stabilised Crushed Limestone and Recycled Road Base Materials documentation and pricing mechanism provided for a variety of road construction materials to be delivered to the Depot, directly to the site and for pick up ex pit. The following table identifies the tenderers and the items tendered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</th>
<th>WA Limestone</th>
<th>Mineral Haulage &amp; Earthmoving</th>
<th>Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Vinci Gravel Supplies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.1.1 Supply and delivery of 75 mm crushed limestone road base material to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.1.2 Supply and delivery of 75 mm crushed limestone road base material to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</td>
<td>WA Limestone</td>
<td>Mineral Haulage &amp; Earthmoving</td>
<td>Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.1.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of 75mm crushed limestone road base material</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.2.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of 26mm crushed limestone road base material to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.2.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of 26mm crushed limestone road base material to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.2.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of 26mm crushed limestone road base material</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.3.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of bitumen stabilised crushed limestone road base material to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.3.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of bitumen stabilised crushed limestone road base material to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.3.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of bitumen stabilised crushed limestone road base material</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.5.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of crushed rock base material to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.5.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of crushed rock base material to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>All Earth Group Pty Ltd</td>
<td>WA Limestone</td>
<td>Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Vinci Gravel Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.5.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of crushed rock base material</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.7.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of recycled crushed concrete rock base material to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.7.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of recycled crushed concrete rock base material to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.7.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of recycled crushed concrete rock base material</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.8.1</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of commingled recycled crushed concrete rock base material to Council’s Crocker Street depot</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.8.2</td>
<td>Supply and delivery of commingled recycled crushed concrete rock base material to locations within the Municipality of Rockingham</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.8.3</td>
<td>Supply only (i.e. ex pit) of commingled recycled crushed concrete rock base material</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.2.9.1</td>
<td>Backload pre crushed concrete and brick material for treatment from the City’s Ennis Avenue recycling/storage facility</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td>Tendered</td>
<td></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 6:** Civic building, 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 City Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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

It was evident during the tender assessment process that no one tenderer would be capable of supplying the broad range of materials required on demand therefore the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City to award the contract to All Earth Group Pty Ltd, WA Limestone, Mineral Haulage and Earthmoving and Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd with material orders to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.
All Earth Group Pty Ltd. WA Limestone, Mineral Haulage & Earthmoving, and Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by All Earth Group Pty Ltd, 42 Kelvin Road, Maddington, WA 6109, WA Limestone, 41 Spearwood Avenue, Bibra Lake WA 6163, Mineral Haulage & Earthmoving, Unit 1, 137 Kelvin Road, Maddington, WA 6109 and Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd, Lot 1 Cockram Road, Martin, WA 6110 for Tender T12/13-04 - Supply and Delivery of Road Base Materials, Including Crushed Limestone, Bitumen Stabilised Crushed Limestone and Recycled Road Base Materials in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tenders submitted by All Earth Group Pty Ltd, 42 Kelvin Road, Maddington, WA 6109, WA Limestone, 41 Spearwood Avenue, Bibra Lake WA 6163, Mineral Haulage & Earthmoving, Unit 1, 137 Kelvin Road, Maddington, WA 6109 and Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd, Lot 1 Cockram Road, Martin, WA 6110 for Tender T12/13-04 - Supply and Delivery of Road Base Materials, Including Crushed Limestone, Bitumen Stabilised Crushed Limestone and Recycled Road Base Materials in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 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

To seek Council approval for the issuing of an Extractive Industries Licence to various land holders/operators within the municipality of the City of Rockingham, for a period of five (5) years, expiring on 30 June 2017.

2. Background

At the December 2011 meeting, Council considered a report in relation to the extension of previously approved Extractive Industries Licences (CES126/4/07 April 2007) for a further 6 months in order to align the licences with the City’s financial year as per the 2011 revised Extractive Industry Local Law 2000 and resolved as follows:

That Council take the following action:

APPROVE the extension of existing Extractive Industries Licences to 30 June 2012, subject to the same conditions for each Licence and payment of a pro-rata Licence Fee for the first six months of 2012 (i.e. 50% of the full Annual Licence Fee), for the licensees as follows and consider the renewal of these Licences at the June 2012 Council meeting.
### Details

The City’s Extractive Industries local law allows for extractive industry licences to be issued for up to 21 years, though a recommended period of 5 years retains future planning flexibility with the City while also providing commercial assurance for the proponent.

The City has received Extractive Industries Licence renewal applications from the following licensees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensee</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>Licensee Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Rockingham Licence No. 1/2007</td>
<td>Lot 1 Mundijong Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>City of Rockingham PO Box 2142 Rockingham WA 6967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italia Stone Group Licence No. 2/2007</td>
<td>Lot 1355 Baldivis Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>Italia Stone Group 55 Miguel Road Bibra Lake WA 6163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennderdin Pty Ltd Licence No. 4/2007</td>
<td>Lots 290 &amp; 291 Kerosene Lane, Baldivis</td>
<td>Hennderdin Pty Ltd 41 Spearwood Avenue Bibra Lake WA 6163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Don Ashby Licence No. 5/2007</td>
<td>Lot 11 Paganoni Road, Karnup</td>
<td>Mr Don Ashby 206 Gordon Road Mandurah WA 6210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Limestone Licence No. 6/2007</td>
<td>Loc. 2170 Millar Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>WA Limestone 41 Spearwood Avenue Bibra Lake WA 6163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoa of Australia Ltd Licence No. 28/926</td>
<td>Lot 12 St Albans Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>Alcoa Kwinana Refinery PO Box 161 Kwinana WA 6167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacaranda Springs Private Estate Pty Ltd Licence No. 18/2007</td>
<td>Lot 569 Baldivis Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>ABN Group PO Box 389 Osborne Park WA 6917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caversham Land Company Pty Ltd Licence No. 19/2007</td>
<td>Lot 1263 Baldivis Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>ABN Group PO Box 389 Osborne Park WA 6917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above applicants hold existing licences on the same land holdings and the City can renew existing Licences under Clause 4.3 of the City of Rockingham Extractive Industries Local Law 2000.

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 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

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

d. Policy
   Nil

e. Financial
   The Extractive Industries Amendment Local Law 2011 requires the payment of the Annual Licence Fee by 30 June each year.
   The Fees and Charges set for the 2011/12 Budget in relation to Annual Licence Fees are determined by the anticipated tonnage of material to be extracted from each site for the period of 1 January to 31 December 2012:
   - Less than 50,000 m³: $2,000 (excl. of GST)
   - Greater than 50,000 m³: $3,000 (excl. of GST)

f. Legal and Statutory
   Extractive Industries Licences are administered in accordance with the City of Rockingham Extractive Industries Local Law 2000.

5. Comments

The City has received renewal applications from Extractive Industries licensees whose licences are due to expire on 30 June 2012 and require further licences to continue their extractive operation, which can be considered under Clause 4.3 of the Extractive Industries Local Law 2000, therefore it is recommended that licences be issued to the applicants referred to in this report.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the issuing of Extractive Industries Licences to the following applicants listed in accordance with the City of Rockingham Extractive Industries Local Law 2000 and conditions, as listed in each of the entities respective Metropolitan Region Scheme Approval to commence development, for a period of five (5) years, expiring on the 30 June 2017:
8. Committee Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the issuing of Extractive Industries Licences to the following applicants listed in accordance with the City of Rockingham Extractive Industries Local Law 2000 and conditions, as listed in each of the entities respective Metropolitan Region Scheme Approval to commence development, for a period of five (5) years, expiring on the 30 June 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensee</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>Licensee Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
<td>Lot 1 Mundijong Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>City of Rockingham PO Box 2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence No. 1/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rockingham WA 6967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Limestone</td>
<td>Lots 290 &amp; 291 Kerosene Lane,</td>
<td>WA Limestone 41 Spearwood Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence No. 4/2007</td>
<td>Baldivis</td>
<td>Bibra Lake WA 6163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Don Ashby</td>
<td>Lot 11 Paganoni Road, Karnup</td>
<td>Mr Don Ashby 206 Gordon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence No. 5/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandurah WA 6210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Limestone</td>
<td>Loc. 2170 Millar Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>WA Limestone 41 Spearwood Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence No. 6/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bibra Lake WA 6163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoa of Australia Ltd</td>
<td>Lot 12 St Albans Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>Alcoa Kwinana Refinery PO Box 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence No. 28/926</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kwinana WA 6167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacaranda Springs Private Estate Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Lot 569 Baldivis Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>ABN Group PO Box 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence No. 18/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Osborne Park WA 6917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caversham Land Company Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Lot 1263 Baldivis Road, Baldivis</td>
<td>ABN Group PO Box 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence No. 19/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Osborne Park WA 6917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 revoke the City’s existing Tender Assessment and Purchasing Policy and adopt a new Purchasing Policy for all of the City of Rockingham’s procurement activities.

2. Background

A review of the City’s Purchasing Policy and procurement history and behaviour conducted by the City’s Procurement Coordinator and Manager Procurement and Projects commenced last year. This review considered the West Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) Procurement Handbook completed in 2011 and investigated the policies and procurement processes of other local authorities as well as State Government Agencies. As an outcome to this review it was determined that it would be necessary to develop a new Purchasing Policy that better met operational requirements and ensured that a consistent, transparent and accountable process is adopted by the City for all of its procurement activities.

During the review of the Purchasing Policy it was evident that a Procurement Standard was also required to provide greater detailed information on the expected requirements the responsible City’s officers are to follow when completing the procurement process.
3. Details

The Purchasing Policy will cover all of the City’s procurement activities and will be implemented through the new Procurement Standards and guidelines. The policy makes direct reference to the City’s Code of Conduct and provides for ‘best value’ considerations for all purchases, and outlines the legislative, financial and ethical responsibilities of all officers, purchasing goods/services for the City.

The Procurement Standards detail the actions and process requirements for the procurement of differing values and provides direction and support to all officers seeking to undertake a quote and/or tender process.

The purchasing policy has changed the purchase thresholds to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Purchase</th>
<th>Purchase Type</th>
<th>Minimum Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to $4,999</td>
<td>Small Quote</td>
<td>Up to $999 – One Verbal Quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 to $4,999 – Two Verbal Quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>Minor Quote</td>
<td>Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of two suppliers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>Major Quote</td>
<td>Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of three suppliers with a written assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>Formal Quote</td>
<td>Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of three suppliers containing price and specification of goods and services in a formal quotation process (with procurement decision based on all value for money considerations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and above</td>
<td>Tender</td>
<td>Conduct a public tender process in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Purchases from WALGA’s Preferred Supply Contract, State Government Supply Contracts or the City’s existing period contracts can be used as a procurement option for any of the above thresholds.

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
   This report seeks to revoke the existing Purchasing Policy and Tender Assessment Policy and adopt the new Purchasing Policy dated June 2012.
### Confirmed at a Corporate & Engineering Services Meeting Held on Tuesday, 17 July 2012

#### Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Minutes

**Tuesday 19 June 2012**

**CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 JULY 2012**

**PRESIDING MEMBER**

---

**e. Financial**

The provision of a new Purchasing Policy that encourages best value considerations and whole of life costs will provide long term cost efficiencies to the City.

**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 11A (1). A local government is to prepare or adopt, and is to implement, a purchasing policy in relation to contracts for other persons to supply goods or services where the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, $100,000 or less or worth $100,000 or less.

---

**5. Comments**

The revoking of the existing Purchasing Policy and the adoption of the proposed new Policy and associated Procurement Standards will ensure that best value considerations are taken into account when the City purchases goods or services at any value. The amended purchasing thresholds in the new Policy will also better reflect the procurement activities of the City now and in the future.

The standards allow for the assessment criteria applied to the selection of formal quotes and tenders, to be more specific to the nature of the goods or services being considered. The Procurement Standards make direct reference to the City’s Code of Conduct, and will ensure accountability, as well as compliance ethical and financial responsibilities are clearly identified and an audit trail for each purchase established. The standards will also provide a direct link through the City’s Intranet to all necessary documentation and will provide guidance on the development of specifications together with all other required documentation.

The Standards require Officers to consistently apply due process, and all Officers undertaking a formal quote and tender process, are to be actively supported and overseen by the Procurement and Project Team in the preparation of all documentation as well as for the advertising, assessment, and appointment process.

The expected outcome will be the City applies a more consistent and transparent approach to all procurement activities undertaken, and actively tests the market to ensure best value considerations are taken into account on an ongoing basis.

---

**6. Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

---

**7. Officer Recommendation**

That Council:


2. **ADOPT** the following Purchasing Policy dated June 2012.

---

**PURCHASING POLICY**

**Policy Objective**

To provide a clear standard and direction and to maintain consistency and control over all of the City of Rockingham procurement activities. To ensure that such activities comply with all relevant legislation, awards and agreements and are considered in a fair and ethical manner to achieve best value to the City.

**Policy Scope**

This policy covers the required conduct for all activities associated with the acquisition of goods, works or services of any value.
This includes tendering arrangements and the contracting of services and applies to all City of Rockingham staff and contractors.

Policy Statement

The City of Rockingham (CoR), as a Local Government entity, will obtain best value for money and maximum operational benefit by efficiently managing the procurement of goods and services and maintain the highest standards of corporate responsibility, particularly in relation to its customers, employees and the environment.

At all times the City will, within the context of the competitive market place, act fairly and ethically to ensure that there is accountability, equity and transparency in its relationships with potential and established suppliers, and ensure that integrity is maintained throughout the process.

All arrangements must be authorised by a responsible officer with an authorised purchasing limit as delegated by the Chief Executive Officer commensurate with the total value. In circumstances where a written contract is required the City reserves the right to cancel informal or irregular arrangements.

Value for money shall be the overarching principle governing procurement that allows the best possible outcome to be achieved for the City. Maintaining compliance with the specification is more important than obtaining the lowest price, particularly taking into account user requirements, quality standards, sustainability, life cycle costing, and service.

Authorities and Responsibilities

The authorisation to proceed with the facilitation of a purchase lies with the respective Director, Manager or Officers authorised purchasing limit as delegated by the Chief Executive Officer.

CoR delivers value for money services to the community

To ensure the best overall value/result is obtained through applying a strategic and cost effective approach. This may include taking into account fitness for purpose, whole of life cost, timeliness, flexibility to adapt, quality, sustainability, intangible costs/benefits, service, support and warranty.

Compliance with statutory and public sector obligations

To ensure activities are conducted in accordance with legislative and common law responsibilities. These include but are not limited to the Local Government act, 1995 and the Local Government Act (Functions and General) Regulations, 1996, Contract Law, the Trades Practices Act 1974, as well as all relevant State, Federal and Industrial awards and agreements.

Commercial in Confidence Information

Information supplied as part of a tender or quote submission considered to be commercial in confidence will not be included in reports of a public nature. This may include details of schedule of rates or other specific reference to pricing or operational details.

Open and Fair/Effective Competition

To ensure open and fair competition is fostered and maintained by providing suppliers and contractors with appropriate access and opportunities to supply goods and services to the City of Rockingham.

Professional Integrity and Probity

Procurement processes should withstand public scrutiny. Officers engaged should at all times undertake their duties in a professional, ethical, honest and impartial manner, act responsibly and exercise sound judgement by observing the highest standards of integrity, probity and professional conduct in accordance with the City's Code of Conduct.

Risk Management

To ensure that appropriate risk management practices and procedures are in place including risk identification, assessment and implementation of controls in the supply of goods and services to the City of Rockingham.
Accountability and Transparency
To ensure that responsibilities are clearly defined and that decisions are made in an open and transparent manner. This will include ensuring all appropriate records/documentation is kept.

Environmental Sustainability
To promote and adopt procurement practices which conserve resources, save energy, minimise waste, protect the environment, and are generally consistent with principles of ecological sustainability, to the greatest extent that is practicable.

The following procurement thresholds apply where the value of consideration (excluding GST) for the value of the contract/purchase over the full contract period (including options to extend) is, as shown in the amounts below:-

Purchase Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Purchase</th>
<th>Purchase Type</th>
<th>Minimum Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to $4,999</td>
<td>Small Quote</td>
<td>Up to $999 – One Verbal Quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 to $4,999 – Two Verbal Quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>Minor Quote</td>
<td>Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of two suppliers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>Major Quote</td>
<td>Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of three suppliers with a written assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>Formal Quote</td>
<td>Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of three suppliers containing price and specification of goods and services in a formal quotation process (with procurement decision based on all value for money considerations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and above</td>
<td>Tender</td>
<td>Conduct a public tender process in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Purchases from WALGA’s Preferred Supply Contract, State Government Supply Contracts or the City’s existing period contracts can be used as a procurement option for any of the above thresholds.

Where considered necessary, officers may consider calling tenders in lieu of seeking quotations for purchases under the $100,000 threshold (excluding GST). This decision should be made after considering the best value options that are consistent with this policy. If a decision is made to seek public tenders for contracts of less than $100,000, a Request for Tender process that entails all the procedures for tendering must be followed in full.

The procurement of goods or services through the WALGA Preferred Supply Contracts or State Government Supply Contracts requires quotes to be obtained in accordance with procurement thresholds (Table 1). Any quotes from these sources, excluding those quotes above $100,000, are to be approved in accordance with the Officers authorised purchasing limit, as delegated by the Chief Executive Officer and available budget allocation or are to be approved by Council if the value exceeds $100,000. For the purchase of goods or services using the City’s existing period contracts any purchases exceeding $100,000 are to be approved by the relevant Director.

Financial Requirements and Delegations
All procurement activities shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of authorised purchasing limit as delegated by the Chief Executive Officer.
All procurement expenditure shall be for CoR related activities and shall be in accordance with an approved budget.

**Records Management**

All records associated with the tender process or a direct purchase process must be recorded and retained. Record retention shall be in accordance with the minimum requirements of the State Records Act, and CoR internal records management policy.

**Policy Exemptions**

Any exemptions to the requirements of this Policy for purchases less than $100,000 must be approved in writing by the Chief Executive Officer.

**Confidentiality**

All information provided between the Contractor and the City shall be treated as Confidential only to the extent provided by the law.

**Definitions**

Procurement - the effective acquisition of goods or services. It is important that the goods/services procured are appropriate and that they are purchased at the lowest possible price to meet the needs of the purchaser in terms of quality and quantity, time, and location.

**Legislation**


**Other Relevant Policies/ Key Documents**

City’s Procurement Standards and Guidelines.
Records Management Policy
Code of Conduct
Delegated Purchasing Limits

### 8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:


2. **ADOPT** the following Purchasing Policy dated June 2012.

**PURCHASING POLICY**

**Policy Objective**

To provide a clear standard and direction and to maintain consistency and control over all of the City of Rockingham procurement activities. To ensure that such activities comply with all relevant legislation, awards and agreements and are considered in a fair and ethical manner to achieve best value to the City.

**Policy Scope**

This policy covers the required conduct for all activities associated with the acquisition of goods, works or services of any value.

This includes tendering arrangements and the contracting of services and applies to all City of Rockingham staff and contractors.

**Policy Statement**

The City of Rockingham (CoR), as a Local Government entity, will obtain best value for money and maximum operational benefit by efficiently managing the procurement of goods and services and maintain the highest standards of corporate responsibility, particularly in relation to its customers, employees and the environment.
At all times the City will, within the context of the competitive market place, act fairly and ethically to ensure that there is accountability, equity and transparency in its relationships with potential and established suppliers, and ensure that integrity is maintained throughout the process.

All arrangements must be authorised by a responsible officer with an authorised purchasing limit as delegated by the Chief Executive Officer commensurate with the total value. In circumstances where a written contract is required the City reserves the right to cancel informal or irregular arrangements.

Value for money shall be the overarching principle governing procurement that allows the best possible outcome to be achieved for the City. Maintaining compliance with the specification is more important than obtaining the lowest price, particularly taking into account user requirements, quality standards, sustainability, life cycle costing, and service.

**Authorities and Responsibilities**

The authorisation to proceed with the facilitation of a purchase lies with the respective Director, Manager or Officers authorised purchasing limit as delegated by the Chief Executive Officer.

**CoR delivers value for money services to the community**

To ensure the best overall value/result is obtained through applying a strategic and cost effective approach. This may include taking into account fitness for purpose, whole of life cost, timeliness, flexibility to adapt, quality, sustainability, intangible costs/benefits, service, support and warranty.

**Compliance with statutory and public sector obligations**

To ensure activities are conducted in accordance with legislative and common law responsibilities. These include but are not limited to the Local Government act, 1995 and the Local Government Act (Functions and General) Regulations, 1996, Contract Law, the Trades Practices Act 1974, as well as all relevant State, Federal and Industrial awards and agreements.

**Commercial in Confidence Information**

Information supplied as part of a tender or quote submission considered to be commercial in confidence will not be included in reports of a public nature. This may include details of schedule of rates or other specific reference to pricing or operational details.

**Open and Fair/Effective Competition**

To ensure open and fair competition is fostered and maintained by providing suppliers and contractors with appropriate access and opportunities to supply goods and services to the City of Rockingham.

**Professional Integrity and Probity**

Procurement processes should withstand public scrutiny. Officers engaged should at all times undertake their duties in a professional, ethical, honest and impartial manner, act responsibly and exercise sound judgement by observing the highest standards of integrity, probity and professional conduct in accordance with the City’s Code of Conduct.

**Risk Management**

To ensure that appropriate risk management practices and procedures are in place including risk identification, assessment and implementation of controls in the supply of goods and services to the City of Rockingham.

**Accountability and Transparency**

To ensure that responsibilities are clearly defined and that decisions are made in an open and transparent manner. This will include ensuring all appropriate records/documentation is kept.

**Environmental Sustainability**

To promote and adopt procurement practices which conserve resources, save energy, minimise waste, protect the environment, and are generally consistent with principles of ecological sustainability, to the greatest extent that is practicable.
The following procurement thresholds apply where the value of consideration (excluding GST) for the value of the contract/purchase over the full contract period (including options to extend) is, as shown in the amounts below:-

**Purchase Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Purchase</th>
<th>Purchase Type</th>
<th>Minimum Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Up to $4,999       | Small Quote  | Up to $999 – One Verbal Quote  
|                    |              | $1,000 to $4,999 – Two Verbal Quotes |
| $5,000 - $19,999   | Minor Quote  | Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of two suppliers. |
| $20,000 - $49,999  | Major Quote  | Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of three suppliers with a written assessment process. |
| $50,000 - $99,999  | Formal Quote | Written quotations are to be obtained from a minimum of three suppliers containing price and specification of goods and services in a formal quotation process (with procurement decision based on all value for money considerations) |
| $100,000 and above | Tender       | Conduct a public tender process in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996. |

Note: Purchases from WALGA’s Preferred Supply Contract, State Government Supply Contracts or the City’s existing period contracts can be used as a procurement option for any of the above thresholds.

Where considered necessary, officers may consider calling tenders in lieu of seeking quotations for purchases under the $100,000 threshold (excluding GST). This decision should be made after considering the best value options that are consistent with this policy. If a decision is made to seek public tenders for contracts of less than $100,000, a Request for Tender process that entails all the procedures for tendering must be followed in full.

The procurement of goods or services through the WALGA Preferred Supply Contracts or State Government Supply Contracts requires quotes to be obtained in accordance with procurement thresholds (Table 1). Any quotes from these sources, excluding those quotes above $100,000, are to be approved in accordance with the Officers authorised purchasing limit, as delegated by the Chief Executive Officer and available budget allocation or are to be approved by Council if the value exceeds $100,000. For the purchase of goods or services using the City’s existing period contracts any purchases exceeding $100,000 are to be approved by the relevant Director.

**Financial Requirements and Delegations**

All procurement activities shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of authorised purchasing limit as delegated by the Chief Executive Officer.

All procurement expenditure shall be for CoR related activities and shall be in accordance with an approved budget.

**Records Management**

All records associated with the tender process or a direct purchase process must be recorded and retained. Record retention shall be in accordance with the minimum requirements of the State Records Act, and CoR internal records management policy.
Policy Exemptions
Any exemptions to the requirements of this Policy for purchases less than $100,000 must be approved in writing by the Chief Executive Officer.

Confidentiality
All information provided between the Contractor and the City shall be treated as Confidential only to the extent provided by the law.

Definitions
Procurement - the effective acquisition of goods or services. It is important that the goods/services procured are appropriate and that they are purchased at the lowest possible price to meet the needs of the purchaser in terms of quality and quantity, time, and location.

Legislation

Other Relevant Policies/ Key Documents
City’s Procurement Standards and Guidelines.
Records Management Policy
Code of Conduct
Delegated Purchasing Limits

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 T12/13-15 – Period Provision of Greenwaste Shredding, Downsizing & Waste Reducing and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding how the tender should proceed.

# Background

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 26 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-15 – Period Provision of Greenwaste Shredding, Downsizing & Waste Reducing. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

# Details

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GG Equipment Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Growers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising Manager Waste and Landfill Services, Manager Procurement and Projects and Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

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**
   Not Applicable

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. In accordance with Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4 Division 2, Regulation 18 (5), the Local Government may decline to accept any tender.

5. **Comments**

During assessment of both submissions received, it was evident that the type of plant proposed within the submission from GG Equipment and Grass Growers did not meet the operational standards and working requirements of the landfill.

The submission from Grass Growers did include a type of shredding machine more suitable, however, the submission stated that an exclusive zone of 50 metres was required. Due to the proximity of the greenwaste loading and unloading area and an internal road used extensively by the public and staff, an exclusive zone is not viable.

The assessment panel considered that due to the submissions not meeting the operation needs of the Landfill, and the need for more detailed specification of the plant required to ensure fairness and in order to satisfy the veracity of the City’s tender process it is recommended that the tender submissions received be rejected. It is recommended that the tender for the period provision of Greenwaste Shredding, Downsizing and Waste Reducing be re-advertised with correct documentation.
6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **REJECT** all the tenders for T12/13-15 – Period Provision of Greenwaste Shredding, Downsizing & Waste Reducing, as they are not in accordance with the correct scope of works and therefore will not meet the City’s requirements.

2. **RE-ADVERTISE** the tender for the statutory period

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **REJECT** all the tenders for T12/13-15 – Period Provision of Greenwaste Shredding, Downsizing & Waste Reducing, as they are not in accordance with the correct scope of works and therefore will not meet the City’s requirements.

2. **RE-ADVERTISE** the tender for the statutory period

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

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-19 – Period Caretaking and Cleaning of Council’s Halls, Community Centres and other public facilities and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

2. Background

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 5 May 2012 for Tender T12/13-19 – Period Caretaking and Cleaning of Council’s Halls, Community Centres and other public facilities. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 23 May 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

3. Details

Brigade Facility Management submitted an alternative tender to complete the works and also supply all cleaning materials. Currently, all cleaning materials are purchased by the City and given to the Cleaning Contractor when required. The assessment panel considered the alternative tender to be not the best option for the City, therefore, the alternative tender was not included in the assessment.
Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Lump Sum Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Clean Property Services Plus</td>
<td>$320,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremac Cleaning Services</td>
<td>$343,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Dennison Services</td>
<td>$432,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigade Facility Management</td>
<td>$468,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Cleaning Experts</td>
<td>$472,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA (WA)</td>
<td>$1,107,144</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.

The lump sum prices above excludes the costs for the Kent Street Arts Building which is currently under refurbishment, upon completion the successful contractor will be offered to submit a variation to complete these works.

A panel comprising Manager Asset Services, Building Maintenance Coordinator, and Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>All Clean</th>
<th>Bremac Cleaning</th>
<th>Karen Dennison</th>
<th>Brigade FM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Office Cleaning Experts</th>
<th>CSA (WA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>64%</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 7: Community facilities and services that are well utilised, accessible and cost effective, and where appropriate, multi-functional

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

Operating works expenditure will be in accordance with the Operational Building Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget. The cost for this service over the past two (2) years was $381,456.

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

Brigade Facility Management submitted an alternative tender to complete the works and also supply all cleaning materials. Currently, all cleaning materials are purchased by the City and given to the Cleaning Contractor when required. The assessment panel considered the alternative tender not to be the best option for the City, therefore, the alternative tender was not included in the assessment.

Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender criteria all companies demonstrated a capacity to complete the works, however, the submission received from All Clean Property Services Plus 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 All Clean Property Services Plus, Unit 1, 27 Augusta Street, Willetton for Tender T12/13-19 – Period Caretaking and Cleaning of Council’s Halls, Community Centres and other public facilities 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 All Clean Property Services Plus, Unit 1, 27 Augusta Street, Willetton for Tender T12/13-19 – Period Caretaking and Cleaning of Council’s Halls, Community Centres and other public facilities 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**

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-07 Road Surface Profiling, 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 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-07 Road Surface Profiling. Tenders closed at 2:00pm, Wednesday 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

3. **Details**

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downer Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Profiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Profilers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

Evaluation of tenders, 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>Downer Australia</th>
<th>WA Profiling</th>
<th>West Coast Profilers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>87.4%</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 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 City Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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**

The tender submissions provided by Downer Australia, WA Profiling and West Coast Profilers were all identified as demonstrating the capacity and ability to perform the duties, as well as sufficient experience to provide the service required.

Due to the diverse nature of the engineering works, together with the understanding that at times no one contractor would be available to carry out the required tasks on demand, the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City to award the contract to Downer Australia, WA Profiling and West Coast Profilers, with works to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Downer Australia, WA Profiling and West Coast Profilers are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted by Downer Australia, 5 Marion Road, Maddington WA 6109; WA Profiling, 28 Felspar Street, Welshpool WA 6106; and West Coast Profilers, 30 Pickett Street, Bayswater WA 6053 for Tender T12/13-07 Road Surface Profiling in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted by Downer Australia, 5 Marion Road, Maddington WA 6109; WA Profiling, 28 Felspar Street, Welshpool WA 6106; and West Coast Profilers, 30 Pickett Street, Bayswater WA 6053 for Tender T12/13-07 Road Surface Profiling in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 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
## Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-08 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete Kerbing, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding the award of the tender.

## Background

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday 24 March 2012 for Tender T12/13-08 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete Kerbing. Tenders closed at 2:00pm, Wednesday 18 April 2012 and were publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
3. **Details**

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbing West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer Australia West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allstate Kerbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comkerb (WA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Construction Engineer and Senior Maintenance Coordinator undertook the tender evaluations.

Evaluation of tenders, 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>Kerbing West</th>
<th>Downer Australia West</th>
<th>Allstate Kerbing</th>
<th>LD Total</th>
<th>Comkerb (WA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>88.4%</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 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 City Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Road Maintenance 2012/13 draft budget, Work Order W21484.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tender submissions provided by LD Total and Comkerb (WA) were both identified as demonstrating the capacity and ability to perform the duties, as well as sufficient experience to provide the service required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quantity of works required under the annual road construction, road resurfacing and renewal programs will require multiple contractors to deliver the services and on occasion simultaneously, therefore the assessment panel considered that it represented better value to the City to award a the contract to LD Total and Comkerb (WA), with works to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD Total and Comkerb (WA) are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Voting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Officer Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Council <strong>ACCEPT</strong> the tenders submitted by LD Total, 64 Mill Point Road, South Perth WA 6151; and Comkerb (WA), 13 Dougall Street, Byford WA 6122 for Tender T12/13-08 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete Kerbing in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Committee Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Council <strong>ACCEPT</strong> the tenders submitted by LD Total, 64 Mill Point Road, South Perth WA 6151; and Comkerb (WA), 13 Dougall Street, Byford WA 6122 for Tender T12/13-08 Supply and Lay In-situ Concrete Kerbing in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Voting – 4/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Figure 1**
1. Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of a proposal to install a military memorial on the Waterfront Village Green adjacent to the existing Cenotaph on Flinders Lane, Rockingham.

2. Background

An application has been received from the City of Rockingham Sub–Branch of the Returned & Services League of Australia, requesting approval for the installation of a memorial to recognise those who served and lost their lives in the Vietnam War.

3. Details

The Returned & Services League of Australia (RSL) is a National Organisation operating through National Headquarters, State Branches, District Boards and Sub-Branches.

The RSL ideals and objectives perpetuate the close ties of friendship created by mutual service in the Australian Defence Force or allied forces, by maintaining a proper standard of dignity and honour among all past and present serving members of the Defence Force and to set an example of public spirit and noble hearted endeavour.

Accordingly, one of the principal objectives of the organisation is to preserve the memory and records of those who suffered and died for Australia.

The aim is to place a limestone monolith in the lawn area adjacent to the existing Village Green Cenotaph and attach a commemorative plaque to the edifice identifying the years of the campaign.

![Figure 2 Limestone monolith](image)

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

Additional support has been received from the Chief Executive Officer representing the members of the Safety Bay Ex-Services & Community Club.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Authorisation will be required from the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defence for permission to display the Navy, Army and Air Force emblems on the commemorative plaque.

c. Strategic

This project addresses the community's vision for the future and specifically the following aspirations of the Community Plan 2011:

**Aspiration 1:** An involved and engaged community enjoying a lifestyle that caters for all residents, including those with specific or special needs

**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.
CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 JULY 2012

5. Comments

While consideration should be given to ensuring that all public liability and Work Safe Australia regulations are complied with prior to the City allowing access to the proposed construction site, it is recommended that Council support the installation of the Vietnam Veterans memorial and continue to work closely with the Returned and Services League to further develop the design and construction brief to facilitate a timely installation.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the application from the Rockingham Sub–Branch of the Returned & Services League of Australia for the installation of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the Waterfront Village Green, subject to location, design development, public liability and Work Safe requirements being resolved to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering and Parks Services.

Committee Voting – 4/0

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the application from the Rockingham Sub–Branch of the Returned & Services League of Australia for the installation of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the Waterfront Village Green, subject to location, design development, public liability and Work Safe requirements being resolved to the satisfaction of the Director Engineering and Parks Services.

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-048/12 Tender T12/13-20 – Maintenance of Natural Areas within the City of Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>T12/13-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr James Henson, Manager Parks Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr David Mort, Conservation Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Bruce Foster, Contracts Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-20 – Maintenance of Natural Areas within the City of Rockingham and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

### 2. Background

Tenders were advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 5 May 2012 for Tender T12/13-20 – maintenance of Natural Areas within the City of Rockingham. Tenders closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 23 May 2012 and were 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>Foreshore Rehabilitation and Landscaping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising Manager Parks Development, Conservation Coordinator and Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Foreshore Rehabilitation &amp; Landscaping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial effects of Tender</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</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 10:** Coastal and Bushland reserves that are well utilised in a way that will preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

   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 City Business Plan as presented to Council and in accordance with the Engineering Operational Parks Maintenance 2012/13 draft 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

Following consideration of the sole submission when assessed in accordance with the tender criteria, Foreshore Rehabilitation and Landscaping clearly demonstrated the capacity and ability to perform the duties, as well as sufficient experience to provide the service required.

The assessment panel considered the full price schedule submitted and the core services required in meeting the specification of the tender, when scoring the overall price.

Foreshore Rehabilitation and Landscaping currently holds the City's Installation of Fencing contract and was the previous contractor for the Natural Area Maintenance contract. The company has always responded in a timely fashion and the level of service provided has been of a very high standard.

The submitted price increases identified in the schedule of rates are in line with the consumer price index over the previous two (2) years and as a result were deemed reasonable by the assessment panel.

Foreshore Rehabilitation and Landscaping is therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted from Foreshore Rehabilitation and Landscaping, 1791 Mandurah Road, Karnup for Tender T12/13-20 – Maintenance of Natural Areas within the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2014.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ACCEPT the tender submitted from Foreshore Rehabilitation and Landscaping, 1791 Mandurah Road, Karnup for Tender T12/13-20 – Maintenance of Natural Areas within the City of Rockingham in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from 1 July 2012 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

Reference No & Subject: EP-049/12

Funding proposal from Murdoch School of Biological Sciences and Biotechnology Marine Research Program

File No: LUP/880

Proponent/s: Murdoch University School of Biological Sciences

Author: Mr David Mort, Conservation Coordinator

Other Contributors: Mr James Henson, Manager Parks Development

Date of Committee Meeting: 19 June 2012

Previously before Council:

Disclosure of Interest:

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

Site: Shoalwater Islands Marine Park

Lot Area:

Attachments:

Maps/Diagrams:

1. Purpose of Report

For Council to consider becoming a partner in the Murdoch University School of Biological Sciences and Biotechnology Project, researching and monitoring the health, ecology and conservation of Bottlenose Dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) and Little Penguins (Eudyptula minor).

2. Background

The Coastal and Estuarine Dolphin Project (CEDP) is an integrated four year research project initiated by Murdoch University in collaboration with Curtin University. The research is designed to address the health ecology and conservation of dolphins inhabiting the Swan Canning Estuary and the surrounding coastal waters.

In 2010 Murdoch University received an initial investment of $200,000 from the Swan River Trust to assist in meeting the costs of health and ecology research. In 2011 Murdoch University entered into a financial and collaborative four year partnership with Fremantle Ports which will ensure long term coordination of the project.

In addition, Dr Belinda Cannell and other Murdoch University researchers have been studying the conservation of the Little Penguin colony on Penguin Island since 1986.

The health of the Little Penguins on Penguin Island is a key performance indicator for the management of the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park. They have been identified as the marine fauna of the Swan region with the highest relative conservation value but also under the highest relative threat. They are also a critically listed marine species in the Environmental Protection and
Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999. There are no other Little Penguin colonies further west than Rockingham, Western Australia, and no others found further north from this location.

Recent genetic work has also shown that the colonies in the Perth region are genetically distinct to other colonies around Australia, including those in Albany.

### 3. Details

Increasing recreational and commercial coastal use by people, as well as coastal development, is increasing the range of threats the penguins are exposed to, however the existence of Little Penguins in coastal waters is not widely known. It is therefore necessary to increase the public awareness of Little Penguins and the effects of human impact. It is also important to study the effects of coastal developments on the penguins, so that policy and management strategies can be developed to ensure the continued existence of this important colony on an island that is just 600m offshore.

The year 2011 was a particularly difficult year for the Rockingham Penguin Island colony, with four times the average penguin mortality and the worst penguin breeding performance since monitoring began in 1986. As a result, investigating the cause of these alarming results, and identifying potential management actions to ensure the ongoing health of the Penguin Island colony is the subject of a proposed multi-faceted three year ecological study to be led by Dr Cannell.

This important project requires funding to proceed. Several funding bodies have been identified to date (BHP Billiton Iron Ore and the Australian Geographic Society) but no firm commitments have been made at this stage. Some limited funding has been secured from Department of Fisheries and the Swan Coastal Catchment Council but without full funding this vital research cannot commence.

In 2009 an unprecedented number of dolphin deaths were also recorded in both Perth and Bunbury waterways prompting the Environment Minister to request the Chief Scientist of Western Australian to investigate and report on what had affected the dolphin populations. The report was inconclusive, and while there were obvious health impacts which included environment, disease, contaminants and human stressors, not enough baseline data was available to properly assess the deaths and their implications.

CEDP now seeks to gain this integral baseline data via a thorough assessment of the populations of the Swan-Canning Estuary and the surrounding coastal waters (including Cockburn Sound) to better understand the resident nature of the populations, their ranging habits and their interactions with populations from neighbouring areas. This data will then be analysed to determine how ecosystem linkages and the general state of health of the populations impact individual dolphins. It is anticipated that this information will allow us to form a better understanding of the actions required at a policy, management and community level to ensure the long term conservation of the dolphins in our urban water systems.

The project does not meet the eligibility criteria identified in the City’s Community Grants Program and accordingly the University is seeking additional financial support from the City of Rockingham and other respective local authorities.

### 4. Implications to Consider

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

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   
   Consultation was undertaken with the Department of Transport

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

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

d. Policy
Ineligible under Community Grants Program Policy July 2011

e. Financial
It is estimated that $90,000 will be required to cover the cost of contributing to the respective research projects.

Year 1 (2012/13)
- $10,000 for the Coastal and Estuarine Dolphin Project
- $20,000 for the Little Penguin Research Project

Year 2 (2013/14)
- $10,000 for the Coastal and Estuarine Dolphin Project
- $20,000 for the Little Penguin Research Project

Year 3 (2014/15)
- $10,000 for the Coastal and Estuarine Dolphin Project
- $20,000 for the Little Penguin Research Project

The City’s contribution will be dependent on the Murdoch School of Biological Sciences and Biotechnology securing similar economic streams both monetary and in-kind support from other Local Governments and stakeholders across the geographic area that the research projects cover.

To date, the following Local Governments have agreed in principal to funding the projects:
- City of Canning
- City of Bayswater
- City of Fremantle
- Town of Victoria Park
- and WALGA

The following authorities have been contacted by the research body and a decision is yet to be confirmed.
- Town of Cottesloe, Town of Nedlands, Town of East Fremantle, City of Melville, Town of Claremont, City of Bassendean, City of South Perth, Town of Vincent, City of Subiaco, Town of Peppermint Grove, Town of Mosman Park, City of Swan, City of Perth, Town of Kwinana, City of Mandurah and the West Australian Government

The City’s contribution will be funded through the current Management Plan Review allocation in the 2012/13 draft budget identified in the Parks Development Team Plan.
- Account Number 210174.1280

f. Legal and Statutory
Nil

5. Comments
The research project will ultimately provide information and establish techniques that can be used in the management of the City’s marine environments. Data collated will be available to assist in climate change modelling and environmental impact assessments undertaken by the City and external consultants.
The City’s involvement in the program will also invariably improve the likelihood of obtaining supplementary funding through other associated stakeholders. In kind support, like project management and routine maintenance assistance, will also add to the viability of the project.

For these reasons, it is recommended that Council commit to supporting the research program on an annual basis for a minimum of three years 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15.

### 6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

### 7. Officer Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the proposal submitted from Murdoch University, School of Biological Sciences and Biotechnology, to annually fund their research programs into Bottlenose Dolphins and the Little Penguin Colonies for financial years 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 subject to adequate support being received from other relevant stakeholders to make the project viable.

### 8. Committee Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the proposal submitted from Murdoch University, School of Biological Sciences and Biotechnology, to annually fund their research programs into Bottlenose Dolphins and the Little Penguin Colonies for financial years 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 subject to adequate support being received from other relevant stakeholders to make the project viable.

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>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-050/12 Bell Park Toilet Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>CPR/479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Kelton Hincks, Manager Asset Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr James Henson, Manager Parks Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>CES 125/4/06 (April 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council's Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 149 Rockingham Beach Road, Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>1.87 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>1-Bell Park Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Current Location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Bell Park Toilet
1. **Purpose of Report**

To obtain Council's endorsement of the preferred design option for the replacement of the Bell Park public toilets.

2. **Background**

Rockingham Beach is one of the City's major tourist destinations which also provides a great venue for many events throughout the year, as well as a popular spot for local families to enjoy foreshore environment and facilities.

The Bell Park Toilet was constructed in the 1980's and was originally of double brick construction with a tiled roof.

In later years the external walls were rendered and the roof was replaced with colour bond sheeting. The facility occupies an area on Bell Park of around 100m2 and is surrounded by a 1.2m wide concrete path.

At the ordinary meeting of Council in April 2006 it was resolved to take the following action:

"Defer the refurbishment of the Bell Park toilet facility pending Council Officers investigating the feasibility and costs of identifying a suitable location and constructing of a new toilet / change room facility, which would service the needs of all potential users".

3. **Details**

The existing facility contains three (3) female water closets, two (2) female showers, two (2) male water closets, two (2) male showers, one (1) urinal and one (1) accessible water closet.

An audit of the facility in 2007 revealed that the facility does not meet Australian Standards due to the following:

- The showers are not individually drained.
- Shower compartments are not tiled.
- There is no shower in the unisex accessible facility.
- The low wall to the accessible toilet does not provide the privacy required in a unisex facility.
- The general floor areas do not have drains and are prone to flooding.
- There are inadequate numbers of hand basins.
- There is no hand drying facilities.
- The ventilation is inadequate.

In addition, the location of the facility currently provides very little passive surveillance due to the size and placement of the facility which encourages anti-social behaviour.

It is also not well utilised due to the current condition and orientation on the park.

Preferably, toilets should be located in the following areas:

- Where high traffic and pedestrian volume exists;
- In areas where there are ‘Activity Generators’ such as BBQ’s and tables;
- Opposite a building or facility that provides opportunity for casual surveillance;
- Highly visible from all or most directions/open sight lines.

Visibility is an important consideration when installing new toilet blocks. It forms the basis of a Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principal i.e. by placing toilets back in an area that has constant movement of pedestrian and vehicle traffic; there will be a reduction in unsafe and inappropriate behaviour.

This criterion will therefore be applied in determining the relocation of new Bell Park facilities.

In determining the best way forward three (3) suggested options to upgrade or replace the facility are as follows:

**Option One (1) Renovate Existing Building**

A structural Engineering report was carried out to determine the current condition of the building and ascertain what level of repairs would be required to the structure if it was to be retained. Overall the report identified the structural component of the building as being in good condition with some issues that would need to be rectified.

All be it the case, the building will require a major overhaul to internal and external elements to comply with the current Australian Standards and Building Code of Australia. The scope of works will need to address as a minimum, ventilation issues, floor & shower drainage, vandal resistant fixtures/fittings, external drainage, lighting, hand dryers, auto door locks, rendering, painting and structural changes to the unisex toilet.

With this option temporary toilet facilities will need to be provided for duration of the project.

**Option two (2) Demolish Existing and Replace (in the existing location)**

Demolish the existing building and install in the same location an anti-vandal pre-constructed restroom, with two (2) universal access toilets, two (2) ambulant toilets, two (2) external showers, paving and drainage to the coast side of toilets. All sanitary and electrical fixtures will utilise the latest technology to improve efficiency and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. All doors will be automatic with a lockout timer.

With this option temporary toilet facilities will need to be provided for duration of the project.
Option three (3) Demolish Existing and Install 2 New Toilet facilities at separate locations on the park.

Demolish the existing building and re-instate with turf. Supply and installation of two (2) individual pre-constructed anti-vandal restrooms, each having a universal access toilet and an ambulant toilet. One (1) building will be located at the southern end of Bell Park (Flinders Lane car park) and the other located at the northern end (Wanliss Street car park).

External showers, paving and drainage will be included at the rear of each facility. All sanitary and electrical fixtures will utilise the latest technology to improve efficiency and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The doors will be automatic with lockout timers. The new buildings will be positioned to allow for optimised visibility to the entrances following crime prevention through environmental design principles (CPTED).

Temporary toilet facilities will not be required as the existing facility would not be demolished until the completion of the new facilities.

Figure 4 Option Three (3) Location Plan

With both option two (2) and option three (3) there is the potential of customising the facade with selected graphics of beach motifs.

Some examples of other themes are shown below:
Certain styling of internal fixtures and décor can also be modified to accommodate the intended theme or sanitary requirements. For example, floor to ceiling tiling or stainless interiors.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Consultation with local residents and businesses will be required following Council endorsement of the preferred option.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Approval from the Western Australian Planning Commission will be a requirement if demolition and replacement of the existing building is preferred.

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

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

   **Aspiration 7:** Community facilities and services that are well utilised, accessible and cost effective, and where appropriate, multi-functional

   **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
   The current operating budget for the existing Bell Park Public Toilet is $36,042.
   Capital expenditure of $448,488 was allocated in the 2011/2012 Budget to enable the refurbishment and renewal of the existing facility. Therefore the amount of $448,488 is to be carried forward to the 2012/13 Capital Budget for this revised project.
   A detailed whole of life cost estimate was completed for all three (3) options and is detailed below.
### Whole of life estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1 Renovate existing building</th>
<th>Option 2 Demolish and replace in existing location</th>
<th>Option 3 Demolish and replace at 2 separate new locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor area m²</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Construction Cost</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Life in Years:</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit out</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Whole of Life Capital Est:</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit out</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Annual Operating Costs:</td>
<td>$34,300.00</td>
<td>$11,500.00</td>
<td>$11,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$9,800.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>$11,760.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>$9,800.00</td>
<td>$6,750.00</td>
<td>$7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>$2,940.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$1,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole of Life Total Capital Est:</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole of Life Operating Total</td>
<td>$1,715,000</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Whole of Life Cost Est.:</td>
<td>$2,140,000</td>
<td>$1,085,000</td>
<td>$1,104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Est. Cost:</td>
<td>$42,800</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$22,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Whole of Life Costs Estimate

f. Legal and Statutory

Nil

5. Comments

Although the least expensive option from a capital expenditure perspective is to renovate the existing facility, the total whole of life cost projection is far greater than the other two options. This is due to the larger building size and associated operating costs for maintenance, graffiti removal, cleaning and utility expenses for a much larger structure. Renovation of the existing structure will also not address the current surveillance and orientation issues.
Currently, the distance of 430 metres between the two main public toilets on Bell and Churchill Park is not considered adequate coverage with the present level of patronage especially during main events and holiday periods.

Option three (3) would decrease these distances to an acceptable level by providing coverage at the southern end of Bell Park on Flinders Lane and additionally at Wanliss Street. This would create a uniform distance of approximately 250 metres between all three facilities.

Removal of the existing facility would as a consequence open up almost 100m² of visually restricted space and the impact of the new facilities will have a much less dominant form than the current building.

The proposed location of the toilets at Flinders Lane and Wanliss St car parks will provide greater opportunity for transient patronage and reduce the overall footprint, thereby limiting the potential for vandalism and graffiti. Access to the toilet for cleaning servicing requirements will also be reduced avoiding the need for the maintenance access across the turf areas.

Comprehensive redevelopment of the facilities would incorporate the latest sustainable design, water saving innovations and energy efficiencies therefore reducing carbon emissions and operating costs. The use of graphics to the external walls to the new toilets in an agreed theme has the potential to reduce the impact of vandalism and improve the overall amenity of the park.

It is therefore considered that option three (3) represents the best value to Council and should be selected as the preferred choice.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **APPROVE** the demolition of the existing Bell Park Toilet and change rooms and construct separate toilet facilities at Flinders Lane and Wanliss Street car parks following planning approval and subject to no adverse comment received during community consultation.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **APPROVE** the demolition of the existing Bell Park Toilet and change rooms and construct separate toilet facilities at Flinders Lane and Wanliss Street car parks following planning approval and subject to no adverse comment received during community consultation.

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
Advisory and Occasional Committee Minutes
Engineering and Parks Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-051/12 Disability Access Reference Group Meeting Minutes 2 May 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>CSV/761-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Phillip Yap, Engineering Technical Officer - Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Ms Tenille Wightman, Community Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>19 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference:</td>
<td>To collate Council’s Disability Services Plan for the improvement of accessibility to Council facilities and services for people with disabilities of all kinds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>2 Councillors, 13 Community Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Support from Engineering &amp; Parks Services, Traffic Services Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Minutes of Meeting held on 2 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Receipt of Minutes**

That Council receive the minutes of the Disability Access Reference Group meeting held on 2 May 2012 for information.

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

There are no recommendations arising from the Disability Access Reference Group meeting to the Committee.

3. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **RECEIVE** the minutes of Lark Hill Sportsplex Management Committee meeting held on 16 May 2012 for information.

Committee Voting - 4/0

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
1. **Purpose of Report**

For Council to accept the appointment of three (3) community members to the Beautiful Gardens Committee and endorse the revised entry classifications.

2. **Background**

**Beautiful Gardens Competition**

In order to build the capacity of the Rockingham community through engagement, the City established the Beautiful Gardens Competition in 1995.

The intent was for the City to sponsor a garden competition to be entitled “City of Rockingham Beautiful Gardens Competition”, to be conducted under the following guidelines:

1. Nominations for the Competition to be received from the month of August and close in the second week of October annually.
2. Preliminary judging, if required, to be undertaken by members of the Committee, with final judging by a suitably qualified Judge and Beautiful Gardens Advisory Committee Members.
3. Final judging takes place on the fourth Saturday in October.
4. Judging to be in accordance with the standards and classifications of the WA Horticultural Council.
Purpose of the Committee
A committee was established comprising people with interest, knowledge and expertise in horticultural practice and design. Their reference would be to ensure compliance with the guidelines of the competition and conduct the nomination and judging process.

Beautiful Gardens Principles
Promote a lifelong enjoyment of gardening through sharing ideas, companionship and participation.
Values encouraged through community engagement:
- Sharing sustainable principles,
- Encourage independence,
- Optimise a sense of wellbeing, participation and belonging.

Membership
Membership of the Advisory Committee comprises of five (5) voting members consisting of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Cr. Joy Stewart</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Cr. Ann Prince</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivor Mitchell</td>
<td>Rockingham Garden Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Reid</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vera Reid</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee is supported by an Officer of the City nominated by the Chief Executive Officer to act as Secretary in a non-voting role.

Terms of Reference
It was determined that it was essential to have on the committee people known for their expertise in gardening. From a Community engagement perspective the approach of obtaining a core group of committed and dedicated experts in all facets of gardening provides a base that can be enhanced with input from external information gathering from the broader community as and when required.

3. Details
It is evident over previous years that the patronage and support for the Beautiful Gardens Completion has been diminishing; in part due to public indifference, busy lives and other important personal commitments.

For this reason, the viability of the competition has at times been questioned, and subsequently, a reduced entry classification is proposed in an attempt to reinvigorate and maintain the intended focus of the competition.

Efforts to re-engage the local business community through sponsorship and promotion will also be encouraged as part of the new format.

The Following table represents the revised categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Category</th>
<th>Revised Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Residential</td>
<td>Single Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Residential Dwelling</td>
<td>Multi Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Residential Complex</td>
<td>Tidy Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidy Street</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidy Cul-de-sac</td>
<td>Sustainable Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Sports Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Complex</td>
<td>School Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frog Friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The requirement of the Governance and Meeting Framework Policy 2009, states that all community memberships of Advisory Committees will be reviewed in the period between 1 July and 30 September in the year falling between ordinary elections with all new membership proposals being considered by Council no later than the October Ordinary Council meeting of that year.

In relation to Beautiful Gardens Completion this constraint is made difficult due to the timing of the nominations period in August and the final judging in October each year.

It was felt that maintaining the interests of the present incumbent members of the committee, rather than inviting them to formally express an interest is a more productive methodology, with a view to adopting an early nomination period for subsequent years should support for the new format be realised.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Committee members are representative of the community.

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 1:** An involved and engaged community enjoying a lifestyle that caters for all residents, including those with specific or special needs
   - **Aspiration 3:** A vibrant community, enjoying access to a wide range of educational, cultural and artistic activities and a wide range of other social opportunities.
   - **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
   'Beautiful Garden Competition Policy' PPG3

e. Financial
   The cost associated with conducting the Beautiful Gardens Competition are estimated to be in the region of $8,000 and will be met from; Account number 210397.1231

f. Legal and Statutory
   In accordance with the Local Government Act 1995 – Section 5.10 Appointment of Committee Members.
   The Committee will operate under the requirements of the Local Government Act 1995, Sections 5.8 to 5.25.

5. Comments

It is expected that the new format will increase community interest in the competition and further engage the wider business community through a stronger focus on cross promotion and sponsorship.

It is also considered that the approach of appointing the current members to act as representatives on the Beautiful Gardens Committee for 2011/12, considering the core group are dedicated garden enthusiasts with a considerable depth of experience, provides a strong base that can be enhanced with input from external information gathered from the broader community as and when required.
6. Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council take the following action:

1. **APPOINT** the following community representatives to the Beautiful Gardens Advisory Committee for a one year term of office commencing 1 July 2012:
   - Mr Ivor Mitchell
   - Mr Fred Reid
   - Mrs Vera Reid

2. **ENDORSE** the following revised entry classifications for the Beautiful Gardens Competition.
   - Single Residential
   - Multi Residential
   - Tidy Street
   - Native
   - Sustainable Garden
   - Sports Complex
   - School Ground

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council take the following action:

1. **APPOINT** the following community representatives to the Beautiful Gardens Advisory Committee for a one year term of office commencing 1 July 2012:
   - Mr Ivor Mitchell
   - Mr Fred Reid
   - Mrs Vera Reid

2. **ENDORSE** the following revised entry classifications for the Beautiful Gardens Competition.
   - Single Residential
   - Multi Residential
   - Tidy Street
   - Native
   - Sustainable Garden
   - Sports Complex
   - School Ground

**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
13. Reports of Councillors

Nil

14. Addendum Agenda

Human Resource Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>HR-004/12 Superannuation Concessional Caps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>PSL/27-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Ben Searcy, Manager Human Resource Development</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>19 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Purpose of Report

To seek support for changes to the superannuation component of remuneration packages for employees affected by changes to the superannuation concessional cap.

2. Background

Caps apply to contributions made to employees superannuation in a financial year. Any superannuation contributed over a cap amount is subject to extra tax. The cap amount and how much extra tax an employee pays once exceeded depend upon whether the contributions are:

- Concessional - which are generally made to a superannuation fund for or by an employee in a financial year and are included in the assessable income of the superannuation fund (for example, superannuation guarantee, salary sacrificed amounts and any amount employees are allowed as a personal superannuation deduction in their income tax return); or
Non-concessional - which are generally made to a superannuation fund by an employee in a financial year and are not included in the superannuation fund's assessable income (for example, personal contributions made from an employee’s after-tax income).

In the 2010-11 and 2011-12 Federal Budget the government announced future changes to super as shown in the table below –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concessional cap*</th>
<th>Transitional concessional cap**</th>
<th>Non-concessional cap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10 to 2011-12 financial years</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08 and 2008-09 financial years</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on amounts over the cap</td>
<td>31.5% (in addition to the 15% paid by the super fund)</td>
<td>31.5% (in addition to the 15% paid by the super fund)</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other information</td>
<td>Any concessional contributions in excess of the cap will also count towards non-concessional contributions cap.</td>
<td>If under 65 years old at any time during the financial year, employees can bring forward the next two years of contributions, this effectively allows employees to contribute up to three times the cap at once, or at any time during the three financial years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The $25,000 concessional cap will be indexed annually from 2011-12 onwards to average weekly ordinary time earnings (AWOTE) and rounded down to the nearest multiple of $5,000.

**The transitional concessional contributions cap is for those employees who are 50 years old or older on 30 June in a financial year and is available until 30 June 2012 and is not indexed.

On 29 November 2011, the federal government announced that it will pause the indexation of the superannuation general concessional contributions cap for one year in 2013-14, so it remains at $25,000. Indexation of the cap will be deferred until 2014-15, when the cap is expected to rise to $30,000. The pause in indexation of the general concessional contributions cap will also result in a pause in the indexation of the concessional contributions cap for individuals aged 50 and over and the non-concessional contributions cap.

### 3. Details

The City's primary employment instrument, the Enterprise Agreement 2005 states that employees may contribute a portion of their pre-tax salary (salary sacrifice) to superannuation and the City will match these contributions of up to 14% as per the table below -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Contribution</th>
<th>Employer Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Required</td>
<td>Contribution Above 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% and over</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee’s contracts of employment state the following in relation to superannuation:

1. The Local Government will make superannuation contributions of up to 14% of the employee’s salary, during the term of the contract, inclusive of payments made in accordance with the Superannuation Guarantee Administration Act 1992 and the Superannuation Guarantee Charge Act 1992.

2. Payments made by the Local Government in excess of the amount prescribed in the Superannuation Guarantee Administration Act 1992 and the Superannuation Guarantee Charge Act 1992 (as varied from time to time) will be contingent upon the employee making their own contributions of up to 4%.

3. The employee shall have freedom of choice over the complying fund that their superannuation contributions are paid to, providing this choice is not changed more regularly than annually. The default fund shall be the WA Local Government Superannuation Plan.

4. At the request of the employee, the Local Government may from time to time vary the amount of the employee’s contributions towards superannuation by way of salary sacrifice and any variation will result in a lower cash component being paid.

5. The employee may elect to pay additional superannuation contributions as part of an (Australian Taxation Office) ATO approved salary sacrifice arrangement with the Local Government.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Nil

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Confirmation with the Australian Taxation Office has been sought in relation to the concessional cap amounts.

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration 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
   Nil

5. Comments

Some employees could be disadvantaged financially by the loss of potential superannuation contributions. The pause in indexation and retention of the $25,000 concessional cap threshold means that anyone with a cash salary component of approximately $140,000 or more per annum loses the capacity to effectively tax utilise the matched superannuation contribution that exists in the City’s Enterprise Agreement over and above the standard City contribution.
By offering affected employees the opportunity to convert any City contribution that falls outside the $25,000 back to the cash salary component of their remuneration package, the City enables each employee to determine whether they:

(a) exceed the concessional cap and pay the top marginal taxation rate; or
(b) receive a greater cash salary component after tax, giving the employee other opportunity to plan for their future.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the option of employees to revert superannuation contribution amounts that exceed the concessional cap threshold back to the cash salary component as part of their remuneration package.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the option of employees to revert superannuation contribution amounts that exceed the concessional cap threshold back to the cash salary component as part of their remuneration package.

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

### Corporate and Engineering Services

#### General Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>GM-004/12 Notice of Motion - Mangles Bay Marina (Cr Allan Hill)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Cr Allan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Hammond, Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:**

Approximately 75 Hectares of land being a portion of Reserve 27853 bordered by Mangles Bay to the North and Safety Bay Road and Hymus Street to the East.

**Lot Area:**


**Attachments:**

- Extract - May 2012 Ordinary Council Meeting Item SPE-008/12 Public Environmental Review – Mangles Bay Marina Based Tourist Precinct

**Maps/Diagrams:**

1. Proposed Site Mangles Bay Marina
2. Mangles Bay Marina - Proposed Conceptual Layout
1. **Proposed Site Mangles Bay Marina**

1. **Purpose of Report**

To provide officer comment and advice on Cr Hill’s notice of motion.
2. **Background**

Proposals for alternative uses for Mangles Bay and the adjacent land have been developed and considered for over 40 years.

The following timeline indicates the proposals, investigations and progress to date with the current project.

- **1971:** The Fremantle Port Authority adopted a plan for the development of a container port in Mangles Bay.
- **1975:** The Metropolitan Region Scheme was amended to provide for connection of the site to the regional road and rail network.
- **1982:** A Cabinet Sub-Committee and Departmental Technical Committee was established to review the Mangles Bay site and compare it with other sites.
- **1984:** The proposed container port facility for the area was rejected on the basis that Catherine Point and North Mole would be more suitable and cheaper alternative sites for a port.
- **1985:** The John Holland Group put forward a proposal for a small marina built out into Mangles Bay, which was found to be environmentally acceptable. The proposal was never pursued due to the downturn in the real estate market.
- **1992:** The Department of Marine and Harbours proposed a 500 pen marine-based marina built out into Mangles Bay close to the Garden Island causeway. The proposal was formally assessed by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) at the level of a Public Environmental Review (PER). The subsequent EPA report and recommendations, Bulletin 693, recommended against the proposal primarily due to seagrass loss. At this time, seagrass rehabilitation was not considered possible.
- **1998:** Following a request by Cabinet in May 1997, the Mangles Bay Boat Harbour Steering Committee developed a concept plan for the development of an inland marina in Mangles Bay. The concept plan was never formally assessed but advice from the EPA indicated that the proposal would not be acceptable due to seagrass loss. Rehabilitation of seagrass was not considered reliable at the time.
- **2005:** The Cape Peron Tourist Precinct Steering Committee commenced a feasibility study to consider the possible redevelopment of the Mangles Bay area of Cape Peron to include a marina facility.
- **May 2005:** Minister for the Environment initiates a Strategic Environmental Review process (SER) process to assess the Development Concept Plan.
- **October 2006:** EPA releases Bulletin 1237 under Section 16E of the Environmental Protection Act. EPA notes Option 2.4 was not considered to be inherently environmentally unacceptable, but significant further investigation and possible project modification would be required to demonstrate that the project could be environmentally acceptable.
- **July 2007:** Minister for Planning & Infrastructure advises the City that any further Government action on the Cape Peron Tourist Precinct project would be deferred until the feasibility of the privately funded Wanliss Street Marina Project was resolved.
- **October 2008:** Change in Government; Phil Edman, MLC appointed Chairman of the Rockingham and Kwinana Taskforce. Marina Project funding reviewed.
- **September 2009:** State Government announces it would take the project to Phase 2 studies.
- **April 2010:** State Government announces Cedar Woods Properties Ltd as Joint Venture Partner with LandCorp to progress the project through the statutory approvals process.
- **June 2010:** LandCorp formally advises City that the role of Cedar Woods will be to progress the Phase 2 statutory planning and environmental approval process.
- **February 2012:** PER released for 10 week comment period.
CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 JULY 2012

PRESIDING MEMBER

April 2012: Public comment period closes.
May 2012: Council endorses the City's submission to the EPA on the Mangles Bay Marina based Tourist Precinct.

In February 2006, Council resolved as follows:

"Moved Cr R Smith seconded Cr A Prince That Council take the following action:

That based on the environmental, planning and financial investigations carried out to date for the Cape Peron Tourist Precinct Feasibility Study, that the City of Rockingham support Option 2.4 (Variation 2), as the basis for proceeding with the further detailed environmental and planning investigations and community consultation, should the project receive State Government approval for Stage 2."

In June 2007, Council resolved as follows:-

"Moved Cr B Warner seconded Cr A Prince That Council take the following action:

1. Receive the Minutes of the Boating Advisory Committee of the 23rd May 2007 for information and Council endorse the actions relating to items arising from the Minutes.
2. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to write to Hon Mark McGowan MLA seeking his support by pursuing the State Government to further progress the Mangles Bay Marina Project to the next stage."

Councillors received a briefing on the proposal from representatives of Cedar Woods, the joint venture developers on 13 December 2011.

Councillors also received a briefing on 3 April 2012 from representatives of Preserve Point Peron Inc. that proposed an alternative development of the subject land based upon a low impact community based recreation and short stay residential concept.

3. Details

The PER process, currently underway, is expected to be determined by October 2012. Council’s response to the PER from May is attached. The approval of the PER is critical to the project going to the next stage, which would essentially entail the securing of planning approvals by way of a Metropolitan Region Scheme, Major Amendment (MRS Amendment).

The MRS Amendment will enable Council input and will be dealt with via a report via the Planning Standing Committee. Irrespective of the City’s response to the MRS Amendment, the WA Planning Commission makes the final determination. Should the MRS Amendment be approved then a Town Planning Scheme Amendment and Local Structure Planning process would follow.

The MRS approval process would be likely to take at least 500 days with a determination unlikely until late 2013 or early 2014.

The proposal is for a tourist based inland marina development comprising a single entry marina comprising of up to 500 pens and moorings and a surrounding land development comprising tourism accommodation, commercial, public open space and residential land uses. The key project construction characteristics of the proposal are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Detail</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main activities</td>
<td>Construction activities to include clearing, wet excavation of the marina and dredging of the access channel. Operational activities include marina operation and maintenance dredging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal area</td>
<td>Proposal area up to 77 ha Total land development area up to 49 ha Total vegetation clearing up to 40 ha Total marine disturbance (below current high watermark) to 6 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Total water area of marina up to 12 ha Deepest depth in marina up to - 4.0 mAHD, shallowest -2.7 mAHD Excavation for marina up to 800,000 m3 (Volume of material below 0.0m AHD is 364,000m3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Detail</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Channel construction                  | Total channel length up to 550 m  
Total channel navigable width up to 30 m, including batters the channel has a width of 55 m  
Total channel area up to 3.4 ha (includes the footprint of 1:5 batters)  
Total channel depth up to -4.0 mAHD  
Total channel dredging of up to 50 000 m$^3$ of spoil  
Dredged spoil material will be piped to the Proposal area, where it will be settled, the water infiltrated and solid material treated and disposed of off-site |
| Reclamation                           | Total reclamation area up to 1.36 ha  
Total breakwater length up to 290 m  
Total breakwater width up to 40 m includes breakwater batters of 1:5  
Total breakwater area up to 1.1 ha |
| Area west of Garden Island causeway   | Improvement works potentially including an upgrade to the car park, boat ramp and jetty platforms                                                  |
| Seagrass loss                         | Total seagrass removal up to 5.36 ha (includes breakwaters, reclamation areas, channel and batters)  
Total indirect loss of seagrass up to 0.3 ha (due to halo effects around infrastructure of approximately 15 m).  
Total marine footprint up to 5.66 ha |
| Water Corporation asset               | Length of pipeline up to 1.6 km  
Width of the service corridor up to 45 m (includes batters, provision for a dual road and Water Corporation infrastructure)  
Pump station area to be cleared up to 0.2 ha |
| Department of Defence                 | Provision of a dual-lane road as part of the service corridor to accommodate traffic to Garden Island |
| Outfall                               | Relocation of Mangles Bay stormwater ocean outfall pipe to Hymus Street                                                                        |
2. **Mangles Bay Marina - Proposed Conceptual Layout**

Existing land uses for the development site include RSL Clubrooms (to be retained), Perth RSL Caravan Park and two boating clubs, the Mangles Bay Fishing Club and Cruising Yacht Club of WA.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   The MRS Major Amendment process will be open for public exhibition for 3 months. This will provide an appropriate timeframe for the community to comment on the proposal. In addition, the local Town Planning Scheme Amendment process has a statutory public comment period of 42 days, and the Local Structure Plan is usually advertised for 28 days.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

   The PER process, along with the MRS Amendment process, gives carriage to significant consultation with all relevant Government Departments. The City is also required to consult with State Government agencies as part of the Town Planning Scheme Amendment and Local Structure Plan processes.

c. **Strategic Community Plan**

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

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

d. **Policy**

   Nil
e. Financial
An “in-principle” or “conceptual” endorsement has no real financial implications. Should the development proceed beyond conceptual, then financial implications would emerge, both positive and negative. On the positive, increased rate revenue would be derived from private development; however future expenses would also be incurred in terms of asset management costs for new infrastructure and the delivery of services such as parks maintenance and street lighting.

The City does not propose to contribute any capital monies to the project nor manage or operate the proposed marina. Should a business case be presented that demonstrated the marina returning profit after provision for life cycle asset costs, then the position in relation to marina management could be reviewed.

f. Legal and Statutory
At this stage (and until the land is appropriately zoned in the MRS and Town Planning Scheme), the City has no jurisdiction over the subject land, nor the project that is proposed. Any decision to support the project can therefore be “conceptual” or “in-principle” only and would carry no legal standing. The purpose of such a decision would enable the City to have a policy position on the project. If the motion to support the concept was lost, and a subsequent motion to oppose the concept won, then the policy position would be the opposite.

Theoretically there is no need for the City to have a position on the matter at all. Council could have input via the MRS Amendment Process and has had input into the PER.

It follows however that whilst the City doesn’t have to have a position on the issue, it is certainly entitled to in an advocacy context. It could be argued that the State Government, community groups and members of the community have a right to know what the City’s position is on the issue.

*It is important to emphasise that this decision, whether positive or negative, must have absolutely no bearing on future planning decisions which must be based on the application of established policies and strategies and sound and orderly planning principles.*

5. Comments
If the City does take a position on the issue then some significant conditions precedent need to be included. Issues such as the environmental approval and MRS Amendment approval are obviously critical to the success of the project.

Some community based matters should also be considered in the context of the approval.

The Cruising Yacht Club of WA and Mangles Bay Fishing Club have been occupiers of the Mangles Bay frontage of the subject land for many years. The provision of sufficient land to adequately accommodate the future activities of these two clubs is important given the large local membership both clubs enjoy and the significant benefit and enjoyment derived by these members.

Should the project proceed the extra residential, commercial and recreational activity will create significant traffic impact and management issues (eg ingress and egress issues for HMAS Stirling traffic and surrounding communities). The planning process that is commenced with the MRS Amendment must provide for appropriate transport corridor(s) that can effectively link the Garden Island Causeway with Safety Bay Road.

The need for a sheltered boat harbour has been well demonstrated for many years. The Port Rockingham Marina project, adjacent to Wanliss St in Rockingham, should it go ahead has the capacity to accommodate some of the latent demand for recreational boating pens in the area. This project, whilst being approved, requires private sector investment to proceed. It is unknown at this time what the status of the project is.

The Mangles Bay Marina also has the potential to satisfy this demand for recreational boating pens however the involvement of the State Government as a joint venture partner gives the project some certainty in terms of investment.
Provided that all statutory legal and financial provisions are met then staff have no objection to Cr Hill’s motion. It is recommended however that conditions relating to environmental and planning approvals, accommodation of the two existing boating clubs and traffic impact and management issues (ingress and egress to HMAS Stirling) be included.

**Council has essentially 5 courses of action to consider:**

1. Support the concept.
2. Support the concept with conditions.
3. Oppose the concept.
4. Not have a position on the concept.
5. Defer consideration until a later date.

**6. Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**7. Officer Recommendation**

That Council **SUPPORT** the concept of a marina based tourist precinct development known as the ‘Mangles Bay Marina’, to be constructed inland of the current Mangles Bay shoreline, immediately east of the Garden Island Causeway of a size and scale as proposed in the Public Environmental Review document (Strategen Feb 2012) considered by Council at its ordinary Meeting on the 22 May 2012, subject to the following:

- Environmental Approval from EPA.
- MRS Amendment approval from WAPC.
- Town Planning Scheme Amendment and Local Structure Plan approvals from the WAPC and the City of Rockingham.
- The Mangles Bay Fishing Club and Cruising Yacht Club of WA being satisfactorily accommodated within the confines of the project.
- Traffic impact and management issues being resolved, including appropriate transport corridors to satisfactorily accommodate traffic traveling between the Garden Island Causeway and Safety Bay Road.

**8. Councillor Hill’s Notice of Motion**

That Council **SUPPORT** the concept of a marina based tourist precinct development known as the ‘Mangles Bay Marina’, to be constructed inland of the current Mangles Bay shoreline, immediately east of the Garden Island Causeway of a size and scale as proposed in the Public Environmental Review document (Strategen Feb 2012) considered by Council at its ordinary Meeting on the 22 May 2012.

**9. Committee Recommendation**

That Council **SUPPORT** the concept of a marina based tourist precinct development known as the ‘Mangles Bay Marina’, to be constructed inland of the current Mangles Bay shoreline, immediately east of the Garden Island Causeway of a size and scale as proposed in the Public Environmental Review document (Strategen Feb 2012) considered by Council at its ordinary Meeting on the 22 May 2012, subject to the following:

- Environmental Approval from EPA.
- MRS Amendment approval from WAPC.
- Town Planning Scheme Amendment and Local Structure Plan approvals from the WAPC and the City of Rockingham.
- The Mangles Bay Fishing Club and Cruising Yacht Club of WA being satisfactorily accommodated within the confines of the project.
Traffic impact and management issues being resolved, including appropriate transport corridors to satisfactorily accommodate traffic traveling between the Garden Island Causeway and Safety Bay Road.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
## Corporate and Engineering Services Engineering and Parks Services
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### Site:
- PAW between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive Singleton
- Bight Reefs Reserve Singleton
- Streetsmart View Foreshore Drive Singleton
- Laurie Stanford Toilet

### Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:
Executive Function
Figure 1 PAW between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive, Singleton

Figure 2 Bight Reefs Reserve, Singleton
1. **Purpose of Report**

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

2. **Background**

Councillor Elliott submitted the following motion for consideration at the Ordinary Council Meeting in June 2012:

That Council *REQUESTS* the November 2012 review of the City Business Plan be prepared with the following item being given greater priority within the next five (5) years:
1. Construction of dual-use path in the public access way between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive, Singleton.
2. Relocation of the temporary toilet from Laurie Stanford Reserve to Bights Reef Road Reserve upon construction of the proposed new community facility on Laurie Stanford Reserve.
3. Installation of Traffic calming devices on Foreshore Drive (between Singleton Beach Road and Bight Reef Road); and
4. Construction of Gazebos’ (with Seating) on Singleton Reserves lacking these community amenities.

3. Details

1. Upgrade of PAW between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive, Singleton

In 2008, the City of Rockingham commissioned planning consultants to undertake a detailed study of all public access ways (PAWs) within the municipality. These PAWs were integral in assisting pedestrian and non-motorised transport movements within the original subdivisions that took place over a period of time within the City.

In February 2010, the completed Pedestrian Access way Strategy was adopted by Council and subsequently endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission in December 2010.

The strategy was developed as a tool to assist in the streamlining of the City’s assessment process for PAW closure requests. In developing the strategy, PAWs were examined and assessed with relation to their general condition, compliance to relevant standards and their importance in terms of their access value to local residents.

The key objectives of the strategy are:

- To provide a co-ordinated strategy to guide Council’s future decision-making in relation to requests for PAW closures;
- To ensure that PAWs remain appropriate and relevant to the surrounding land uses and pedestrian/cyclist user groups;
- To ensure essential PAW links to schools, commercial facilities, transport routes etc. are retained;
- To provide recommendations on prioritising PAWs for retention and closure;
- To develop recommendations for the improvement, upgrading and maintenance of PAWs; and
- To identify and provide recommendations to improve anti-social behaviour and address negative impacts on surrounding residents.

On reviewing the strategy, it was noted that the PAW running between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive was not included within the strategy inventory, had not been assessed against the strategies assessment criteria and therefore no recommendations for future planning or upgrades had been considered. Closer analysis revealed that the PAW was missed during the planning strategy development process as a recent title search revealed that the PAW had been incorrectly identified as road reserve rather than public open space.

2. Laurie Stanford Toilet Facility

The Council approved strategy for the provision of all new public toilets recognises that design techniques will be ineffective if a location is inappropriate. As such, the first step in determining a design standard is to assess the usage of public areas without toilet facilities to determine if they are required.

Once a site has been identified as in need of toilets, it is then important to determine correct location.

Toilets should be located in the following areas:

- Where high traffic and pedestrian volume exists;
- In areas where there are ‘Activity Generators’ such as BBQ’s and tables;
- Opposite a building or facility that provides opportunity for casual surveillance;
- Highly visible from all or most directions/open sight lines.

Visibility is an important consideration when installing new toilet blocks. It forms the basis of a Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principal i.e. by placing toilets back in an area that has constant movement of pedestrian and vehicle traffic; there will be a reduction in unsafe and inappropriate behaviour.

This criterion will therefore be applied in determining the relocation of the temporary toilet facility currently situated on Laurie Stanford Reserve, Singleton.

3. Traffic Calming Devices for Foreshore Drive, Between Singleton Beach Road and Bights Reef Road

Foreshore Drive is located on the Singleton beach front and is classified as a Local Distributor Road under the Main Roads Metropolitan Road Hierarchy. It is noted however that it is currently serving the role of a local access street due to incomplete development to the incomplete developments to the north and south. The section of Foreshore Drive referred to in the notice of motion is located between Singleton Beach Road and Bights Reef Road and has a length of approximately 770 metres. The road is fronted by a low density residential development to the east and beach foreshore reserve to the west. Formalised beach car parks are located adjacent to Foreshore Drive which provides the primary car park access.

Traffic monitoring within this section of Foreshore Drive was last undertaken in 2006. The results of those traffic counts are as follows;

Foreshore Drive (north of Coffey Street) – 2006 – 260 vehicles per day (Sunday)  85% speed – 66.6 Km/h

Crash records within this section of Foreshore Drive over the last 5 years (ending December 2010) show a total of 1 reported crashes over this period which involved a vehicle failing to give way while leaving a beach side car park.

4. Singleton Reserves Infrastructure

![Figure 5 Singleton Reserves](image-url)
The following tables identify the corresponding facilities for the Public Open Space Reserves in the Singleton locality and the minimum standards for the development of Local, Neighbourhood and District level active and passive Public Open Space outlined in the City’s Planning Policy 3.4.1.

### Table 2 Singleton Reserve Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Gazebo/s shelter</th>
<th>Picnic Setting</th>
<th>Seating/ Bench</th>
<th>Skate Park</th>
<th>Sporting facilities</th>
<th>BBQ</th>
<th>Toilet</th>
<th>Playground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Stanford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reilly Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownrigg Reserve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bights Reef Reserve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton Foreshore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 Public Open Space provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-on Instant Turf</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped Planting Areas</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Equipment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) On-street Parking Bays</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) Off-street Disabled Parking Bay</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) On-street Disabled Parking Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisex and Individual Public Toilets/Change Room Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-use Path Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 On-site Parking Bays, including a minimum of one (1) Disabled Parking Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Playground equipment in District POS is required to be fenced.

** One (1) On-street Disabled Parking Bay required where POS approved for passive use.

### 4. Implications to Consider

#### a. Consultation with the Community

Any develop proposal involving the relocation and installation of the Laurie Stanford temporary toilet will involve broad dialogue and subsequent consultation with the local community with respect to the placement and ongoing management of the facility.
In relation to the installation of local area traffic management in Foreshore Drive, all adjacent property owners and wider residential community will require consultation before implementation of traffic calming.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Any proposed local area traffic management designs will require support and approval from Main Roads Western Australia.

c. Strategic

**Community Plan**

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

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

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

d. Policy

Nil

e. Financial

There are currently no funds identified within the City Business Plan for relocation or re-housing of the Laurie Stanford Reserve temporary toilet. The estimated cost of relocation which would be dependent on the location of existing services is likely to be in the region of $30,000.

There are currently no funds identified within the City Business Plan for additional park infrastructure. The estimated cost of providing the shade and seating for Brownrigg and Reilly Reserve, Singleton is $16,000.

There are currently no funds identified within the City Business Plan for construction of a dual use path within the PAW between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive. Typical construction costs for the length of Path required would be in the region of $12000 assuming no unforeseen clearing or retaining is required.

There are currently no funds identified within the City Business Plan for the installation of local area traffic management within Foreshore Drive. Potential associated costs can differ significantly depending on selected method of traffic calming.

f. Legal and Statutory

Nil

5. Comments

1. Upgrade of PAW between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive, Singleton

As the recent investigation highlighting the omission of the PAW between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive within the strategy has been noted, it would now be reasonable to undertake a full assessment of the PAW under the same criteria established within the adopted Pedestrian Access Way Strategy. This will allow for the PAW to be graded against other PAWs in the area and any deficiencies needing to be addressed identified. Once complete, the findings and priority rankings determined by the strategy assessment criteria will allow for appropriate planning and inclusion of any required upgrades within the City's Business plan.
2. Laurie Stanford Toilet

Any allocation of capital funds which relate to the relocation of the Laurie Stanford Reserve temporary toilet will need to be considered along with the social and local community concerns identified during an obligatory consultation phase of the project.

Consideration will also need to be given to the acceptable criterion for the placement of new toilets set out in the New Toilet Plan adopted by Council in February 2012.

Given that the development of Laurie Stanford Reserve is identified in the Business Plan for 2015/16 it is recommended that any decision which relates to the relocation of the toilet be deferred until this time.

3. Traffic Calming Devices for Foreshore Drive, Between Singleton Beach Road and Bights Reef Road

Examination for the current vehicle operating conditions within this section of Foreshore Drive using the ‘Procedure for the Investigation of Local Area Traffic Management’ adopted by Council in May 2008 suggests that while the operating speed is above the posted speed limit for the road, the low traffic volume using the road results in a warrant recommendation “Considered a minor difficulty but not sufficiently serious to demand funding even in the long term”. Even when assessing the road under the local road criteria, the warrant recommendation of “Considered to be some difficulty but not of a sufficient degree to demand immediate funding in the short term.” On this basis, traffic calming for the identified section of Foreshore Drive would be unlikely to be considered a high enough priority for inclusion into the 5 year business plan.

It is however noted that the traffic count data is now dated and in order to ensure a fully robust assessment, it is recommended that current traffic data collection be programmed in as a priority and the local area traffic management warrants be reassessed.

4. Singleton Reserves Infrastructure

When a comparison is done between the current service level provisions identified in Planning Policy 3.4.1 and the existing infrastructure on Singleton Reserves, it is evident that a gap exists for the provision of adequate shelter and seating on Reilly and Brownrigg Reserves.

With all the requests for reserve infrastructure, however, it is always difficult to establish a hierarchy which satisfies all the community aspirations.

Assignment priority is therefore determined by the availability of capital funds within the City Business Plan and the higher priority of other projects currently included in the plan.

It is therefore recommended that these items be included along with all other requests and should savings be identified from existing expenditure accounts in a future budget review then consideration be made to install the items.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council DIRECT the Chief Executive Officer to take the following action:

1. Assess the Public access way between Reilly Street and Murdoch against the City’s adopted Pedestrian Access Way Strategy criteria and provide a report back to Council with the findings and recommendations of the completed assessment.

2. Defer investigation into the relocation of Laurie Stanford Reserve temporary toilet until the redevelopment of the reserve commences in 2015/16 and include relocation costs in a future review of the City’s Business Plan.

3. Undertake a detailed traffic investigation of Foreshore Drive, between Singleton Beach Road and Bights Reef Road, using collected findings to re-assess the request for traffic calming against established warrants within the adopted ‘Procedure for the Investigation of Local Area Traffic Management’ and if found to be warranted, consider including the traffic management
works as part of the current priority for infrastructure projects identified in the Engineering Services Team Plan.

4. Consider including additional park infrastructure on Brownrigg and Reilly Reserves as part of the current priority for infrastructure projects identified in the Parks Development Team Plan.

8. **Motion from Cr Elliott**

That Council *REQUESTS* the November 2012 review of the City Business Plan be prepared with the following item being given greater priority within the next five (5) years:

1. Construction of dual-use path in the public access way between Reilly Street and Murdoch Drive, Singleton.
2. Relocation of the temporary toilet from Laurie Stanford Reserve to Bights Reef Road Reserve upon construction of the proposed new community facility on Laurie Stanford Reserve.
3. Installation of Traffic calming devices on Foreshore Drive (between Singleton Beach Road and Bight Reef Road; and
4. Construction of Gazebos’ (with Seating) on Singleton Reserves lacking these community amenities.

9. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *DIRECT* the Chief Executive Officer to take the following action:

1. Assess the Public access way between Reilly Street and Murdoch against the City’s adopted Pedestrian Access Way Strategy criteria and provide a report back to Council with the findings and recommendations of the completed assessment.
2. Defefer investigation into the relocation of Laurie Stanford Reserve temporary toilet until the redevelopment of the reserve commences in 2015/16 and include relocation costs in a future review of the City’s Business Plan.
3. Undertake a detailed traffic investigation of Foreshore Drive, between Singleton Beach Road and Bights Reef Road, using collected findings to re-assess the request for traffic calming against established warrants within the adopted ‘Procedure for the Investigation of Local Area Traffic Management’ and if found to be warranted, consider including the traffic management works as part of the current priority for infrastructure projects identified in the Engineering Services Team Plan.
4. Consider including additional park infrastructure on Brownrigg and Reilly Reserves as part of the current priority for infrastructure projects identified in the Parks Development Team Plan.

**Committee Voting** – 4/0

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
# Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Minutes
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Figure 1 Livingstone Road

Figure 2 Warnbro Sound Avenue, Port Kennedy
1. **Purpose of Report**

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

2. **Background**

Councillor Hill submitted the following motion for consideration at the Ordinary Council Meeting in June 2012:

That Council **REQUESTS** the November 2012 review of the City Business Plan be prepared with the following item being given greater priority within the next five (5) years:

1. Construct a dual use path on Livingstone Road (between Acute Court and Martin Road); and

2. Tree planting (local Species) of the median strip on Warnbro Sound Avenue (from Port Kennedy Drive to Secret Harbour Boulevard).

3. **Details**

1. **Construction of dual-use path on Livingstone Road, Rockingham City Centre**

Livingstone Road is classified and a Local Access Street under the Main Roads Metropolitan Road Hierarchy and is part of the internal road network servicing the commercial zoned area located in the north western corner of the Rockingham City Centre.

Livingstone Road, between Acute Court and Martin Road, is currently not serviced by a footpath or dual use path on either verge however the businesses located on this section of road are generally not typical generators of high levels of pedestrian traffic. The main key traffic generator is the former Hoyts cinema which is located at the north eastern end of the street. Traffic counts have not been conducted on Livingston Road, however it would be expected that volumes would be below 1000 vehicles per day.

2. **The Warnbro Sound Avenue Landscaping**

The Warnbro Sound Avenue duplication project occurred in 2010 and as part of these works a rudimentary dry grass treatment was established within the median as a result of the groundwater restrictions for the adjoining Lark Hill Sportspex and the proximity to the Port Kennedy Scientific Park.

It was anticipated that it would take some time for the grassing to take hold and therefore any dry planting proposal would be postponed until a level of coverage was achieved.

A proposal to install tree planting along the length of Warnbro Sound Avenue from Port Kennedy Drive to Secret Harbour Boulevard was then listed as an infrastructure project in the Parks Development Team Plan for delivery in 2013/14; acknowledging, however, that all capital expenditure assignment priority is determined by the availability of capital funds within the City Business Plan and the higher priority of other projects currently included in the plan.

Despite this, it was considered reasonable to delay the planting until additional funds are made available in the current business planning process.

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

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

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

d. **Policy**

Nil

e. **Financial**

There are currently no funds identified within the City Business Plan for construction of a dual use path Livingston Road, Rockingham.

It is estimated that an amount of $85,000 would be required for the design, installation and establishment of the tree planting scheme for Warnbro Sound Avenue.

Capital funding for this project is not currently listed in the City Business Plan.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

Nil

---

5. **Comments**

1. **Construction of dual-use path on Livingstone Road, Rockingham City Centre**

   Under a desktop assessment, it would appear that the need for a footpath along Livingstone Road would be considered a low priority. Analysis against a needs criteria scoring system gives a future Livingstone Road path a score of 16.6 out of a possible 60. The calculation of this score however does make use of a number of assumptions such as traffic speeds, volumes and pedestrian traffic generation and as such, it would be worthwhile to conduct a more detailed investigation into the path.

2. **Warnbro Sound Landscaping**

   While it can be considered reasonable to now address the median landscaping along Warnbro Sound Avenue with an added sense of urgency, changing the existing programming must be seen in the context of all other projects and community aspirations.

   It is therefore recommended that priority for this project remain consistent with the current timing outlined for infrastructure projects in the current Parks Development Team Plan.

---

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council **DIRECT** the Chief Executive Officer to take the following action:

1. Investigate the need for a dual use path within Livingstone Road and if considered warranted against established criteria, include the path as part of the priority for infrastructure projects identified in the Engineering Services Team Plan.

2. Confirm listing of the Warnbro Sound Avenue tree planting project within the current scheduling identified in the Parks Development Team Plan for delivery in 2013/14.
8. **Motion from Cr Hill**

That Council **REQUESTS** the November 2012 review of the City Business Plan be prepared with the following item being given greater priority within the next five (5) years:

1. Construct a dual use path on Livingstone Road (between Acute Court and Martin Road); and
2. Tree planting (local Species) of the median strip on Warnbro Sound Avenue (from Port Kennedy Drive to Secret Harbour Boulevard).

9. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council **DIRECT** the Chief Executive Officer to take the following action:

1. Investigate the need for a dual use path within Livingstone Road and if considered warranted against established criteria, include the path as part of the priority for infrastructure projects identified in the Engineering Services Team Plan.
2. Confirm listing of the Warnbro Sound Avenue tree planting project within the current scheduling identified in the Parks Development Team Plan for delivery in 2013/14.

**Committee Voting – 4/0**

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notices of motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Matters Behind Closed Doors

Moved Cr Dunkling, Seconded Cr Hill:
That in accordance with section 5.23(2)(a)(b) and (c) of the Local Government Act 1995, the Committee proceed behind closed doors to discuss Confidential Items GM-003/12 – Provision of Legal Services to the City and EP-029/12 - Southern Metropolitan Regional Council – City of Canning Withdrawal Deed of Settlement.

Carried – 4/0

5:06pm Members of the Gallery and Officers departed the meeting with the exception of the Chief Executive Officer, Director Corporate Services, Director Engineering and Parks Services and Manager Governance and Councillor Support and the meeting resumed behind closed doors.

CONFIDENTIAL ITEM
NOT FOR PUBLIC ACCESS
Section 5.95(3) Local Government Act 1995 (the Act)
This item may be discussed behind closed doors as per Section 5.23(2)(a) and (b) of the Act

Corporate and Engineering Services
General Management

Reference No & Subject: GM-003/12 Provision of Legal Services to the City
File No: Mr Andrew Hammond, Chief Executive Officer
Proponent/s: 19 June 2012
Author: Executive
Other Contributors: Site:
Date of Committee Meeting: Lot Area:
Previously before Council: Attachments:
Disclosure of Interest: Maps/Diagrams:
1. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

2. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council *ENDORSE* the provision of “in-house” legal services subject to the proposal being cost neutral.

3. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *ENDORSE* the provision of “in-house” legal services subject to the proposal being cost neutral.

Carried – 4/0
CONFIDENTIAL ITEM
NOT FOR PUBLIC ACCESS
Section 5.95(3) Local Government Act 1995 (the Act)
This item may be discussed behind closed doors as per Section 5.23(2)(c) of the Act

### Corporate and Engineering Services
Engineering and Parks Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-029/12 Southern Metropolitan Regional Council – City of Canning Withdrawal Deed of Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>Southern Metropolitan Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson, Director Engineering and Parks Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>19 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>19 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>EP-029/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Deed of Settlement dated 8 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Southern Metropolitan Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Southern Metropolitan Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson, Director Engineering and Parks Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>1. Voting Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>Simple Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority
2. Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **CONSENT** to The City of Canning being retired from its obligations with the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council under the following loan agreement with the Western Australian Treasury Corporation and the participants and the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council:

   \$2 million secured lending facility (known as the office project loan) – withdrawal effective 30 June 2012

2. **FORWARD** a letter to the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council requesting it to submit a revised exhibit (b) certificate to the Western Australian Treasury Corporation as required under the terms and conditions of the loan agreements specified in (1a) above indicating the new percentages of the reduced amount of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council debt being apportioned to the remaining participants following the withdrawal of the City of Canning effective 30 June 2012.

3. **ENTER** into a Deed of Settlement between the continuing participants of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council and the City of Canning and in the presence of the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer, sign and affix the common seal of the Council.

3. Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **CONSENT** to The City of Canning being retired from its obligations with the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council under the following loan agreement with the Western Australian Treasury Corporation and the participants and the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council:

   \$2 million secured lending facility (known as the office project loan) – withdrawal effective 30 June 2012

2. **FORWARD** a letter to the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council requesting it to submit a revised exhibit (b) certificate to the Western Australian Treasury Corporation as required under the terms and conditions of the loan agreements specified in (1a) above indicating the new percentages of the reduced amount of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council debt being apportioned to the remaining participants following the withdrawal of the City of Canning effective 30 June 2012.

3. **ENTER** into a Deed of Settlement between the continuing participants of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council and the City of Canning and in the presence of the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer, sign and affix the common seal of the Council.

   Carried – 4/0

5:15pm

**Moved Cr Hill, seconded Cr Dunkling**

That the meeting again be open to the public.

   Carried – 4/0

The meeting came out from behind closed doors and the Chairman invited members of the gallery and Officers to return to the meeting.

The Manager Governance and Councillor Support did not read aloud the Committee Recommendations carried behind closed doors as no members of the public returned to the meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date and Time of Next Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting will be held on <strong>Tuesday 17 July 2012</strong> in the Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The meeting will commence at 4:00pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 5:17pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>