

CITY OF ARMADALE

MINUTES

OF TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM,
ADMINISTRATION CENTRE, 7 ORCHARD AVENUE, ARMADALE ON MONDAY, 3
DECEMBER 2012 AT 7.00 PM.

PRESENT: Cr R Butterfield (Chair)
Cr D M Shaw
Cr K Busby
Cr J H Munn JP CMC
Cr G Nixon
Cr L Sargeson

APOLOGIES: Cr G A Best

OBSERVERS: Nil

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr K Ketterer Executive Director Technical Services
Mr J Gossmann Acting Executive Manager Technical
Services
Mr R Sutton Coordinator Waste Services
Ms Y Longridge Minute Secretary

PUBLIC: Nil

*“For details of Councillor Membership on this Committee, please refer to the City’s website
– [www.armadale.wa.gov.au/your council/councillors](http://www.armadale.wa.gov.au/your_council/councillors).”*

DISCLAIMER

The Disclaimer for protecting Councillors and staff from liability of information and advice given at Committee meetings was not read as there were no members of the public in attendance.

DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor Busby - Tender No 29/12 - Additions and Alterations to Staff Toilets Main Administration Building.

QUESTION TIME

Nil.

DEPUTATION

Nil.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMEND

Minutes of the Technical Services Committee Meeting held on 5 November 2012 be confirmed.

**Moved Cr D M Shaw
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

ITEMS REFERRED FROM INFORMATION BULLETIN

- **Outstanding Matters and Information Items**
Nil
- **Minutes/Notes of Occasional/Advisory Committees**
Container Deposit System Policy Forum Minutes
Municipal Waste Advisory Council - Unconfirmed Minutes
- **Miscellaneous**
Bridge Maintenance Works on Local Roads by Main Roads WA

Committee noted the information and no further items were raised for discussion and/or further report purposes.

CONTENTS

TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

3 DECEMBER 2012

1. WASTE SERVICES	
1.1 BULK VERGE COLLECTION ANALYSIS AND REPORT	4
2. TENDERS	
2.1 TENDER NO 24/12 - MAINTENANCE AND CONTROL OF CITY WIDE VEGETATION ON DRAINAGE BASINS, OPEN DRAINS AND BRIDGES	11
2.2 **TENDER NO 29/12 - ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO STAFF TOILETS MAIN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	16
2.3 TENDER NO 31/12 - FOR SUPPLY AND INSTALLATION OF A STANDBY GENERATOR FOR THE CITY OF ARMADALE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING.....	23
3. MISCELLANEOUS	
3.1 EIGHTH AUSTRALIAN ROAD ENGINEERING AND MAINTENANCE CONFERENCE 2013	26
3.2 ARK ROADWISE COMMUNITY GROUP - VACANCY DEPUTY DELEGATE	29
4. COUNCILLORS' ITEMS	
NIL	31
5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TECHNICAL SERVICES REPORT	
NIL	31
SUMMARY OF "A" ATTACHMENTS.....	32

1.1 - BULK VERGE COLLECTION ANALYSIS AND REPORT

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/757/12
DATE : 17 October 2012
REF : SW
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Technical Services

In Brief:

- This report has been requested to examine the alternate options for bulk waste verge collections.
- **Recommend:**

That Council maintain the current format and methodology of the bulk waste verge collections.

Tabled Items

Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil.

Strategic Implications

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments
 - 2.10 Best practice integrated waste management.
 - 2.10.1 Deliver improved municipal waste and recycling collection services.
 - 2.10.2 Promote recycling, reuse and minimisation of waste materials to the community and industry.
 - 2.10.3 Provide and manage waste disposal and recycling facilities.

Legislation Implications

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Local Government Act 1995 (as amended).
- Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2007 - Part 6 Waste services.
- Litter Act 1979 - Part IV Section 23 Littering, offence.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

Assessment of Policies/Local Laws indicates that the following are applicable:

Local Laws Relating to the removal of refuse, rubbish and disused materials.

Budget/Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with the adoption of the officer recommendations.

Consultation

- Intra directorate.
- Industry comparisons.

BACKGROUND

Some concerns have been expressed by residents relating to the untidiness of verges during the periods where verge collections are being undertaken, and Council has requested that this matter be investigated, and that possible alternatives be investigated.

Currently The City of Armadale provides residents a comprehensive annual waste service including:

- weekly rubbish collection;
- fortnightly co-mingled recycling collection;
- four (4) tip passes for sorted rubbish only;
- two (2) verge greenwaste collections;
- one (1) verge junk collection; and
- two (2) e-waste recycling vouchers.

This allows the City of Armadale to provide a wide range of services and opportunities to dump large volumes of waste at “no cost”, at one of the lowest rubbish rates costs in the metropolitan area.

The purpose of this report is to:

- investigate the concerns with the existing service;
- provide an overview of what other local governments are offering; and
- provide some possible alternatives to the current service.

COMMENT

During verge collections, it is expected that residents place their greenwaste or junk waste on the verge in front of their properties for collection. There is a two (2) week notice period, followed by a maximum of one (1) week for collection following directly thereafter. This contains to a three (3) week period the time in which verge waste is in the public view. Any waste deposited on the verge outside these periods can be dealt with in terms of the Litter Act.

There is some evidence of people abusing the system and placing waste on the verge outside of the collection period. These instances, while being very prominent and visible, have been few and are usually dealt with within a short time.

Some areas have peculiar issues relating to the verge collections, and revolve mainly around insufficient space or an area on which to place the waste. Multiple-Unit Dwellings (MUDs) in particular are limited in verge collection participation due to limited verge space and having no dedicated area provided in any complex for this service.

In terms of public feedback, while there have been a limited number of complaints, the 2012 Catalyse Survey indicates that community satisfaction with the waste service is high. The verge-side bulk rubbish collection satisfaction rating of 78% is close to the industry high of 82%.

In addition, the current verge collection has a relatively high recycling rate, with all greenwaste mulched and all steel from the junk collection recycled. The City has a 77% recycling rate by weight of materials presented on the verge for collection.

OPTIONS

In order to gauge the range of alternatives and options currently in operation in Perth, four (4) Local Government Authorities (LGA's) have been contacted with a view to determining the level of public acceptance and an indication of costs. In order to ensure unanimity, the names of the LGA's have been withheld.

There are four (4) options available to the City as detailed below.

OPTION ONE: Scheduled Verge Collections. This is the existing service being provided to all households.

The advantages of the current system include:

- Cost effective;
- Reduces waste remaining on properties;
- Reduces propensity for illegal dumping;
- Provides uniform collection;
- Provides a service to residents who are unable to transport waste to the landfill;
- Scavengers reducing amount of waste to be collected;
- Easier to implement traffic management for the collection on major roads; and
- Steel and greenwaste can be recycled.

There are a number of disadvantages with the current verge collection. These include:

- Residents not following instructions on flyers:
 - Residents putting junk out early;
 - Wrong things – contamination;
 - Volume (high volume);
 - Not sorting junk collections into steel etc; and
 - Putting out after collection has passed;

- Residents dumping waste not accepted for collection on other peoples verges;
- Scavengers disturbing and redistributing piles of waste;
- Scavengers theft of steel to the detriment of the contractor;
- Fly-In Fly-Out (FIFO) workers often cannot utilise the service;
- Multi-unit development sites and battleaxe blocks lack verge space;
- People on laneways having difficulty in participating;
- Unsightly verges;
- Difficulty placing and collecting waste from high traffic road verges, such as Albany Highway; and
- Considerable opposition from residents who don't use the service.

OPTION TWO: On-Call Skip Bins

Two of the local governments interviewed offer a skip bin service to their residents, they were generally happy with the service in terms of aesthetics.

Advantages of an on-call skip bin service include:

- Reduces untidiness on verge;
- Reduces scavenging; and
- Offers opportunity for residents to utilise service at a time more suited to them.

This type of service does have a number of disadvantages, including:

- Minimal resource recovery;
- Greenwaste bins can be contaminated;
- Difficult to forecast annual budget based on uptake;
- Risk of contamination with hazardous waste;
- Higher cost service per tonne/per household;
- Neighbours filling bin before resident who requested the service does;
- Vehicle visits site twice delivering and collecting bin;
- Customer service requirements are greater for booking collections;
- Difficult to collect skip bins from high traffic roads; and
- Difficult to provide service to multi-unit dwellings.

The two (2) Local Governments that offer skip bin services also offer free drop-off days for household hazardous waste.

MUDs rarely have adequate verge space therefore this option can be difficult to fully utilise for this housing type. In addition, laneway access properties are also unlikely to be able to utilise this service. The councils interviewed provided tip passes to residents in MUDs and other difficult locations.

OPTION THREE: On-call Service

The On-call Verge service would be similar to the skip bin service, though will still incur individual verges looking untidy. Scavenging will also be present, however is likely to be minimal. This service could be offered to units and laneway dwellings only in place of a verge collection, which these properties are unlikely to be able to utilise.

Advantages

- All residents have access to convenient waste collection service;
- Reduces scavenging;
- Potential to work with charities and increase reuse;
- Units and laneway dwellings can better utilise the service;
- No contamination; and
- Offers residents opportunity to utilise service at a time more suited to them.

Disadvantages

- Significant cost;
- Difficult to forecast annual uptake and therefore budget;
- Likely that less items would be collected; and
- Customer service requirements are greater for booking collections.

Any service offered needs to be supported by adequate marketing and support material, customer service telephone support and data collection for ongoing review.

Provided there is adequate room in MUDs, this option would be most suited to this housing type. If the City is able to resource this only for MUDs and laneway access properties, this would enable these residents access to a service and reduce the likelihood of illegal dumping.

OPTION FOUR: Additional Tip Passes in lieu of collection

Advantages

- No unsightly verges;
- Much lower cost;
- Best recycling rates;
- Greater control on volume of waste per household;
- No need for traffic management on high traffic roads;
- User pays system;
- No need to tender and manage contract; and
- Reduce customer service requirements.

Disadvantages

- Extra effort required by residents may result in greater illegal dumping;
- Not all residents have access to vehicles;
- Cannot be utilised by everyone easily; and
- Will require additional landfill staff to manage deposits in site.

The additional tip passes could be used at both Hopkinson Road and Springdale Road for greenwaste. Bulk bin weekends at Springdale Road could be continued under this option.

The table in Attachment 1 - Verge Collection Review (Version 1) Comparison Table – 2012, provides a summary of the information gained from other local authorities who provide a differing range of and type of service for green waste and junk waste.

From the table, it is relatively clear that the Armadale service is performing well in comparison to others in terms of volumes collected, and that the comparative cost is very low.

DISCUSSION

In general, an ideal system for disposing of waste from residential properties would need to meet the following criteria:

- Cost effective;
- Equitable to all/accessible;
- Maximum recycling;
- Promotes reuse;
- Meets residents needs;
- Timely; and
- Adequately resourced.

Each of the options provides alternatives to collecting bulk rubbish and greenwaste. Notwithstanding the unsightliness of the City's verge collections, the costs, volumes, recycling and traffic safety of the City's current collection method rates higher than the other options for bulk collections.

Providing additional tip passes in lieu of verge collections is another option that stands up to these criteria. The main disadvantage of this is that it will not be accessible to all residents.

There is high community satisfaction for the current verge collection method and any change would need to meet the needs of the community. The scheduled verge collections are cost effective and provide a high rate of recycling.

It is difficult to provide bulk verge collections to MUDs, dwellings located in cul-de-sacs, battleaxe blocks, residents with only laneway access and high traffic roads. Alternatives should be investigated for these properties, which may include combinations of the various options detailed above.

CONCLUSION

Providing additional tip passes is the lowest cost and easily managed option, returning a high recycling rate. It is the least conspicuous. It is, however, unequitable to many residents and cannot be recommended as a first option.

The current verge collection, despite its sometimes untidiness, offers the highest rate of recycling; is also the most effective in removing maximum tonnages and the least costly option for collection of household waste.

In summary, the current system is recommended to be continued.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That Council maintain the current format and methodology of the bulk waste verge collections.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee discussed the report, and after some deliberation regarding disadvantages, it was agreed that the recommendation include alternative investigations regarding waste collection were required for Multiple-Unit Dwellings, and other higher density developments.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Verge Collection Review V4 Comparison Table – 2012.

T84/12/12 **RECOMMEND**

That Council:

1. **Maintain the current format and methodology of the bulk waste verge collections.**
2. **To investigate alternatives for waste collection and bulk verge collections to Multiple-Unit Dwellings, dwellings located in cul-de-sacs, battleaxe blocks, residents with only laneway access, strata developments and high traffic roads.**

Moved Cr J H Munn
MOTION CARRIED (6/0)

**2.1 - TENDER NO 24/12 - MAINTENANCE AND CONTROL OF CITY WIDE
VEGETATION ON DRAINAGE BASINS, OPEN DRAINS AND BRIDGES**

Councillor Busby disclosed a financial interest relating to this item as one of the tenderers was a client of his business, and left the meeting at 7.13pm.

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/743/12
DATE : 7 November 2012
REF : JC/SA
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Technical Services

In Brief:

- Tender No 24/12 was recently called for the provision of Maintenance and Control of City Wide Vegetation on Drainage Basins, Open Drains and Bridges.
- The Request for Tender seeks the provision of the required services for a period of two (2) years, with an option for a further two (2) periods of 12 months, subject to satisfactory performance and in accordance with Clause 4.1 in the Special Conditions of Contract.

▪ **Recommend:**

That with Tender No 24/12 for Maintenance and Control of City Wide Vegetation on Drainage Basins, Open Drains and Bridges, Council:

1. Accepts the tender from Beaver Tree Services for a period of two (2) years, commencing on 3 January, 2013 for a cost of approximately \$100,000.00 annually, in accordance with the submitted tender, Councils contract documentation, and Budget allocation.
2. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to extend the contract for two (2) periods of 12 months up to 2 January, 2016, subject to satisfactory performance by the contractor and price adjustments as specified in the Request for Tender document Clause 4.1.

Tabled Items

Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil.

Strategic Implications

1. Community Wellbeing
 - 1.6 A safe community.
 - 1.6.3 Promote and support planning and activities that encourage a safe and responsible community.
2. Enhance Natural and Built Environments
 - 2.5 Safe and efficient movement of goods, services and people.
 - 2.5.1 Provide a safe and efficient movement network, including local and arterial roads and associated infrastructure.

Legislation Implications

- Section 3.57 Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) – Tenders for providing goods or services.
- Division 2 Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 – Tenders for providing goods or services.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services.

Budget/Financial Implications

Works can be accommodated within the 2012/2013 Civil Works Budget.

Consultation

Intra Directorate.

BACKGROUND

Currently the City does not have a contract for the maintenance and control of City wide vegetation around its drainage basins, open drains and bridges. These works typically have been undertaken for Civil Works by contractors appointed by the Parks Department or the City's own Civil Works maintenance staff as required.

In 2011/12, Civil Works spent approximately \$70,000.00 for this service. This figure is expected to significantly increase to around \$100,000.00 within the next two (2) years due to additional infrastructure, such as drainage basins, swale drains and pedestrian bridges being created in conjunction with subdivisional development.

Tender No 24/12 for Maintenance and Control of City Wide Vegetation on Drainage Basins, Open Drains and Bridges was advertised in the Saturday 22 September, 2012 edition of the 'West Australian' newspaper, and in a notice displayed on the Administration Centre, Armadale, Kelmscott and Seville Grove Libraries public notice boards.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The successful tender will be required to provide bridge and drainage basin vegetation clearance, tree pruning, slashing and general cleaning of rubbish within and surrounding these areas. The service will also include some vegetation clearing and slashing along footpaths and roads to compliment the City's own maintenance staff.

Council approval is sought to award the tender for the Maintenance and Control of City Wide Vegetation on Drainage Basins, Open Drains and Bridges for a period of two (2) years for the period 3 January, 2013 to 2 January, 2015, with possible extension of two (2) periods of 12 months, subject to satisfactory performance.

Contract Type	Schedule of Rates
Contract Duration	Two (2) years
Commencement Date	3 January, 2013
Expiry Date	2 January, 2017
Extension Permitted	Yes as per Request for Tender Clause 4.1 (two (2) x 12 month extensions)
Annual Contract Cost	\$100,000.00
Total Contract Cost (4 years)	\$400,000.00
CPI	Yes

COMMENT

Evaluation

Tender No 24/12 Maintenance and Control of City Wide Vegetation on Drainage Basins, Open Drains and Bridges closed at 2.00pm on 9 October, 2012. Tender submissions were received from:

	Tenderer's OR Respondent's Name
1.	Jim's Tree Services
2.	WA Treeworks
3.	Beaver Tree Services
4.	Gecko Contracting
5.	Landscaping Systems

No tenders were received after the close of deadline.

An evaluation process was undertaken having specific regard to the following Qualitative Criteria:

Tenderer	Relevant Experience	Key Personnel	Tenders Resources	Demonstrated Understanding	Tendered Price	Total Overall	Ranking
	15%	15%	10%	10%	50%	100%	
Beaver Tree Services	15.00	15.00	10.00	10.00	50.00	100.00	1
Landscape Systems	8.39	12.50	7.14	10.00	27.84	65.87	2
WA Treeworks	6.25	8.60	8.0	7.50	22.98	41.97	3
Jim' Tree Services	13.21	6.25	4.76	7.00	25.30	62.53	4
Gecko Contracting	8.04	11.42	8.04	9.33	21.64	58.46	5

Based on the panel's evaluation, using a combination of the above qualitative criteria and price, the submission from Beaver Tree Services will be the most advantageous to the City.

Beaver Tree Services has advised in the submission that the tender is a joint venture with Trinity's Contractor. Trinity Contractor will in fact be carrying out the majority of the works included in the tender (approximately 90%). It should be noted therefore that the prices from Trinity's Contractor included in Section 1.1.1 of Attachment 15 of Beaver Tree Services submission, have been taken into consideration in the tender assessment.

It is therefore recommended Beaver Tree Services be selected as the City's preferred contractor for Maintenance and Control of City Wide Vegetation on Drainage Basins, Open Drains and Bridges.

Conclusion

Tenders for the Maintenance and Control of City Wide Vegetation on Drainage Basins, Open Drains and Bridges for period 3 January 2013 to 2 January , 2015, were recently invited with five (5) submissions being received and tenders assessed by an evaluation panel against compliance and qualitative criteria.

The result was that the submission received from Beaver Tree Services represented the most advantageous to the City of Armadale.

The evaluation panel therefore recommends that Tender No 24/12 be awarded to Beaver Tree Services at their submitted schedule of rates for a period of two (2) years, with the option for a further two (2) 12 month extensions, subject to satisfactory performance.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

T85/12/12 RECOMMEND

That with Tender No 24/12 for Maintenance and Control of City Wide Vegetation on Drainage Basins, Open Drains and Bridges, Council:

- 1. Accepts the tender from Beaver Tree Services for a period of two (2) years, commencing on 3 January, 2013, for a cost of approximately \$100,000.00 annually, in accordance with the submitted tender, Councils contract documentation and Budget allocation.**

- 2. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to extend the contract for two (2) periods of 12 months up to 3 January, 2017, subject to satisfactory performance by the contractor and price adjustments as specified in the Request for Tender document Clause 4.1.**

**Moved Cr D M Shaw
MOTION CARRIED (5/0)**

Councillor Busby returned to the meeting at 7.14pm.

Coordinator Waste Services left the meeting at 7:14pm

****2.2 - TENDER NO 29/12 - ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO STAFF TOILETS
MAIN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/851/12
DATE : 20 November 2012
REF : JNG
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Technical Services

In Brief:

▪ Tender No 29/12 was recently called for the Additions and Alterations to Staff Toilets Main Administration Building.

▪ **Recommend:**

That with Tender No 29/12 Additions and Alterations to Staff Toilets Main Administration Building, Council:

1. Accepts the tender from RWE Robinson & Sons Pty Ltd, in the amount of \$342,995.00 in accordance with their submitted tender, Councils contract documentation and Budget allocation.
2. Approves the budget variations to accommodate the required expenditure.

Tabled Items

Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil.

Strategic Implications

2. Enhance Natural and Built Environments.
 - 2.6 Council buildings and facilities that meet community needs.
 - 2.6.1 Provide and maintain Council buildings, facilities and public amenities.
 - 2.6.2 Develop new buildings and facilities in accordance with asset management principles and based on a planned and prioritised approach.

Legislation Implications

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Section 3.57 Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) – Tenders for providing goods or services.
- Division 2 Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 – Tenders for providing goods or services.
- Section 6.8 of the Local Government Act 1995.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services.

Budget/Financial Implications

Works can be accommodated within the 2012/13 Budget.

Consultation

- Intra Directorate.
- Governance and Administration.

BACKGROUND

The City of Armadale administration building was constructed in 1987 and provided staff accommodation for around 80 staff. As the City has grown, so has the number of staff, currently around 152 accommodated within the main administration.

The proposed refurbishment is to bring the existing toilets on both floors up to standard, increase the number of cubicles where possible and provide new modern, efficient fixtures and fittings, lighting, wall and floor treatments.

In addition the recently upgraded foyer has provided an opportunity to provide a public visitors toilet, hand basin and baby change table. Access to these will be from within the Foyer space and monitored by the front counter staff and accessed by request.

This facility will be of great benefit for the customers attending the City.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The City of Armadale invited tenders for the Additions and Alterations to Staff Toilets Main Administration Building on 27 October, 2012.

The successful tender will be required to provide the refurbishment of the staff toilets on the ground level, first level and provision of a new public toilet accessed from the foyer of the Administration Building.

At the time of advertising, normal working hours would have applied, and the normal office activities were anticipated to be unavoidably disrupted by this work. Since the resolution to close the office during the festive period, the tenderers have been requested to confirm whether they could accommodate the initial demolition work during this period, and whether additional costs would apply. All tenderers have indicated that they can accommodate this request, with only Almac WA indicating that they will have an additional cost if awarded the tender.

It is therefore the intention to have the demolition and initial disruptive construction works completed during the office closure scheduled between 22 December 2012 and 1 January 2013.

ANALYSIS

The Tender No 29/12 Additions and Alterations to Staff Toilets Main Administration Building closed at 2.00pm on 13 November 2012. Tender submissions were received from:

	Tenderer's OR Respondent's Name
1.	RWE Robinson & Sons Pty Ltd
2.	Palace Homes & Constructions Pty Ltd
3.	Devco Builders
4.	Plan Constructions Pty Ltd
5.	Classic Contractors
6.	Almac WA Pty Ltd

No tenders were received after the close of deadline.

No non-conforming tenders were received.

An evaluation process was undertaken having specific regard to the following Qualitative Criteria:

Tenderer	Relevant Experience	Key Personnel	Tenderers Resources	Demonstrated Understanding	Tendered Price	Total Overall	Ranking
	15%	15%	10%	10%	50%	100%	
RWE Robinson & Sons Pty Ltd	15.00	15.00	10.00	10.00	41.22	91.22	1
Palace Homes & Constructions Pty Ltd	10.61	11.15	4.74	7.38	50.00	83.88	2
Devco Builders	13.90	13.46	9.21	8.33	38.78	83.69	3
Plan Constructions Pty Ltd	11.34	11.54	7.11	7.62	46.00	83.61	4
Classic Contractors	13.54	11.92	7.63	7.86	37.25	78.20	5
Almac WA Pty Ltd	11.71	11.92	4.74	7.14	39.12	74.63	6

Based on the panel's evaluation, using a combination of the above qualitative criteria and price the submission from RWE Robinson & Sons Pty Ltd represents the most advantageous submission. It is therefore recommended this firm be selected as the City's preferred contractor for the Additions and Alterations to Staff Toilets Main Administration Building.

FUNDING

The funding for the project was included in the 2012/13 Budget as a carry over from previous budgets. These budgets were predicated on the assumption that the toilets were to receive a facelift, but with the planning of the work, it was apparent that additional facilities were required, and that the toilets required a total rebuild in order to accommodate the increased requirements. This scope expansion was extended to include the first floor toilets, which is now required to also accommodate the additional demands of the Community Services staff usage. As a result the original budget provision has been shown to be inadequate.

The analysis of the funding provisions and requirements are as follows:

Budget	Admin Centre Toilets - \$113,200.00	\$138,200.00
	Additional Toilet Admin Building - \$25,000.00	
Less: Expenditure to date	Architect and consultants fees	-\$25,600.00
Balance Available		\$112,600.00
This tender expenditure		\$342,995.00
Shortfall		\$230,395.00
Funding of Shortfall		\$230,395.00
Traffic Calming Poad St - Anti Hoon Measures - completed	- \$9,500.00	
Traffic Calming Clifton St - Anti Hoon Measures - completed	- \$55,000.00	
Reconstruct Roads to be determined - balance available	- \$30,595.00	
Public Amenities Minnowarra Park Bridge Imp - completed	- \$31,600.00	
Champion Centre car park construction - completed	- \$15,000.00	
Camelot Close resurfacing - completed	- \$15,000.00	
Ryland Road resurfacing - completed	- \$15,000.00	
Wakehurst Rd resurfacing - completed	- \$10,000.00	
Pavilions William Skeet Facility Improvements - completed	- \$10,000.00	
Pavilions William Skeet Floor Renewal - completed	- \$3,500.00	
Admin Facilities Old Library Roof and Gutters - completed	- \$20,000.00	
Administration Facilities First Floor Storage - completed	- \$5,500.00	
Greendale Centre Air Conditioning and Heating - completed	- \$9,700.00	

The funding of the shortfall is sourced from the balance of budget funding for projects which have been completed. These savings have been identified as part of the preparatory investigations for the mid year budget review, and additional savings are anticipated, which will be reported at the mid-year review. These additional savings could then possibly be assigned to other expenditure over-runs, or to other projects identified as new priorities.

OPTIONS

Options available at this stage are:

1. Award the contract as recommended and approve funding as recommended. This is the preferred option as it allows for the demolition works to possibly take place during the office closure period.
2. Not award the contract, due to insufficient funding, and delay appointment of the contract until the mid-year budget review anticipated in February 2013. This is not a preferred option as the tenders are only valid for 90 days, and will no longer be applicable, although these validity dates may be extended with the cooperation of the

tenderers. However, a delay of 12 weeks to the consideration of the mid-year budget review would possibly be considered unreasonable for the tenderers to extend their validity period.

In addition, the possible window of opportunity for proceeding with the demolition works during the office closure period would be lost, with considerable disruption to the workings of the offices anticipated.

3. Not award the contract and retain the toilets in their current unacceptable state and inadequate capacity.

CONCLUSION

The submission received from RWE Robinson & Sons Pty Ltd represented the most advantageous tender to the City of Armadale. The evaluation panel therefore recommends that the contract be awarded to RWE Robinson & Sons Pty Ltd in accordance with their submitted tender.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee discussed questions raised concerning the figures contained in the evaluation table, specifically relating to the pricing figures. Following deliberation, the Executive Director Technical Services advised that a corrected table would be provided to Elected Members, and included in the report for consideration by Council (Memorandum distributed 04/12/2012, Reference INT/23919/12).

Further debate ensued relating to the merits of applying budget savings identified at this early stage, or delaying the award of this tender to the mid year budget review in late February 2013. The Executive Director Technical Services further advised that such deferral would delay the project, as the tender would need to be readvertised, and by doing so the project would then be completed in the 2013/14 financial year.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

T86/12/12 **RECOMMEND**

**That with Tender No 29/12 Additions and Alterations to Staff Toilets
Main Administration Building, Council:**

1. **Accepts the tender from RWE Robinson & Sons Pty Ltd in the amount of \$342,995.00, in accordance with their submitted tender, Councils contract documentation and Budget allocation.**
2. **Pursuant to Section 6.8 of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended):**
 - (i) **Authorise the following expenditure:**

**Administration Centre Toilets (including foyer
public toilet) \$342,995.00**

(ii) Amend the 2012/13 Annual Budget as follows:

**Increase Admin Centre Toilets from \$112,600.00 to
\$342,995.00**

Decrease Additional Toilet Admin Foyer by \$25,000.00

Decrease by amounts indicated for:

Traffic Calming Poad St - Anti Hoon Measures	\$9,500.00
Traffic Calming Clifton St - Anti Hoon Measures	\$55,000.00
Reconstruct Roads - to be determined	\$30,595.00
Public Amenities Minnowarra Park Bridge Improvements	\$31,600.00
Car Park Construction - Champion Centre	\$15,000.00
Roads Resurfacing - Camelot Close	\$15,000.00
Roads Resurfacing - Ryland Road	\$15,000.00
Roads Resurfacing - Wakehurst Rd	\$10,000.00
Pavilions William Skeet Facility Improvements	\$10,000.00
Pavilions William Skeet Floor Renewal	\$3,500.00
Admin Facilities Old Library Roof and Gutters	\$20,000.00
Admin Facilities First Floor Storage	\$5,500.00
Greendale Centre Air Conditioning and Heating	\$9,700.00

**For the purpose of providing additions and alterations to the staff and
public toilet facilities in the Main Administration building.**

ABSOLUTE MAJORITY RESOLUTION REQUIRED

**Moved Cr K Busby, Opposed Cr D Shaw
MOTION CARRIED (4/2)**

2.3 - TENDER NO 31/12 - FOR SUPPLY AND INSTALLATION OF A STANDBY GENERATOR FOR THE CITY OF ARMADALE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/852/12
DATE : 20 November 2012
REF : JNG
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Technical Services

In Brief:

- Tender No 31/12 was recently called for the Supply and Installation of a Standby Generator for the City of Armadale Administration Building.
- Only one valid tender was received with a price well in excess of the reasonable estimated cost.
- **Recommend:**

That Council not accept the tender received and that the supply and installation of a standby generator for the City of Armadale Administration building be re-tendered with a tender period of six (6) weeks.

Tabled Items

Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil.

Strategic Implications

2. Enhance Natural and Built Environments
 - 2.6 Council buildings and facilities that meet community needs.
 - 2.6.1 Provide and maintain Council buildings, facilities and public amenities.
 - 2.6.2 Develop new buildings and facilities in accordance with asset management principles and based on a planned and prioritised approach.

Legislation Implications

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) – Tenders for providing goods or services
- Division 2 of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 – Tenders for providing goods or services

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services.

Budget/Financial Implications

Works can be accommodated within the 2012/13 Technical Services Budget.

Consultation

- Intra Directorate.
- Governance and Administration.

BACKGROUND

The guarantee for the supply of continuous power to the City has been a major concern to the operations of the City over many years.

Power outages resulting from many factors including pole top fires, accidents by vehicles damaging poles and aerial cables, failure of Western Powers infrastructure and transmission cables, pole top transformers and weather conditions.

The Administration offices have been forced to close on numerous occasions, whereby staff have had to sit in darkened offices without fresh air ventilation, operable computers or telephones. The cost of lost production is considerable with staff numbers around 200 unable to work effectively and together with customer services being severely curtailed, financial transactions unable to be made has an impact on many more people relying on the City Administrative services.

Outlying operations such as the Depot, Waste Transfer Station and the Libraries, whilst they may have had power, were off line due to the central IT data services unable to operate. This condition effectively closes all of the City of Armadale operations and customer services.

Council meetings have also been disrupted due to power outages and, in the worst case, have had to be rescheduled.

Although the original proposals at time of budget completion limited the generating capacity to essential sources only, the proposed installation of a standby generator is designed to provide uninterrupted power to the main Administration, Technical Services and History House for the full range of services for varying periods of power outages up to 24/7 in the case of Western Power failure to maintain supply.

COMMENT

Analysis

The tender closed at 2.00pm on 20 November, 2012. Tender submissions were received from:

	Tenderer's OR Respondent's Name
1.	Stiles Electrical Services

Two (2) tenders were received after the close of deadline and in accordance with Regulation 18 (1) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 were rejected.

As only one (1) tender was received by the closing date comparisons were unable to be made. The tender received was, however, considerably higher than the assessed market value, and was not considered good value and in Council's interest to accept, and is not recommended.

Conclusion

The evaluation panel therefore recommends that the contract Supply and Installation of a Standby Generator for the City of Armadale Administration Building be re-tendered with an extended tender period of six (6) weeks.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

T87/12/12 RECOMMEND

That Council not accept the tender received and that the Supply and Installation of a Standby Generator for the City of Armadale Administration Building be re- tendered with a tender period of six (6) weeks.

**Moved Cr G Nixon
MOTION CARRIED (6/0)**

**3.1 - EIGHTH AUSTRALIAN ROAD ENGINEERING AND MAINTENANCE
CONFERENCE 2013**

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/705/12
DATE : 25 September 2012
REF : KK
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Technical Services

In Brief:

- The Eighth Australian Road Engineering and Maintenance Conference will be held in Melbourne on 13 and 14 March 2013, and is designed to alert State and Local Government Road Engineers, Councillors, Managers, consultants, contractors and suppliers about new developments and issues in relation to roads and their environs.

▪ **Recommend**

That Council:

1. Nominate Councillor as a delegate to the Eighth Australian Road Engineering and Maintenance Conference 2013, to be held in Melbourne from 13-14 March 2013.

OR should no nomination be received, then the recommendation is as follows:

Make no nomination for attendance at the Eighth Australian Road Engineering and Maintenance Conference 2013.

2. Note the attendance of Senior Officers as delegates to the Eighth Australian Road Engineering and Maintenance Conference 2013, to be held in Melbourne from 13-14 March, 2013.

Tabled Items

Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil.

Strategic Implications

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments
 - 2.5 Safe and efficient movement of goods, services and people.
 - 2.5.1 Provide a safe and efficient movement network, including local and arterial roads and associated infrastructure.

Legislation Implications

General assessment of relevant legislation, eg Local Government Act 1995 (as amended), has not revealed any restrictions.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

Assessment of Policies/Local Laws indicates that the following are applicable:

- Council Policy ADM3 – Conferences and Training.
- Council Policy EM1 – Reimbursement of Councillor's Expenses.

Budget/Financial Implications

Costs can be accommodated within the 2012/13 Annual Budget.

Consultation

Intra Directorate.

BACKGROUND

The Eighth Australian Road Engineering and Maintenance Conference will be held in Melbourne on 13 and 14 March 2013, and is designed to alert State and Local Government Road Engineers, Councillors, Managers, consultants, contractors and suppliers about new developments and issues in relation to roads and their environs. This includes other pavements such as car parks, hardstands, bicycle and footpaths.

This long running, annual roads conference attracts over two hundred participants each year, and provides an opportunity to interact with peers from around Australia and New Zealand.

COMMENT

The Conference has two streams at all times, with a mixture of speaking sessions and practical workshops. Delegates may freely swap between both streams at no additional charge. Practical case studies, a series of workshops, and a road exhibition will all feature during the two day Conference.

Key topics will include:

- Roads, pavements, hardstands, car parks, bicycle paths, and foot paths.
- Achieving sustainability on road projects.
- Road delivery models and contracts.
- Road safety and traffic engineering.
- Road design.
- Road maintenance practices.
- Road maintenance management.
- Asset management.
- Service and utility reinstatement.
- Road construction.
- Good paving and sealing practices.
- Cracks: Treatment and prevention.
- Roads and drainage.
- Road and landscape.

Project topics will include:

- Roads, pavements, hardstands, car parks.
- Bicycle paths.
- Pedestrian precincts and foot paths.
- Public or private projects.

Attendance costs, including full registration, flights, accommodation, and sundry expenses are approximately \$2,060.00 per person.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

T88/12/12 RECOMMEND

That Council:

- 1. Nominate Councillor R Butterfield as a delegate to the Eighth Australian Road Engineering and Maintenance Conference 2013, to be held in Melbourne from 13-14 March 2013.**

***OR* should no nomination be received, then the recommendation is as follows:**

Make no nomination for attendance at the Eighth Australian Road Engineering and Maintenance Conference 2013.

- 2. Note the attendance of Senior Officers as delegates to the Eighth Australian Road Engineering and Maintenance Conference 2013, to be held in Melbourne from 13-14 March 2013.**

**Moved Cr D M Shaw
MOTION CARRIED (6/0)**

3.2 - ARK ROADWISE COMMUNITY GROUP - VACANCY DEPUTY DELEGATE

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/856/12
DATE : 22 November 2012
REF : CB
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Technical Services

In Brief:

- The purpose of the ARK Community Group is to promote road safety throughout the Community.
- A vacancy in the role as Deputy Delegate has occurred after the resignation of the initial Deputy nomination.
- **Recommend:**

That Council appoint Councillor as Deputy Delegate to the ARK RoadWise Community Group.

Tabled Items

Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil.

Strategic Implications

4. Good Governance and an Effective Organisation
 - 4.1 Good governance and leadership.
 - 4.1.3 Provide leadership for the community in sustainability issues and local government reform matters.
 - 4.3 An informed and engaged community.
 - 4.3.1 Improve two way communications with the local community.

Legislation Implications

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Sections 5.8 of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) - Establishment of Committees
- Sections 5.11A of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) - Deputy Committee Members

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

Full assessment of all Policies/Local Laws indicates that none are applicable.

Budget/Financial Implications

Nil.

Consultation

Nil.

BACKGROUND

The purpose of the ARK RoadWise Community Group is to promote road safety throughout the local community.

At the Council Meeting of 14 November 2011, Council resolved (T76/11/11):

2. *Cr. Busby be appointed as Delegate and Cr. Shaw be appointed as Deputy Delegate of the ARK RoadWise Community Group.*

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Councillor Shaw has advised that due to unforeseen circumstances she has resigned as Deputy Delegate from the ARK RoadWise Community Group.

COMMENT

Current practice is for the Delegate and Deputy Delegate to be nominated from the Technical Services Committee.

OPTIONS

Nil.

CONCLUSION

That a Deputy Delegate of the ARK RoadWise Community Group is required to be appointed.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

T89/12/12 **RECOMMEND**

That Council appoint Councillor G Nixon as Deputy Delegate of the ARK RoadWise Community Group.

**Moved Cr R Butterfield
MOTION CARRIED (6/0)**

COUNCILLORS' ITEMS

Nil.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TECHNICAL SERVICES REPORT

Nil.

MEETING DECLARED CLOSED AT 7:56PM

TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE		
SUMMARY OF "A" ATTACHMENTS		
3 DECEMBER 2012		
ATT NO.	SUBJECT	PAGE
1.1 BULK VERGE COLLECTION ANALYSIS AND REPORT		
1.1.1	Verge Collection Review V4 Comparison Table - 2012	33

Table 1: Comparison of Verge Waste Collection Services Provided Local Governments

	Actual					Comparative estimates for Armadale	
Council	Armadale	1	2	3	4		
Type of Collection	Scheduled verge (contractor)	On-Call Verge	On-call skip	Scheduled verge (In-house)	Scheduled verge (In-house)	Additional Tip Passes (estimated)	On-Call Skip (estimated)
No. of Collections							
G/waste /year	2	6	3	2	2	6	3
Junk /year	1			1	2		
Volume/household							
G/waste m ³ /col	6	2	3	3	2		
Junk m ³ /col	<u>12</u>			<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	1.3	3
Total m³/year	24	12	9	9	8	8	9
Tonnes/year							
G/waste	4,481**	1000	500	2,184	2100(est)	6500	500
Junk	1,035	6,200	4,000	3,196	1620(est)	2000	4,000
Metal	474	500			500(est)	500	
Total /year	5,990	7,700	4,500	5,380	4220	9,000***	4,500
Recycling Rate	77%	19%	13%	41%	62%	80%	13%
Number Households	24,263	59,000	26,280	45,754	32,249	24263	24623
Cost per annum	\$764,723	\$1,239,000	\$683,000	\$920,000	\$802,000	\$100,000****	\$690,000
Waste rate	\$255	\$450	\$314.50	\$310	\$390	-\$12	+\$7
Verge cost/tonne	\$128	\$161	\$151	\$171	\$190	\$11	\$150
Disposal cost*	\$291,324	\$714,900	\$493,500	\$580,000	\$235,140	\$504,000	\$500,000
/household							
Kgs	247**	131	171	118	131	371	171
Collection Cost	\$31.50**	\$21	\$26	\$20.11	\$24.87	\$4.12	\$26
Disposal cost	\$12.01**	\$12.12	\$18.18	\$10.61	\$7.29	\$20.77	\$18.18
Accessibility to strata units	Limited	Available	Difficult in multistorey developments	no verge collection – 6 tip passes	Limited	Available	Difficult

* Disposal costs have been included because there is substantial saving if the waste is recycled.

**Unlimited greenwaste allowance for hills residents - normally \$25/ household

***In all systems only 25-35% of available services used

**** Cost for collection would be zero but extra staff would be required at landfill

TABLE 2: Other Waste Services Provided

Council	Actual					Comparative estimates for Armadale	
	Armadale	1	2	3	4		
Kerbside Rubbish	240L - wk	140L - wk	240L - wk	240L - wk	240L - wk	240L - wk	240L - wk
Kerbside Recycling	204L -fn	204L -fn	204L -fn	204L -fn**	240L - wk	204L -fn	204L -fn
Kerbside g/waste	n/a	204L -fn	204L -fn	n/a	n/a		
Tip passes	4	Nil	3 passes or 3 skip bins	6*.	6	4	4
Other	2 e-waste passes junk flier			3 recyclables drop-off days pa inc. e-waste HHW disposal days			
Customer service	In-house and directed to contractor	Bookings – contractor Complaints - council	Bookings – contractor Complaints - council	In-house	In-house	Minimal	In-house
Council Landfill	Yes	Yes	No - Regional	No - Regional	Yes		
Other information		Provide different level of service to different areas and charge different rubbish rates.	WMRC report indicated that skip bins increased waste output		No longer send out notification fliers of verge collections 2 weeks prior		

to be replaced by 360L

*only for properties that do not receive verge collections. Weekly passes for rural properties