# MINUTES

# OF THE

# SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

# HELD ON

# 24 NOVEMBER 2009

# AT 6.30PM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS

# MELVILLE CIVIC CENTRE

## DISCLAIMER

**PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER BEFORE PROCEEDING:**

Any plans or documents in agendas and minutes may be subject to copyright. The express permission of the copyright owner must be obtained before copying any copyright material.

Any statement, comment or decision made at a Council or Committee meeting regarding any application for an approval, consent or licence, including a resolution of approval, is not effective as an approval of any application and must be relied upon as such.

Any person or entity who has an application before the City must obtain, and should only rely on, written notice of the City's decision and any conditions attaching to the decision, and cannot treat as an approval anything said or done at a Council or Committee meeting.

Any advice provided by an employee of the City on the operation of written law, or the performance of a function by the City, is provided in the capacity of an employee, and to the best of that person's knowledge and ability, it does not constitute, and should not be relied upon, as a legal advice or representation by the City. Any advice on a matter of law, or anything sought to be relied upon as representation by the City should be sought in writing and should make clear the purpose of the request.

**DISTRIBUTED: 27 NOVEMBER 2009**

# CONTENTS PAGE


| | Item Description | Page Number |
|---|---|---|
| C09/6025 | Construction of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths | 5 |
| C09/6026 | Road Maintenance Program 2009-2012 | 11 |
| C09/6027 | Supply of 5 Side-Loading Waste Trucks and Operating Lease | 18 |

City of Melville

10 Almondbury Road Booragoon WA 6154
Postal Address: Locked Bag 1, Booragoon WA 6954
Tel: 08 9364 0666
Fax: 08 9364 0285
Email: melinfo@melville.wa.gov.au
Web: www.melvillecity.com.au

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MELVILLE CIVIC CENTRE, 10 ALMONDBURY ROAD, BOORAGOON, COMMENCING AT 6.30PM ON TUESDAY, 24 NOVEMBER 2009.**

---

## 1. OFFICIAL OPENING

The Presiding Member welcomed those in attendance to the meeting and declared the meeting open at 6:30 pm. Mr J Clark the Governance and Compliance Program Manager read aloud the Disclaimer and then His Worship the Mayor, R Aubrey, read aloud the Affirmation of Civic Duty and Responsibility.

The Presiding Member advised that the Special Meeting had been convened to discuss and consider tenders relating to –

- Construction of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths
- Road Maintenance Program 2009-2012
- Supply of 5 Side-Loading Waste Trucks and Operating Lease

**Affirmation of Civic Duty and Responsibility**

**I make this Affirmation in good faith on behalf of Elected Members and Officers of the City of Melville. We collectively declare that we will duly, faithfully, honestly, and with integrity fulfil the duties of our respective office and positions for all the people in the district according to the best of our judgement and ability. We will observe the City's Code of Conduct and Standing Orders to ensure the efficient, effective and orderly decision making within this forum.**

## 2. PRESENT

His Worship the Mayor R Aubrey

| COUNCILLORS | WARD |
|---|---|
| Cr R Subramaniam Deputy Mayor | Bull Creek/Leeming |
| Cr N Pazolli, Cr P Reidy | Applecross/Mount Pleasant |
| Cr A Ceniviva, Cr A Nicholson | City |
| Cr C Robartson | Bull Creek/Leeming |
| Cr G Wieland | Bicton/Attadale |
| Cr B Kinnell | Palmyra/Melville/Willagee |
| Cr M Reynolds, Cr N Foxton | University |

## 3. IN ATTENDANCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Dr S Silcox | Chief Executive Officer |
| Mr M Tieleman | Director Corporate Services |
| Mr S Cope | Director Urban Planning |
| Ms C Young | Director Community Development |
| Mr J Christie | Director Technical Services |
| Mr T Cahoon | Manager Health & Lifestyle Services |
| Mr L Bosworth | Manager Operations |
| Mr J Clark | Governance & Compliance Program Manager |
| Ms D Beilby | Minute Secretary |

At the commencement of the Meeting there was 1 member of the public in the Public Gallery and no members of the Press in the Press Gallery.

## 4. APOLOGIES AND APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

### 4.1 APOLOGIES

Cr Barton
Cr Halton

### 4.2 APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

## 5. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION) AND DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS

### 5.1 DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS WHO HAVE NOT READ AND GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO ALL MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE BUSINESS PAPERS PRESENTED BEFORE THE MEETING.

Nil.

### 5.2 DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS WHO HAVE RECEIVED AND NOT READ THE ELECTED MEMBERS BULLETIN.

Nil.

## 6. QUESTION TIME

### 6.1 Mr C Boots, Parkwood

Question 1

*"Is the Mayor of Melville aware that under the "Establishment Agreement of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council" that the City of Melville is responsible for its share of SMRC operating expenditure, debts and other liabilities?"*

Response

The Mayor and the City are aware of their financial obligations with regards to the Establishment Agreement of the SMRC. The Establishment Agreement clearly details the City's obligations from a financial perspective with regards to Operating Expenditure, Contributions to Capital and other Debts and Liabilities.

Question 2

*"Is the Mayor of Melville aware of a Parliamentary Inquiry, Department of Environment & Conservation and Department of Health recent negative reports against SMRC?"*

Response

The City of Melville is aware of the findings of the Department of Environment and Conservation's 'Final reports from odour investigations around the SMRC's Regional Resource Recovery Centre (RRRC), it is also aware of the Legislative Council Standing C
ommittee on Environment and Public Affairs report, the Municipal Waste Management in Western Australia's report and the Department of Health report on "The SMRC's Regional Resource Recovery Centre Odour, Health and Management."

The Mayor is aware that none of these reports recommend the RRRC be closed, moved to another location or that a different technology be employed to process the community's waste.

Characterising the reports as "negative" or "against SMRC" is a matter of opinion and not a matter of fact.

Question 3

*"How then, then is the Mayor of Melville going to prepare the City of Melville against further uncontrollable costs and abhorrent behaviour of the SMRC?"*

Response

The SMRC is an open and accountable Regional Local Government. We understand that the most recent independent audit has found that the Regional Council's governance, administration and finance departments are operating in accordance with all requirements.

Cost increases have been made in consultation with the SMRC Member Councils, including the City of Melville, and are subject to close scrutiny by Council officers and the City's representative on the SMRC.

The City appoints a Regional Councillor to represent the City of Melville and the regional community. The City is also represented by senior officers on a number of SMRC committees and groups.

The phrase "uncontrollable costs and abhorrent behaviour" is again a matter of opinion and not a matter of fact.

## 7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil.

The Members' and Officers' attention was drawn to the following provisions of the Local Government Act 1995 regarding disclosures of interest;

### 7.1 FINANCIAL INTERESTS

A declaration under this section requires that the nature of the interest must be disclosed. Consequently a member who has made a declaration must not preside, participate in, or be present during any discussion or decision making procedure relating to the matter the subject of the declaration.

### 7.2 DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST THAT MAY CAUSE A CONFLICT

Councillors and staff are required (Code of Conduct), in addition to declaring any financial interest, to declare any interest that might cause a conflict. The member / employee is also encouraged to disclose the nature of the interest. The member / employee must consider the nature and extent of the interest and whether it will affect their impartiality. If the member / employee declares that their impartiality will not be affected then they may participate in the decision making processes.

## 8. APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVES OF ABSENCE

- Cr Halton

At 6.37pm Cr Reynolds moved, seconded Cr Subramaniam -

**That the application for new leave of absence submitted by Cr Halton on 24 November 2009, be granted.**

At 6.37pm the Mayor submitted the motion which was declared

**CARRIED (11/0)**

## 9. IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

Nil.

## 10. BUSINESS

## C09/6025 – CONSTRUCTION OF IN-SITU CONCRETE FOOTPATHS (CO08/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ward | : | All |
| Category | : | Operational |
| Subject Index | : | Tenders |
| Customer Index | : | City of Melville |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items | : | Not Applicable |
| Works Programme | : | Not Applicable |
| Funding | : | 2009/2010 Budget |
| Responsible Officer | : | Leigh Bosworth<br>Manager Operations |

### AUTHORITY / DISCRETION

| | | Definition |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ | Advocacy | *when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.* |
| ☒ | **Executive** | ***the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.*** |
| ☐ | Legislative | *includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes & policies.* |
| ☐ | Review | *when Council review decisions made by Officers.* |
| ☐ | Quasi-Judicial | *when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.* |

## C09/6025 – CONSTRUCTION OF IN-SITU CONCRETE FOOTPATHS (CO08/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

### KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY

- To recommend acceptance of a tender for the Construction of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths for a three year period.

### BACKGROUND

Tenders for the Construction of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths were invited by advertisement by WALGA in the West Australian on Saturday 12 September 2009 and closed on Tuesday 13 October 2009 at 3.00pm.

This tender was prepared and evaluated by WALGA and an Evaluation Report was subsequently prepared and forwarded to the City for acceptance.

#### Price Schedule

The Price Schedule was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on Thursday 19 November 2009 under confidential cover and was included in the Evaluation Report below which was also distributed to Elected Members on Friday 20 November 2009 under confidential cover.

#### Tender Evaluation Process

All tenders were evaluated using a non-price weighted attribute method.and were assigned a percentage score out of 100. The tenderer who achieved the highest score has been recommended.

The Evaluation Report Sheet was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on Thursday 19 November 2009 under confidential cover and was also distributed to Elected Members on Friday 20 November 2009 under confidential cover.

The WALGA Evaluation Committee consisted of the Business Development Manager, the Business Development Coordinator and the Business Management Coordinator. The City's Evaluation Panel consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the Manager Operations and the Senior Design Engineer.

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes.

1. Demonstrated Capacity and Experience
2. Key Personnel and Subcontractors
3. Performance

## C09/6025 – CONSTRUCTION OF IN-SITU CONCRETE FOOTPATHS (CO08/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

### DETAIL

22 sets of tender documents were issued and 3 submissions were received as follows:

Dowsing Concrete
Metro Concrete
Trenchbusters

The tenders from Dowsing Concrete and Metro Concrete were shortlisted by WALGA with Trenchbusters failing to comply with the Conditions of Tender.

WALGA has prepared a detailed Evaluation Report, (refer to Confidential Evaluation Report) which is attached.

The City's Evaluation Panel met to discuss the report and have agreed with the recommendations for the appointment of Dowsing Concrete as the preferred supplier of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths.

The business has relevant experience with Local Government, experienced personnel and access to suitably skilled sub-contractors and positive reference checks. Pricing is seen as competitive. Whilst the initial intention of the tender was to appoint a panel for the supply of services, the appointment of one single contractor is not seen as a risk due to the size of the business and the works requiring only 19% of their current capacity.

On acceptance of the recommendation from WALGA, the panel discussed the possibility of using Dowsing Concrete for the supply of In-Situ Footpaths that are required in the Road Maintenance Program. Legal opinion was obtained and it was confirmed that this undertaking was possible as long as no contractor was appointed for these services under the Road Maintenance Services Tender. Dowsing Concrete was contacted to confirm that they would be able to undertake the additional volume of works, approximately $200,000.00 and it was confirmed that there was sufficient capacity.

The Evaluation Panel recommendation is to accept the Evaluation Report from WALGA for Dowsing Contractors to be awarded the contract for the Supply of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths for a three year period.

### PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Not applicable

### CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS

Not applicable

**C09/6025 – CONSTRUCTION OF IN-SITU CONCRETE FOOTPATHS (CO08/09)**
**(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

## STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 states "A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services".

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The costs for the implementation of the Footpaths Capital Works Programme are included within the Technical Service Operations Management Budget
(451-84770-7126-000 and 451-84690-7126-000). The recommended tenderer is in line with market expectations, however is approximately 35% cheaper than rates for similar services recently received in a concurrent Request for Tender (Road Maintenance Program 2009-2012). A further request to the tenderer was made to determine if they had the capacity to incorporate an estimated $200,000.00 additional works per annum in support of the Road Maintenance programme, budget 452-84550-7126-000. As the tenderer confirmed their capacity to service the associated Road Maintenance Program concrete works, the estimated annual expenditure under this tender is $1,105,350.00 excluding GST. This tender is for the delivery of the above services for a period of up to 3 years.

Failure to appoint a contractor would create a significant risk in terms of severely restricting the ability to expend budgeted funds on endorsed projects and would create significant delays in a large value of proposed works, resulting in a high probability of a significant 'Carry Forward' at the end of the financial year.

The percentage increase from the previous tender awarded in 2005, based on a unit rate from Year One for 100mm thick in-situ concrete footpath, crossovers and aprons (total works) is 37%. Based on Year 3 of that contract the increase difference is 25%.
The tender was assigned to new owners in 2007 and in 2008 the contractor was placed in receivership. It should be noted that the structural strength required in 2005 was 25MPA, this is now a 32MPA strength rating which increases the cost by 5-10%. The tendered rate offers a 22% saving on current open market prices.

## STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

<u>Strategic Management Implications</u>

This report is consistent with the City's Plan for the future and in particular the Community Plan Priorities, where

**C09/6025 – CONSTRUCTION OF IN-SITU CONCRETE FOOTPATHS (CO08/09)**
**(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

"Facilitate sustainable transport Options – to meet the changing population growth in the City of Melville that requires different formes of transport networks including bus, cycle and pedestrian routes……to connect the community".

Risk Management Implications

The appointment of one single supplier for the works could pose a risk, however the contractor has a demonstrated capacity to supply and adequate resources and the inability to provide services is considered unlikely.

The City has used this contractor for footpath works in the past and their quality, capability and resources have all proved significant reducing the level of perceived risk in appointing a single contractor.

## POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Procurement of Goods and Services through Direct Purchasing and Public Tendering Policy 13-PL-005.

## ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable

## CONCLUSION

The tender will be sent to Council for consideration as the value of the tender exceeds the level of $500,000 , delegated to the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit.

It is the opinion of the Evaluation Panel that the tender for the Construction of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths be awarded to Dowsing Concrete based on the Evaluation Report prepared by WALGA and the City's own scrutiny. Dowsing Concrete demonstrates relevant experience, adequate resources and competitive pricing.

**EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION (6025) (CO08/09) APPROVAL**

**That the tender submitted by CQ & JM Dowsing Pty Ltd as Trustee for the Dowsing Family Trust, trading as Dowsing Concrete for the Construction of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths and for a three year period for the Schedule of Rates as specified, exclusive of GST, be accepted as the most advantageous.**

**C09/6025 – CONSTRUCTION OF IN-SITU CONCRETE FOOTPATHS (CO08/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**CONTRACT AND TENDER ADVISORY UNIT RECOMMENDATION & COUNCIL RESOLUTION (6025) (CO08/09)**

**APPROVAL**

**That the tender submitted by CQ & JM Dowsing Pty Ltd as Trustee for the Dowsing Family Trust, trading as Dowsing Concrete for the Construction of In-Situ Concrete Footpaths and for a three year period for the Schedule of Rates as specified , exclusive of GST, be accepted as the most advantageous.**

At 6.38pm the Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

**CARRIED EN BLOC (11/0)**

## C09/6026 – ROAD MAINTENANCE PROGRAM 2009-2012 (CO23/08) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ward | : | All |
| Category | : | Operational |
| Subject Index | : | Tenders |
| Customer Index | : | City of Melville |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items | : | Not Applicable |
| Works Programme | : | Not Applicable |
| Funding | : | 2009/2010 Budget |
| Responsible Officer | : | Leigh Bosworth<br>Manager Operations Services |

### AUTHORITY / DISCRETION

| | | Definition |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ | Advocacy | *when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.* |
| ☒ | **Executive** | ***the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.*** |
| ☐ | Legislative | *includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes & policies.* |
| ☐ | Review | *when Council review decisions made by Officers.* |
| ☐ | Quasi-Judicial | *when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.* |

## C09/6026 – ROAD MAINTENANCE PROGRAM 2009-2012 (CO23/08) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

### KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY

- To recommend acceptance of a panel supply tender for the Road Maintenance Program 2009-2012.

### BACKGROUND

Tenders for the Road Maintenance Program were invited by advertisement in the West Australian on Wednesday 14 October 2009, closing at 4.00 pm on Thursday 29 October 2009.

The intention of this tender is for a panel of contractors to be utilised for the purposes of Road Resurfacing Projects. Tenderers were given the opportunity to tender on only those parts that suited their capability or the entire works.

#### Price Schedule

The Price Schedule was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on Thursday 19 November 2009 under confidential cover and distributed to Elected Members on Friday 20 November 2009 under confidential cover.

#### Tender Evaluation Process

All tenders were evaluated using a non-price weighted attribute method and were assigned a percentage score out of 100. The tenderers who achieved the highest score have been recommended.

The Evaluation Sheet was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on Thursday 19 November 2009 under confidential cover and distributed to Elected Members on Friday 20 November 2009 under confidential cover.

The Evaluation Committee consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the Manager Operations and the Senior Design Engineer.

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes.

1. Demonstrated Capacity and Experience
2. Key Personnel and Subcontractors
3. Performance

**C09/6026 – ROAD MAINTENANCE PROGRAM 2009-2012 (CO23/08) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**DETAIL**

32 sets of tender documents were issued and 7 submissions were received as follows:

Nextside Pty Ltd (Nextside)
Omega Asphalt Pty Ltd ATF The Omega Asphalt UT (Omega)
Roads 2000 Pty Ltd (Roads 2000)
Roads 2000 Pty Ltd (Non –Conforming)
Boral Resources (WA) Ltd (Boral)
Asphalt Services Pty Ltd (Asphalt Services)
Downer EDI Works Pty Ltd (Downer)

All submissions were considered compliant, with varying degrees of qualitative criteria being provided. All submissions were evaluated accordingly.

Nextside's submission was for the Construction of In-Situ Concrete Footway, Profile Asphalt Lips at Crossovers and Drainage Structures only. Due to contractual agreements the owner has been unable to work in the Metropolitan area for the last 2 years and has therefore been working in rural areas. Nextside is a small business with minimal staff and resources identified, and whilst the contractor has demonstrated relevant experience, the number of personnel available to carry out the works appears insufficient for the requirements of the project. Minimal information regarding OHS and Incident reporting was supplied. Scoring achieved was 45.04%.

Omega's business structure is made up of a small number of experienced management personnel who have gained experience from previous employment within medium to large corporations. No detail regarding staff performing the actual works was provided and it would appear from the submission that Omega operate as a project management team whilst sub-contracting the supply of asphalt to Downer EDI Works. Whilst Omega appear to have experience from significant projects, the role that was played and the scope of the works was unclear. Concern was raised over delivery ability with potential conflict over being able to provide services for the City, seeking major contracts elsewhere and relying on subcontractors to perform the works. No financial detail or current capacity of works was provided. Scoring achieved was 48.69%.

Roads 2000 (Conforming) demonstrated sound relevant experience and sufficient resources to carry out the works. Information regarding the current capacity of the asphalt plant owned by Roads 2000 showed as 50% committed capacity. Detail regarding Incident reporting was provided. Asphalt personnel were sufficient with relevant experience and capabilities. Detailed subcontractor information was provided and demonstrated a sound history with the business. Scoring achieved was 69.88%.

**C09/6026 – ROAD MAINTENANCE PROGRAM 2009-2012 (CO23/08) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Roads 2000 (Non-Conforming) provided the same detail as in the Conforming Tender however an option for price linking to changes in the price of oil, using a standard practice formula was included. Prices across each year appeared marginally lower using this formula, however there is a perceived risk in relating pricing to future oil prices due to it being difficult to control and administer. Scoring achieved was 58.48%.

Boral Resources' submission and covering letter highlighted this company's skills, experience and capabilities well. They have stated financial capacity and demonstrated resources. Significant plant was identified along with their own asphalt production plant. Key personnel are experienced with a range of subcontractors nominated. Boral Resources have been the incumbent contractor for the past 3 years for this position, and over the past 6 months they have been working with the COM representatives to implement improvements to their project management. Scoring achieved was 80.19%.

Asphalt Services submission outlined good methodology and sound management systems including OHS. Relevant experience was good with considerable expertise at a managerial level. Capabilities of ground crews were not as detailed in the submission so further information was requested and were provided by the contractor to the satisfaction of the City. It is noted that this company only uses its own crews which is seen as beneficial. Subcontractor details were provided. Scoring achieved was 73.50%.

Downer EDI's submission was detailed and comprehensive. All criteria were met and good detail relating to relevant experience, and the actual scope of works was included. Downer EDI has significant financial resources along with plant and equipment. Methodology was included along with value added capabilities. Well detailed information regarding communication with stakeholders was provided. Management systems are very good with well documented OHS details. Scoring achieved was 92.21%.

After evaluating qualitative criteria the panel then discussed the prices submitted by all companies and have assessed the following 3 as presenting the best value to Council:

Boral Resources (WA) Ltd (Boral)
Asphalt Services Pty Ltd (Asphalt Services)
Downer EDI Works Pty Ltd (Downer EDI)

Reference checks were then conducted and all returned positive comments with no major issues having arisen. One consistent comment across all referees was the importance of on-site project supervision to ensure good communication and understanding of the works to the contractors supervisors and to ensure prompt rectification if there were any issues.

It is recommended that rates provided for the supply of in-situ concrete footpath be excluded from the award as a more competitive rate (up to 35% lower) can be achieved by the utilisation of the In-Situ Concrete Tender contractor for these works.

## C09/6026 – ROAD MAINTENANCE PROGRAM 2009-2012 (CO23/08) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

### PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Not applicable

### CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS

Not applicable

### STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 states "A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services".

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The contractor costs for the implementation of the Capital Works Programme are included within the Technical Service Operations Management Budget
452-84550-7126-000.

Services from this tenderer will be utilised across a series of partially State and Federal funded projects including MRRG, State and National 'Black Spot' and Roads to Recovery. For the FY09/10 there is an expected expenditure of $4.6m (including funding) and this is allocated across a series of Capital accounts in the Technical Service Operations Management Budget, 410 codes.

The provision of concrete paths has been excluded from the approval for this tender as the rates received in the submissions were an average of 35% greater than similar rates available via the specific Concrete Path tender/contract. The replacement of concrete paths in support of the Road Resurfacing Program has an approximate value of $200,000.00 per year.

Price comparison sampled from an awarded contractor from Year One (2006-2007) of the previous tender, for SMA10 Asphalt (0-300m$^2$) shows a 63% increase to those tendered by the same contractor currently. This increase is reasonably proportionate to increases experienced in asphalt costs over that period of time. Based on Year Three (2008-2009) it shows a 48% increase. It should be noted however, that the percentage increase to the lowest price tenderer on the recommended panel shows only a 43% increase from Year One.

**C09/6026 – ROAD MAINTENANCE PROGRAM 2009-2012 (CO23/08) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

## STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Strategic Management Implications

This report is consistent with the City's Plan for the future and in particular the Community Plan Priorities, where

"Facilitate sustainable transport Options – to meet the changing population growth in the City of Melville that requires different formes of transport networks including bus, cycle and pedestrian routes……to connect the community".

Risk Management Implications

The appointment of a panel supply arrangement will provide the City with a low risk scenario, with all the nominated companies demonstrating sound business systems and adequate financial resources to provide the services.

The selection of a panel supply is the preferred option as it allows the City of Melville to use a more targeted approach by concurrently utilising multiple contractors across multiple projects, allowing a larger concentration of works during the dryer months, not possible with a single contractor. Furthermore, this also provides the City of Melville with a greater ability to react quickly should more funds become available from State or Federal sources to complete unplanned works.

Failure to appoint a contractor would create a significant risk in terms of severely restricting the ability to complete the endorsed projects and would create significant delays in a large value of proposed works. These would inturn lead to significant carry forwards being experienced for the 09/10 FY and contribute to a further degradation of the overall road and transport networks.

## POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Procurement of Goods and Services through Direct Purchasing and Public Tendering Policy 13-PL-005.

## ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable

**C09/6026 – ROAD MAINTENANCE PROGRAM 2009-2012 (CO23/08) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**CONCLUSION**

The Council is required to consider this tender and the recommendation from the Contract & Tender Advisory Unit because the value of the contract exceeds the $500,000 limit delegated to the Unit. It is the opinion of the Evaluation Panel that the tender for the Road Maintenance Program 2009-2012 be awarded to:

Boral Resources (WA) Ltd
Asphalt Services Pty Ltd
Downer EDI Works Pty Ltd

These companies demonstrate relevant experience, sufficient financial resources, experienced staff along with representing the best value for money.

**EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION (6026) (CO23/08) APPROVAL**

**That the tenders submitted by Boral Resources (WA) Ltd, Asphalt Services Pty Ltd and Downer EDI Works Pty Ltd for the Road Maintenance Program 2009-2012 for specified Schedule of Rates and excluding In-Situ Footpaths exclusive of GST be accepted as the most advantageous.**

**CONTRACTS AND TENDER ADVISORY UNIT RECOMMENDATION & COUNCIL RESOLUTION (6026) (CO23/08) APPROVAL**

**That the tenders submitted by Boral Resources (WA) Ltd, Asphalt Services Pty Ltd and Downer EDI Works Pty Ltd for the Road Maintenance Program 2009-2012 for specified Schedule of Rates and excluding In-Situ Footpaths exclusive of GST be accepted as the most advantageous.**

At 6.38pm the Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

**CARRIED EN BLOC (11/0)**

## C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ward | : | All |
| Category | : | Operational |
| Subject Index | : | Tenders |
| Customer Index | : | City of Melville |
| Disclosure of any Interest | : | No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter. |
| Previous Items | : | Not Applicable |
| Works Programme | : | Not Applicable |
| Funding | : | 2009/2010 Budget |
| Responsible Officer | : | Leigh Bosworth<br>Manager Operations Services |

### AUTHORITY / DISCRETION

| | | Definition |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ | Advocacy | *when Council advocates on its own behalf or on behalf of its community to another level of government/body/agency.* |
| ☒ | **Executive** | ***the substantial direction setting and oversight role of the Council. e.g. adopting plans and reports, accepting tenders, directing operations, setting and amending budgets.*** |
| ☐ | Legislative | *includes adopting local laws, town planning schemes & policies.* |
| ☐ | Review | *when Council review decisions made by Officers.* |
| ☐ | Quasi-Judicial | *when Council determines an application/matter that directly affects a person's right and interests. The judicial character arises from the obligation to abide by the principles of natural justice. Examples of Quasi-Judicial authority include town planning applications, building licences, applications for other permits/licences (eg under Health Act, Dog Act or Local Laws) and other decisions that may be appealable to the State Administrative Tribunal.* |

## C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

### KEY ISSUES / SUMMARY

- To recommend acceptance of a contract for the supply of 5 side-loading waste trucks and operating lease.

### BACKGROUND

Tenders were called through WALGA's Preferred Supply Contracts for Trucks and Associated Equipment Contract Number TPS 0815 and Operating Lease Services Contract Number T0701 for the supply of 5 side-loading waste trucks and for a financial operating lease with the City taking responsibility for maintenance.

The vehicles are to be used in the City's domestic waste collection service.

| *Plant #* | *Make* | *Model* | *Purchase Date* | *Engine Hours* | *Optimum Replacement* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38501 | Isuzu | F VY1400 | 2001 | 13200 | *8,000hrs/5yrs* |
| 38001 | Isuzu | F VY1400 | 2001 | 13850 | |
| 38904 | Isuzu | F VY1400 | 2004 | 9300 | |
| 39303 | Isuzu | F VY1400 | 2003 | 10650 | |
| 38904 | Isuzu | F VY1400 | 2004 | 8973 | |

All 5 vehicles have exceeded their optimum replacement point of 5 years or 8,000 hours and should to be replaced immediately.

#### Price Schedule

The Price Schedule forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on 19 November 2009 under confidential cover and also to the Elected Members on Friday 20 November under confidential cover.

#### Tender Evaluation Process

Each offer was assessed using the following selection criteria and weightings:

| Criteria | Weighting |
|---|---|
| WOL Costs | 40% |
| Operational Assessment | 20% |
| Mechanical Assessment | 20% |
| Environmental Assessment | 10% |
| Warranty & Service support | 10% |

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Note: All criteria are scored out of 5 for each tenderer.

**Whole of Life Cost (WOL)**

The Whole of Life Cost consists of the cost of owning and operating the vehicle for the determined period of ownership. For these vehicles the parameters for whole of life cost determination are 8,000hrs/8years.

Whole of life costs were calculated using the spreadsheet template in the Fleet Consultant's UniWeb facility with the following input data:

- Purchase cost
- Repairs and Maintenance
- Tyres
- Fuel cost and consumption
- Fleet Management Cost
- Insurance and licence

The lowest total cost item receives a score of 5. The remaining tendered items receive a percentage out of 5.

Scores are rated as follows.

| Assessment Rating | Score |
|---|---|
| Excellent | 5 |
| Above Average | 4 |
| Average | 3 |
| Below average | 2 |
| Poor | 1 |

**Operational Requirements**

This was undertaken by a group of current waste drivers and was scored by assessing similar models as the tendered trucks and completing a score card. Score cards were completed for each vehicle and scores averaged across the cards.

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The following criteria were assessed:

- Vehicle Capability to perform waste collection tasks
- Daily checks oil, water, greasing etc
- Operation of bin lifter grab and controls
- Turning circle
- Compaction ability
- Steering position (left hand seat)
- Visibility of the grab from the driving position
- Controls (indicators, brake, gear shift)
- Entry and exit from the cab
- Occupational Health and Safety

**Technical Specification (Mechanical Assessment)**

The mechanical assessment was undertaken by the mechanics and scored by assessing similar models as the proposed trucks and completing a score card. Score cards were completed for each vehicle and scores averaged across the cards.

The following criteria were assessed:

- Weekly safety checks – brake wear, air cleaner, greasing requirements
- Flat Rate
- Tyres and rim also spare
- Loader arm – access for maintenance
- Electronics
- Oil and Fuel filter frequency of change
- Parts support

**Environmental Assessment**

The environmental assessment was conducted by the City's fleet consultant Uniqco. Criteria were assessed with a score out of 5.

The following criteria were assessed:

- Fuel consumption
- % Biodiesel compatible
- Recycle parts
- Emissions ADR80/02

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Warranty Service Support**

The Warranty Service Support Assessment was conducted by the City's Fleet Consultant, Uniqco.

The following criteria were assessed with a score out of 5.

- Local service support
- Warranty
- Service training for Melville staff

The Evaluation Sheet forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit on 13 November 2009 under confidential cover and also to the Elected Members on Friday 20 November 2009 under confidential cover.

The Evaluation Committee consisted of Uniqco Fleet Consultants, Manager Operations, Fleet Coordinator and Workshop Supervisor.

**DETAIL**

On 17 August 2009, Vehicle Specifications were issued to WALGA from the City requesting quotes from their preferred supplier panel under the WALGA Contract No: TPS 0815. WALGA issued the final quotes to the City on 7 September 2009. The City then completed a series of detailed operational and mechanical whole of life assessments against each tender offer.

The following units were offered.

| Supplier | Make | Model |
|---|---|---|
| Major Motors | Isuzu | FVY1400 C/W MJD Body |
| Purcher International | Iveco | F2350G/260 C/W Superior Pak |
| Purcher International | Iveco | F2350G/260 C/W MJD Body |
| Skippers | Iveco | F2350G/260 C/W MJD Body |

The trucks to be replaced will be sold at auction, with received funds being returned to Fleet and Plant Replacement Reserve.

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The submissions were firstly assessed in terms of compliance with the general conditions of contract and the tender specification. All tender submissions were compliant.

**Panel Discussion and Conclusion**

Generally the submission with the highest score is recommended subject to meeting compliance requirements. However, given the scores were close between the two highest scoring submissions, the panel conducted a further review.

It was considered that all 4 tenderers meet the minimum requirements, as they all met the compulsory criteria. Once a ranking of the tenderers was completed by the assessment panel of the criteria, each of the tenderers was compared 1 to 1 on a 'value for money' basis. In this stage of review, the evaluation panel looked at the strengths and weaknesses of the each of the tender submissions and compared.

An in-depth comparison of the individual scoring components of each submission was undertaken to determine exactly which areas an individual submission was higher or lower ranked than another to review how the overall scores related, (i.e. within the Operational Assessment, a significantly superior bin control unit may be valued higher than access in to and out of the cab).

The vehicle achieving the best result in the 'Value for Money' criteria is agreed as the preferred and recommended tenderer.

**Comparing the 2 Purcher International Offers**

| | |
|---|---|
| Purcher International Chassis with Superior Body | 81.40 |
| Purcher International Chassis with MacDonald Johnson Body | 83.43 |

Both of these submissions were for the same truck chassis and components with a differing waste compactor body installed. The net scores were very similar, with the superior body scoring higher on the Whole of Life Assessment and the MacDonald Johnson body scoring higher on the Operational and Technical Assessments.

The whole of life costing for the Superior body was 5% lower than that of Macdonald body, which equates to a difference of $4.81 per hour when comparing the hourly charges: $90.08 (Superior) verses $94.89 MacDonald. This difference in whole of life costing is mainly attributed to the purchased price difference with the Superior body being 4.8% cheaper than the MacDonald body.

Taken in context of a proposed lease arrangement this correlates to an increased monthly lease charge of $5,859 for the Superior body verses $6,015 for the MacDonald body (a 2.5% difference).

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Within the Operational Assessment, the MacDonald Johnston compactor body ranked higher in 7 assessment criteria and equal in 6 out of the thirteen criteria. The evaluation panel felt that the 7 higher criteria were significant as they included items such as grab controls, compaction ability, noise and operator comfort, all of which are considered as critical in both the operation and safety of our drivers. It was also noted that there was no part of the Operational Assessment in which the superior body outscored the MacDonald Johnson body.

Within the Technical (mechanical) Assessment, the MacDonald body scored higher on 2 and equal on the 4 criteria assessed. The evaluation panel agreed that higher score awarded to the MacDonald body on the ease of maintenance was a significant factor as the City is placing a greater emphasis on driver inspections and preventative maintenance and it was believed that in making this easier for the drivers it would help support this change in behaviour.

Across all criteria the evaluation panel believe that the significant operational and technical advantages offered by the MacDonald body greatly outweigh the greater whole of life costing. This was further reinforced when viewed in the recommended lease context where the cost impacts of choosing the MacDonald body is a 2.5% increase in monthly hire charges.

The Panel recommends that the Purcher International Chassis with MacDonald body should progress in the assessment.

**Comparing the Purcher MacDonald and Skipper Trucks Offers**

| | |
|---|---|
| Purcher International Chassis with MacDonald Johnson body | 83.43 |
| Skippers International Chassis with MacDonald Johnson body | 87.37 |

Both of these submissions where for the same chassis and body configuration, being an international chassis with a MacDonald compaction body. There is a discernable difference in the scoring between the 2 trucks with this being primarily based upon the large difference awarded in the Warranty and Service Support Criteria. The Purcher truck has a marginally better whole of life score and both trucks were evaluated as even across the Technical, Operational and Environmental.

The Whole of Life score for the Purcher supplied truck (37.91) is only marginally better than the Skipper truck (37.85), with calculated hourly charges of $94.89 (Purcher) verses $94.56 (Skippers). This lower running rate was due to the availability of local service and parts and compensated for the more expensive purchase costs. The slight score difference in the Whole of Life Criteria demonstrates the small difference in purchase price afforded to the Purcher supplied vehicle. This is further reinforced with the minor difference in monthly lease payments, $6,015 (Purcher) vs $6,081 (Skippers), a less than 1% difference.

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Across the Operational, Technical and Environmental Criteria, the vehicles were scored the same; however the trucks scored significantly different on the Warranty Service Support Criteria.

The Skippers supplied truck scored better (10) as Skippers is locally based and has the capacity, experience and service to provide an expected high quality of service and spare part availability to the City.

The Purcher supplied truck scored a 6 which was due to the Panel believing that Purcher do not have a significant support network within Perth. The evaluation panel held concerns that the availability of parts and/or response to warranty claims may be slower as the company is coordinated from Geraldton, Western Australia.

It was identified that within the Waste Business, the warranty service support is critical in minimising costly downtime particularly with domestic waste collection where any significant delay would result in a reduction of service to our residents.

It was however accepted that the trucks were the same and ultimately parts would be readily accessible if urgently required, however fears of voiding supplier warranty arrangements and the supplier support were seen as significant issues.

Across all criteria, the Evaluation Panel felt the only difference between suppliers was their ability for warranty service support. The evaluation panel agreed that there was a significantly lower risk in this area afforded by the local Skippers supplier and as such felt that this was the stronger of the two tenders. Given the potential issues arising from any potential delay in warranty service support, it was felt that this took precedence over a minor, less than 1%, cost increase for monthly rental.

The Panel recommends that the Skipper Internal with MacDonald body should progress in the assessment.

**Comparing the Skipper Trucks and Major Motors Offers**

| | |
|---|---|
| Skippers International Chassis + MacDonald Johnson body | 87.37 |
| Major Motors Isuzu Chassis + MacDonald Johnson body | 87.97 |

Both of these submissions include the MacDonald Johnson body and differing chassis. The submission from Skippers utilises the International chassis whereas the Major Motors submission utilises the Isuzu chassis. Across the 5 Assessment Criteria, Skippers International scored higher in the Whole of Life and Operational Criteria and equal in the Warranty and Environment Criteria with Major Motors Isuzu scoring higher in the Technical Criteria.

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The Whole of Life scores were 35.65 for the Isuzu as compared to 37.85 for the International. This relates to an hourly rate comparison of $97.22 for the Isuzu and $94.56 for the International. There is a significant difference in prices with Isuzu being the higher by 3.9% which, when combined with the running costs, made International the clear preference.

The Technical Assessment by the mechanics favoured the Isuzu trucks with a score of 20 as compared to the International score of 16. The Isuzu scored higher than the International across all 5 criteria, scoring a maximum of 5 for each in comparison to the International scoring 4 across each of the criteria.

In the Operational Assessment however, the International out scored the Isuzu 17.52 to 16.32. This related to scoring better in 5, equalling in 7 and scoring lower in 1 of the thirteen criteria of the Operational Assessment.

The Evaluation Panel believed that preference in the vital operation of bin and controls, turning circle, steering position, and controls were all significant factors of preference for the International truck.

The one area in which the Isuzu was rated better was for entry and exit of the truck, and whilst a key safety point, was seen as lower in priority given the infrequency of a driver entering and exiting the cabin. Also given that a large percentage of the current fleet are International chassis, this lower score was not seen as a significant factor as currently all drivers enter and exit safely from the trucks. In the Environment and Warranty criteria the 2 trucks were scored equally.

The Evaluation Panel identified that the Isuzu truck scored higher in the overall assessment than the International truck. However, the panel noted that there was a significant cost disparity between the two vehicles, and whilst the Isuzu was scored better in the Technical area, the panel felt that minor technical benefits, in comparison to the International, did not justify the significant cost increase associated with the Isuzu vehicle. The Panel also noted that the International chassis outscored the Isuzu in the Operational area.

The Evaluation Panel agreed that based on the above assessment review that the International Iveco Acco 23506 x 4 dual control with the MacDonald Johnson compaction unit as supplied by Skippers Trucks provided the City of Melville with the best value for money.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not Applicable

## C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)

### CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES / CONSULTANTS

Not applicable

### STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 states, "A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services".

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The purchase of the proposed 5 x side loading waste trucks is included on the City of Melville's 10 year replacement plan but was not included for funding in the 2009/10 Capital budget. These items were excluded at the time of budget development as it was identified that the significant purchase price of these 5 trucks would be restricted due to the current reduced Fleet and Plant Reserve balance, and would create a major impost on cash flow. If the City were to purchase the vehicles outright, the Capital Funds needed would have to be taken from other projects.

The identified lease arrangement provides a financial capability to lease the trucks at what are calculated as similar cost to ownership without the initial capital outlay.

Currently capital cost are recovered via an operational charge paid by the Service Area, in the case of leasing, the recovery of the capital component would instead be used to pay the lease fees.

The proposal to lease the vehicles rather than borrow and purchase is seen as a lower risk as the risk associated with any potential resale value is borne by the Lessor rather than City, as the lease agreement is an 'Operating Lease' and includes an assumption on the resale price of the vehicle.

The Evaluation Panel recommends that 5 International (Iveco) Acco 2350, 6 x 4 dual control with the MacDonald Johnson Compaction Unit as tendered by Skippers Trucks are purchased though a commercial operating lease via SG Fleet for an annual rental cost of $364,863.00 per annum on a 5 year (60 month) Operating Lease, at a total cost of $1,824,315.00 for the life of the asset.

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

## STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

This report is consistent with the City's Corporate Plan's Key Result Area of Environment including the provision of Waste Management Services. It is also consistent with the Strategic Waste Management Plan developed in association with the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council.

Risk Management Implications

The replacement of the 5 existing waste trucks will help ensure that the City of Melville is able to continue to provide efficient and safe waste collection services to the City of Melville residents.

Should Council decide not to replace the existing waste trucks, there will be increased maintenance cost as the waste trucks will be subject to "wear and tear" and increased mechanical failures. This can also have a detrimental impact on service delivery.

Should council decide to purchase new waste trucks, there is no guarantee that the price of $70,000 could be achieved at auction when these trucks reach the end of their useful life.

## POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Procurement of goods and services through Direct Purchasing and Public Tendering Policy: 13-PL-005.

Asset Financing & Borrowings Policy: 13-006 states under the heading Borrowing Term that:

"Should the City decide to borrow funds, the term of the borrowing shall generally not be greater than half of the Economic Life of the asset being acquired or constructed. This is to enable the City to use the remaining economic half life to set sufficient funds aside in a sinking or reserve fund in order to renew or replace that asset, should that be required, at the end of its Economic Life.

The City will **not** generally borrow funds (other than by way of Excluded Borrowings) to acquire an asset that has an economic life of less than five (5) years."

## ALTERNATE OPTIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

It is identified that there are 2 possible alternatives to the lease of the identified vehicles:

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

1. Purchase the vehicles as capital items;

2. Extend the life of the current vehicles to beyond their recommend replacement.

The implication of purchasing the vehicles would require the City of Melville to identify $1,643,500 from either current funds and/or borrow all or part of the funds required.

Given the current level of the Fleet and Plant Replacement Reserve there are insufficient funds to allow for a purchase without having an impact on the Capital Budget. Borrowing part or all of the funds would then expose the City of Melville to additional interest payments for the life of the loan.

The implication of extending the life of the current trucks will result in a significant increase in maintenance requirements, a lowering of productivity of current waste collection personnel and provide a possible increased environmental risk.

**CONCLUSION**

The tender will be referred to Council for consideration as the value of the contract over the term exceeds the amount of $500,000 which is delegated to the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit.

The evaluation panel recommends that 5 International (Iveco) Acco 2350, 6 x 4 dual control with the MacDonald Johnson compaction unit as tendered by Skippers Trucks are purchased though a commercial operating lease via SG Fleet for an annual rental cost of $364,863 per annum on a 5 year (60 month) Operating lease at a total cost of $1,824,315 for the life of the asset.

**EVALUATION PANEL RECOMMENDATION (6027) (CO06/09) APPROVAL**

1. **That the submission by Skippers Trucks Pty Ltd T/As Skipper Trucks for 5 International (Iveco) Acco 2350, 6 x 4 dual control with MacDonald Johnson compaction units be purchased through a commercial operating lease through SG Fleet Australia Pty Ltd trading as SG Fleet Australia for an annual rental cost of $364,863.00 per annum on a 5 year (60 month) non-maintenance Operating Lease at a total cost of $1,824,315.00 for the life of the asset, exclusive of GST, be accepted as the most advantageous.**

2. **That the 5 existing trucks as identified in the Capital Replacement Program be sold at auction with the funds being placed into the Fleet and Plant Reserves.**

**C09/6027 – SUPPLY OF 5 SIDE-LOADING WASTE TRUCKS AND OPERATING LEASE (CO06/09) (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**CONTRACTS AND TENDER ADVISORY UNIT RECOMMENDATION & COUNCIL RESOLUTION (6027) (CO06/09)**

**APPROVAL**

**1. That the submission by Skippers Trucks Pty Ltd T/As Skipper Trucks for 5 International (Iveco) Acco 2350, 6 x 4 dual control with MacDonald Johnson compaction units be purchased through a commercial operating lease through SG Fleet Australia Pty Ltd trading as SG Fleet Australia for an annual rental cost of $364,863.00 per annum on a 5 year (60 month) non-maintenance Operating Lease at a total cost of $1,824,315.00 for the life of the asset, exclusive of GST, be accepted as the most advantageous.**

**2. That the 5 existing trucks as identified in the Capital Replacement Program be sold at auction with the funds being placed into the Fleet and Plant Replacement Reserves.**

At 6.38pm the Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

**CARRIED EN BLOC (11/0)**

## 11. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

## 12. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF THE COUNCIL

Nil.

## 13. EN BLOC ITEMS

At 6.39pm Cr Robartson moved, seconded Cr Subramaniam -

**That the recommendations for items C09/6025, C09/6026 and C09/6027 be carried En Bloc.**

At 6.39pm the Mayor submitted the motion which was declared

**CARRIED (11/0)**

## 14. CLOSURE

There being no further business to discuss His Worship the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 6.39pm.