

CONTENTS

1.	APOLOGIES & REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCES	4
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES & ATTACHMENTS.....	5
3.	CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS.....	5
4.	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	6
5.	RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY DECISIONS.....	7
6.	PLANNING AUTHORITY DECISIONS.....	8
7.	COUNCIL DECISIONS.....	9
7.1.	Community Engagement Framework	9
7.2.	Rochester Flood Management Plan (RFMP) Feasibility Report - Mitigation Options	12
7.3.	Audit and Risk Committee Charter	19
7.4.	Quarterly Financial Statements	22
8.	COUNCIL INFORMATION	25
8.1.	Open Assembly of Councillors Records	25
8.2.	Letters of Appreciation.....	29
8.3.	Petition – Removal of Parking Bays in Fenaughty Street, Kyabram.....	30
8.4.	Internal Audit Committee Meeting Minutes.....	35
9.	COUNCILLOR REPORTS.....	38
10.	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT.....	40
11.	PETITIONS/LETTERS.....	41
12.	NOTICES OF MOTION	41
13.	URGENT BUSINESS	41
14.	QUESTION TIME	41
15.	CLOSED SESSION OF THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC	42
16.	CONFIRMATION OF CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES & ATTACHMENTS	42
17.	CONFIDENTIAL COUNCIL INFORMATION	42
17.1.	Confidential Assembly of Councillors Records	42
17.2.	Confidential Communication Reports & Attachments.....	42
18.	CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS	43
19.	CONFIDENTIAL COUNCIL MEETING CLOSE.....	43
20.	ITEMS DETERMINED TO BE NO LONGER CONFIDENTIAL	43
21.	OPEN MEETING TO THE PUBLIC.....	43
22.	CLOSE MEETING	43

Attachments

7.1.	Community Engagement Framework	44
7.2.	Rochester Flood Management Plan (RFMP) Feasibility Report - Mitigation Options	106
7.3.	Audit and Risk Committee Charter	185
7.4.	Quarterly Financial Statements	197
8.3.	Petition – Removal of Parking Bays in Fenaughty Street, Kyabram	205
8.4.	Internal Audit Committee Meeting Minutes	208

AGENDA



For a meeting of the seventh Campaspe Shire Council to be held on Tuesday, 20 February 2018, commencing at 5:00pm at the Echuca Civic Centre.

OPENING PRAYER

We pray to Almighty God that our decisions as a Council be in the best interest of the people, culture and the environment of the Shire of Campaspe.

Amen

The Campaspe Shire Council acknowledges the traditional owners of the land upon which we meet and pay our respect to their elders both past and present.

MEETING PROCEDURES

Please ensure that all electronic devices are turned off or switched to silent.

There are Ask a Question Forms just inside the door for anyone who would like to submit a question to Council. Questions forms must be completed within 10 minutes and returned to the tray. Questions will be addressed at the end of the open section of the meeting.

Council meetings are broadcast live via the internet. During the meeting, members of the public may be recorded, particularly those speaking to an item. By attending this meeting, you are consenting to the possibility that your image may also be broadcast to the public. Any personal and health information voluntarily disclosed by any person at Council meetings may be broadcast live, held by Council and made available to the public for later viewing.

Those people who have requested to speak to an item will be allowed five minutes to address Council. Speakers will be notified with a bell when there is 60 seconds remaining. Speakers must only speak in relation to the subject stated on their application and shall not debate the issue with Councillors and officers. Councillors are able to ask questions of the speaker on points of clarification.

Speakers are advised that they do not enjoy any special protection from defamation arising from comments made during their presentation to Council and should refrain from voicing defamatory remarks or personal defamatory statements against any individual. Speakers will be treated with respect when addressing Council. I ask that the same respect is extended to Councillors and officers.

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES & REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES & ATTACHMENTS

For the:

- Open section of the Council Meeting held on 30 January 2018
- Open section of the Campaspe Briefing Session held on 23 January 2018
- Open section of the Campaspe Briefing Session held on 30 January 2018

Recommendation

That the following minutes be accepted as true and accurate records:

- **The open section of the Council Meeting held on 30 January 2018**
- **The open section of the Campaspe Briefing Session held on 23 January 2018**
- **The open section of the Campaspe Briefing Session held on 30 January 2018**

3. CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

Once an agenda has been prepared and sent to Councillors, the order of business for that meeting may only be altered by resolution of the Council. This includes the request for an item to be brought forward.

4. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Disclosure of Conflict of Interests are to be made immediately prior to any relevant item being discussed.

Local Government Act 1989 Section 79

- (1) If a Councillor or member of a special committee has a conflict of interest in a matter which is to be considered or discussed at a meeting of the Council or the special committee, the Councillor or member must, if he or she is attending the meeting, disclose the conflict of interest in accordance with subsection (2).
- (2) A Councillor or member of a special committee who has a conflict of interest and is attending the meeting of the Council or special committee must make a full disclosure of that interest:
 - (a) by either
 - (i) advising the Council or special committee at the meeting of the details required under paragraphs (b) and (c) immediately before the matter is considered at the meeting; or
 - (ii) advising the Chief Executive Officer in writing of the details required under paragraphs (b) and (c) before the meeting; and
 - (b) classifying the type of interest that has given rise to the conflict as either:
 - (i) a direct interest; or
 - (ii) an indirect interest and specifying the particular kind of indirect interest under section 78, 78A, 78B, 78C, 78D or 78E; and
 - (c) describing the nature of the interest; and
 - (d) if the Councillor or member advised the Chief Executive Officer of the details under paragraph (a)(ii), the Councillor or member must make a disclosure of the class of interest only to the meeting immediately before the matter is considered at the meeting.

5. RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY DECISIONS

Nil

6. PLANNING AUTHORITY DECISIONS

Nil

7. COUNCIL DECISIONS

7.1. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Author:

Sam Campi, Community Engagement Manager

Responsible Manager:

General Manager Economic and Community Development

Attachments:

7.1.1. Council Policy 059 Community Engagement

7.1.2 Community Engagement Framework, (Part A)

7.1.3. Community Engagement Toolkit, (Part B)

1. Purpose

Council to adopt Policy 59 Community Engagement.

Council to ratify the Community Engagement Framework and Toolkit.

2. Recommendation

That Council adopt the reviewed Policy 059 Community Engagement.

3. Conflict of Interest

In accordance with Section 80B of the *Local Government Act 1989*, the officer preparing this report declares no conflict of interest in regards to this matter.

4. Charter of Human Rights

This report has considered and complies with the Human Rights and Responsibilities contained in the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

5. Instrument of Delegation

This report has considered and complies with the Instrument of Sub-Delegation by the Chief Executive Officer in so far as this report is not contrary to the existing policy or strategy previously adopted by Council.

6. Background

In October 2017 Council were presented with an outline of the proposed changes to the management and delivery of Community Engagement. The revised approach seeks to:

- Adopt a Place Based Planning methodology rather than a community development model
- Use the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Framework for the development and implementation of Community Engagement strategies

Supporting the implementation of the revised approach a Framework and Toolkit has been prepared. These will ensure consistency across Council in the application Policy 59.

These changes have been made to ensure

- Council is operating in line with the recommendations outlined by Victorian Auditor General's Office (VAGO) on best practise for Community Engagement in Local Government
 - That we are using the IAP2 platform to develop and implement our community engagement processes
- Council is compliant with the potential changes outlined in the proposed new Local government Act, which focuses on:
 - Engaging with the communities most affected when undertaking engagement
- That we have a clear and effective structure for all Council officers to use when undertaking community engagement

7. Issues and Risk Management

Issues:

Issue 1: Council at risk of not meeting community expectations

Community's expectation of Council is we deliver transparent engagement on all issues. This process ensures our internal structures can provide the community with an suitable level of access that is appropriate to circumstances of the situation.

Issue 2: Council at risk of not meeting VAGO guidelines on Community Engagement

Based upon the data sourced through this project it has been identified as critical that Council adopts a revised process for Community Engagement. With the expectations of VAGO and the soon to be adopted changes to the Local Government Act, these process improvements ensures Council meets the expectations of Government.

Risk:

Risk	Likelihood	Consequence	Rating	Mitigation action
Not implementing this policy and Framework will result in Poorly delivered Community Engagement process	Likely – Uncertain	Moderate to Catastrophic	Moderate to Extreme	Implement the proposed Community Engagement Policy and Framework and Community Engagement team along with EMG to monitor and support consistent application of process

8. Strategic Planning Environments

Strong and Engaged Communities:	<p>The adoption of a revised Policy 059 supports the achievement of:</p> <p>Strategy 1; <i>Foster community partnerships and support other agencies in the delivery of services</i> by improved communication between Council and the Community.</p> <p>Strategy 2: <i>Build Strong, healthy and vibrant communities through innovation and implementing best practise in service delivery for our diverse community</i>, by ensuring our processes for community engagement are fair, transparent and consistent and support Council understand the needs of the community.</p> <p>Strategy 3: <i>Enable residents to be active and engage in their community and support participation in artistic, cultural, sporting and leisure opportunities</i>, again through the transparent Place Based Planning process accompanied by the use of the IAP2 model of engagement.</p>
Resilient Economy:	No Impact
Healthy Environment:	No Impact
Balanced Services and Infrastructure:	No Impact
Responsible Management:	<p>Strategy 1: <i>Consult and Engage with all sectors of the community to determine their priorities and support Council decision making</i>, there is a clear link between the policy and this strategy.</p> <p>Strategy 6: <i>Foster a customer centred approach</i>, this will ensure Council has the formal framework to meet this objective.</p>

9. Consultation

The consultation process was initially directed towards benchmarking Council with the standards set by VAGO and works undertaken in other LGA's such as Shepparton and Bendigo. This was an opportunity to identify best practise methodology.

Internal Consultation process has focused on working with the Council Leadership group to determine current processes and their compliance with VAGO standards, as well as opportunities for improvement.

7.2. ROCHESTER FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLAN (RFMP) FEASIBILITY REPORT - MITIGATION OPTIONS

Author:

Richard Conway, Assets Manager

Attachments:

7.2. Draft Final Feasibility Report – Rochester Flood Mitigation Study January 2017

1. Purpose

To consider the results of the community consultation process and finalise the draft 'Final Feasibility Report – Rochester Flood Mitigation Strategy' (Feasibility Report) (Attachment 7.2) investigating the wider implications of the flood mitigation works recommended in the Rochester Flood Management Plan 2013.

2. Recommendation

That Council:

1. Note:

- a. **Successful implementation of the southern levee and flood warning system as recommended in the Rochester Flood Management Plan 2013;**
- b. **The relatively low benefit cost ratio of less than 0.2 associated with the preferred structural flood mitigation option identified in the Rochester Flood Management Plan 2013 as investigated in the 'Draft Feasibility Report – Rochester Flood Mitigation Strategy' dated September 2017 prepared by Water Technology Pty Ltd;**
- c. **The extensive community consultation process and relatively low level of support for the preferred structural flood mitigation option shown by respondents to the community survey; Rochester Township (support from 35% of respondents) and Eastern (Nanneella) Depression (2%) and those who suffered above floor flooding in 2011 (45%);**
- d. **The views of the Reference Panel comprising representatives from within the Township and along the Eastern Depression that:**
 1. **The preferred mitigation option is not feasible and should not be further pursued; and**
 2. **Efforts should be directed to further developing the flood warning system and flood response programs;**
- e. **None of the other alternatives identified during preparation of the Rochester Flood Management Plan June 2013, the Preliminary Options Assessment Report 2017 or Draft Feasibility Report – Rochester Flood Mitigation Strategy September 2017 are economically feasible; and**
- f. **Investigation of the one new option arising from the consultation process comprising pipelining and removal of the Waranga Western Channel banks between the Campaspe River and High Street to restore the Campaspe river flood plain width shows no benefit to the Rochester urban area**

2. **Having considered the 'Draft Feasibility Report – Rochester Flood Mitigation Strategy' and associated community comment provided through the consultation process, conclude that the preferred structural mitigation option is neither economically feasible nor adequately supported by the community to meet the**

State and Federal capital works funding guidelines for flood mitigation works or to warrant Council funding for it to be implemented;

3. **Determine it is neither feasible, worthwhile nor in the community's overall best interests to proceed with stage 2 of this project to invest funds in preparing functional designs for this infrastructure;**
 4. **Work with the State Emergency Service to assist it further develop the flood warning and response systems and other non-structural flood mitigation measures to continue to grow the Rochester community's resilience to flooding events until such time as a feasible structural mitigation option is identified with a particular focus on:**
 - a. **Installation of flood height markers at strategic locations throughout Rochester;**
 - b. **Installation of floor height level markers on all township dwellings; and**
 - c. **Establishing an evacuation plan which provides for flood-free havens and access routes to them, and locations for supplies of sandbags;**
 5. **The community's requests for improvements to the township and rural drainage systems and consider implementing improvements in conjunction with the infrastructure renewal program and as the opportunity arises; and**
 6. **Thank the members of the Rochester Community Reference panel for their time and efforts in assisting with this study.**
-

3. Conflict of Interest

In accordance with Section 80B of the *Local Government Act 1989*, the officer preparing this report declares no conflict of interest in regards to this matter.

4. Charter of Human Rights

This report has considered and complies with the Human Rights and Responsibilities contained in the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

5. Instrument of Delegation

This report has considered and complies with the Instrument of Sub-Delegation by the Chief Executive Officer in so far as this report is not contrary to the existing policy or strategy previously adopted by Council.

6. Background

The North Central Catchment Management Authority in collaboration with Campaspe Shire completed the Rochester Flood Management Plan 2013 following the 2010-2011 floods. Hydrologists, Water Technology Pty Ltd undertook the study which modelled Campaspe River flood behaviour through Rochester and recommended a preferred mitigation option comprising three elements.

Two of the elements comprising construction of a replacement levee about 5.7km south of Rochester and implementation of a flood warning system including installation of a new river gauge are complete. The Bureau of Meteorology can now issue forecast river heights and associated flood warnings for Rochester Township with up to 24 hours warning.

The third recommended element involved:

- Restoration of breakaway flood flow paths from the Campaspe River to:
-

- an eastern depression that forms the upstream end of the Nanneella Depression, and
- to the second railway bridge 200m north of the main railway bridge on the northern outskirts of Rochester, and
- Construction of a compensatory levee adjacent the eastern depression and a significant levee along the western side of the Campaspe River south of the road bridge. (Refer Attachment 7.2.1 – Works Locality Plan).

The report recommended these works in concept only and recommended further investigations into the impact of these works outside of the Township. For this reason, Council scoped a strategic project to understand the full implications of this concept rather than implement works. Water Technology undertook this strategic project as an extension of the original Rochester Flood Management Plan. A community reference panel with members selected from Rochester Township and affected downstream rural areas provided guidance.

The community consultation program following Council approval to release the draft Feasibility Report in October 2017 is now complete and covered by this report.

7. Draft Feasibility Report

Overview

Stage 1 of the Feasibility Report was to review several options the community believed had not been adequately considered in the original Rochester Flood Management Plan. These options included construction of a dedicated flood mitigation storage upstream of Rochester, installing vegetation upstream of Rochester to attenuate the flow, widening of the bridges and retro-fitting flood protection to existing buildings by raising or flood proofing them. Investigations demonstrated that none of these options provided a viable alternative to that recommended in the Rochester Flood Management Plan.

Stage 2 involved investigating the recommended option's downstream impacts on lands to the east of Rochester. These investigations included ways to protect downstream properties in an effort to improve the feasibility of the third recommendation of the original Rochester Flood Management Plan. The report concluded by identifying the best option and associated revised costs and benefits of its implementation. It deliberately did not recommend the works proceed or be abandoned as this should not be considered until the views of the community affected by the works were known.

Summary of draft Feasibility Report Conclusions

In summary, the report:

1. Outlines investigations into the additional 'community' options comprising construction of a dedicated flood mitigation storage upstream of Rochester, installing vegetation upstream of Rochester to attenuate the flow, widening of the bridges and retro-fitting flood protection to existing buildings by raising or flood proofing them. All except the flood proofing of buildings were shown to make negligible difference or in one case exacerbating flooding in the western side of Rochester.
2. Compares the most feasible of these 'community' options comprising flood proofing of existing buildings with the other recommended option. Flood protecting individual buildings against a 1% AEP event would cost of the order of \$12.3 million and result in an annual average damages reduction of \$150,000. The damage bill still remains high as most of the damage costs relate to house curtilages, outbuildings and public infrastructure that would remain unprotected. Its feasibility falls well short of that offered by the recommended option of diverting flows to the east which only required a \$1.8 million investment to generate almost the same damages reduction.
3. Investigates the impact of diverting flows along the eastern flow path (Nanneella Depression) in its present state. Water levels generally increase by 130mm in a 1% AEP event increasing the number of properties flooded from 12 to 29 (i.e. from 3 to 12 above floor). Fifty-three would remain flood free. Four of those flooded above floor level were previously flood free.

4. Examines four scenarios for mitigating flooding to the east of Rochester as a result reinstating the eastern flow path including the combined impact of 1% ARI stormflows from the hills to the south. It concluded that even a 1% AEP storm would make less than 20mm difference in flood levels and marginally speed up water reaching peak levels along the eastern depression by 1-2 hours. It concluded riverine breakouts to be the dominant cause of flooding.
5. Identifies a preferred combination of actions considered to provide the best option for detailed assessment. That option comprises the four elements making up the original recommended option (i.e. western levee, minor eastern levee and lowering the eastern river bank to engage the Nanneella depression and possibly the second railway bridge), construction of the recommended Ramsay Street drain, construction of 6 levees near the eastern drainage line, 15 individual ring levees around rural dwellings and increased culvert capacities at 5 locations (Pasco Street, Heathcote-Rochester Road, 2 under Kyabram-Rochester Road and Echuca-Nanneella Road) with an estimated capital cost of \$7.12 million.
6. Within the Rochester Township, this preferred option is assessed as:
 - 6.1. Significantly reducing flooding within the western area of Rochester Township by up to 500mm in a 1% AEP event;
 - 6.2. Generally reducing flooding by 30-50mm on the eastern side north of Bridge Street in a 1% AEP event;
 - 6.3. Slightly increasing flooding by 40mm at the southern end of High Street in a 1% AEP event; and
 - 6.4. Significantly reducing flooding in all events above a 5% AEP event.

The following table summarises the effects of this option in the Study Area.

Event	Properties Flooded Above Floor	
	Existing	Mitigated
1% AEP Event	335	172
2% AEP Event	207	106
5% AEP Event	50	17

7. Along the Nanneella Depression and area to the east of Rochester, this option is assessed as:
 - 7.1. Engaging the eastern drainage line more frequently (5% AEP events c.f. 2% events now).
 - 7.2. Increasing flows across the Waranga Western crossing by factors of 2.5 in a 1% AEP event and 14.5 in a 2% AEP event.
 - 7.3. Accelerating the commencement of flooding by 8 hours for a 1% AEP event and 12 hours for a 2%AEP event.
 - 7.4. Increasing the duration of flooding (at least 24 hours for 1% AEP event).
 - 7.5. Increasing the areal extent of flooding and depth of flooding for all events in which the depression is engaged. (i.e. 5% AEP and above).
 - 7.6. Most importantly it protects all dwellings currently flooded and those that would potentially be flooded along the Nanneella Depression as follows:

Event	No. Properties Inundated East of Rochester		
	Existing	Mitigated with No Local Works	Mitigated with Proposed Local Works
1% AEP Event	12 (3)	29 (12)	0 (0)

Figures in brackets are numbers of dwellings flooded above floor

8. Reassesses the flood damages under existing conditions and post implementation of the mitigation works for the total study area (Rochester and Nanneella area) as summarised below:

	Existing Conditions	Mitigated Conditions	Benefit
No Properties Flooded	1,499	1,001	498 improvement
No. Properties Flooded Above Floor	335	172	163 improvement
Damage From 1% AEP Event	\$25.9 million	\$20.4 million	\$4.5 million improvement
Annual Average Damages Bill (All Events)	\$810,280	\$696,782	\$113,498 improvement

Note – the damages calculations include damage to general infrastructure, dwellings and outbuildings etc. and to farming properties. The NSW 'high value agricultural land' standard damages rates have been applied to the inundated rural areas to assess farming land damages.

9. Estimates the cost of implementing the scheme to be about \$7.1 million excluding land acquisition and compensation costs as compared to the capitalised cost of the savings (6% discount rate) after allowing for ongoing maintenance costs of \$1.16 million. The resulting Benefit / Cost Ratio is slightly less than 0.2. In other words in the long term the community will only recoup about 20% of its investment through economic savings. Typically a ratio greater than 1 is preferred to justify funding and indicates the economic benefits of the proposed scheme will outweigh the costs over a 30 year life. It also needs to be understood that this is a straight economic analysis that does not consider the associated social or environmental issues.

8. Community Consultation

The Rochester and district community were widely consulted during preparation of the original Rochester Flood Management Plan. The North Central and Goulburn Broken Catchment Management Authorities were consulted and provided guidance to this study and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning and Emergency Management Victoria provided financial assistance and has been consulted and kept informed of the study's progress.

The Community Reference Panel comprising representatives from Rochester and rural areas downstream along the proposed flow diversion paths oversaw and provided guidance to the consultants undertaking the modelling and investigations. Many landowners in the immediate vicinity or owning properties potentially affected by the proposed works were directly consulted or invited to attend the Panel meetings to ensure their concerns were considered.

The community consultation program following Council approval to release the draft Feasibility Report in October 2017 is now complete. It comprised two community presentations in November, distribution of a letter and information brochure followed by a questionnaire to township residents and rural landowners along the Eastern (Nanneella) Depression, a street display and posting of information on Council's website and in the Rochester Office.

192 paper and on-line questionnaires were returned of which 2 were incomplete or from people in unrelated areas. 77 provided additional comment. Some did not complete all sections. The return rate for surveys is considered to be very satisfactory. It does involve an element of 'self-selection' as opinions were only sourced from those choosing to respond. However it is considered to provide a reasonable reflection of community attitudes. Survey results are summarised in the following table:

	Township	Eastern Rural	Total
Responses	142	48	190
Support for proposal	49 (35%)	1 (2%)	50 (26%)
Support from above floor flooded respondents	13 / 29 = 42%	0 / 2 = 0%	13 / 31 = 42%
Support from below floor flooded respondents	20 / 51 = 40%	1 / 14 = 7%	21 / 65 = 32%

The survey indicates a low level of support from townspeople with 35% of returned surveys supporting the proposal. Support is also relatively low at 40% to 42% in favour amongst those who suffered below or above floor flooding in the 2011 flood event.

Survey forms indicate virtually no support for the proposal from the rural community east of Rochester along the Eastern Depression even though the proposal provided for flood proofing of all of the buildings in the flood path including those that currently flood. Comments from the Community Reference Panel and echoed in the surveys indicate the rural community is more concerned with the impact on farming operations, livestock and crops than affected buildings.

Results were discussed with the Community Reference Panel. Concern was expressed that townspeople may not have understood that flooding to the east of Rochester would not affect houses and buildings because of the ring and local levees forming part of the proposal. It was difficult to understand how such a high proportion of people flooded above floor do not support the proposal.

The Panel sought investigation of one further option involving removing the channel banks and extending the Waranga Western Channel siphons from the Campaspe River to the eastern side of High Street to restore flow capacity to the north. Investigation of this option shows the 1% AEP flood level at the upstream end of the pool impounded by the Waranga Western Channel banks is approximately 600m downstream and 1.2m below the flood levels in the nearest urban areas. In short the fall of the ground and distance between the Township and the siphons means the effects of removing the channel banks will not extend upstream as far as the Rochester Township.

The Panel acknowledges the low level of community support and relatively poor economics mean this mitigation strategy will not meet the government funding guidelines for provision of financial assistance. It has recommended Council work closely with the State Emergency Service to further develop the flood warning system and response program including:

- Provision of flood height markers at strategic locations to assist the community understand the implications of various forecast river heights,
- Marking floor height levels on all township dwellings so people can more readily understand if a forecast river level poses a risk to their property,
- Establishing an evacuation plan providing for flood-free havens and access routes to them, and adequate supplies of sandbags for the general public in well-known locations.

9. Issues, Risks and Proposed Action

The draft final report is complete. Council is faced with deciding if it is worthwhile investing funds to prepare functional designs and accurate estimates of cost for the works to enable government funding to be sought to assist with implementation.

The report indicates the proposed works are not feasible on purely economic grounds. Subsequent community consultation indicates a relatively low level of support from the townspeople including those suffering above-floor flooding in 2011. It is not supported by the affected rural community even though all existing flood prone buildings in that area would be flood proofed. These works are extremely unlikely to attract funding support as government funding guidelines require works to be economically sound and have strong community support. It is therefore unlikely that functional designs for this infrastructure would ever be implemented.

The Community Reference Panel considered the benefits, economics and community survey results and considers it more beneficial to direct efforts into the improving the flood warning systems and response programs as the economics and community support fall well short of that required by government funding guidelines.

10. Strategic Planning Environments

Strong and Engaged Communities:	This project involved a detailed community consultation process resulting in a relatively high response rate to the community engagement meetings and in response to the questionnaire.
Resilient Economy:	The project is intended to assist in reducing the impact of future flooding and its negative impacts on the Rochester economy. It provides a basis for Council to direct its efforts where best value for the community will be achieved
Healthy Environment:	Flooding impacts the physical and mental health of communities. This project aims to reduce those impacts without severely impacting the natural environment.
Balanced Services and Infrastructure:	The report considered the economic implications of proposed works. The consultation process sought out the social and environmental issues to enable Council to make a balanced decision regarding the level of service and best way to reduce the impact of future flooding on Rochester.
Responsible Management:	The proposal engaged the Rochester and district communities providing opportunity for the community to have all relevant issues considered in an open and transparent manner.

11. Consultation

Consultation included the following:

Internal:

- Project Manager
- General Manager Infrastructure Services

External:

- Project's Community Reference Panel
 - Rochester community via community survey and community drop in session.
-

7.3. AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE CHARTER

Author:

Fleur Cousins, General Manager Corporate Services

Attachments:

7.3.1. Proposed Audit and Risk Committee Charter

7.3.2. Proposed Audit and Risk Committee Charter with tracked changes

1. Purpose

To gain Council endorsement and adoption of the proposed Audit and Risk Committee Charter, having been reviewed by the current Internal Audit Committee.

2. Recommendation**That Council:**

- 1. Rename the Internal Audit Committee to the Audit and Risk Committee; and**
 - 2. Endorse and adopt the proposed Audit and Risk Committee Charter, attached as Attachment 7.3.1.**
-

3. Conflict of Interest

In accordance with Section 80B of the *Local Government Act 1989*, the officer preparing this report declares no conflict of interest in regards to this matter.

4. Charter of Human Rights

This report has considered and complies with the Human Rights and Responsibilities contained in the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

5. Instrument of Delegation

This report has considered and complies with the Instrument of Sub-Delegation by the Chief Executive Officer in so far as this report is not contrary to the existing policy or strategy previously adopted by Council.

6. Background

In accordance with section 139 of the *Local Government Act 1989*, all Councils are required to appoint an Audit Committee as an advisory committee to Council. The Audit Committee membership is to be comprised of Councillors and independent external members and the committee is required to be chaired by one of the independent external members.

As outlined in the Committee Charter the role of the Committee 'is to assist Council in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities for the financial reporting process, the system of internal control, risk management, the audit process and Council's process for monitoring compliance with legislation and the code of conduct.'

Campaspe Shire Council established its Audit Committee in 1997 and since this time the Committee has been known by different names. The current Committee is named the Internal Audit Committee and this report seeks to amend the name of the Committee to be the Audit and Risk Committee.

The Committee Charter outlines that at least every three (3) years the Charter is reviewed and request Council approval for any proposed changes.

7. Content

A comprehensive review of the Committee Charter has been undertaken and presented to the Committee at its January 2018 meeting. The review took into consideration the content of Local Government Victoria's publication 'Audit Committees: A Good Practice Guide for Local Government' as well as the recently released Local Government Bill – Exposure Draft and recommended a number of changes, as identified in red in the marked up Committee Charter attached as Appendix B.

In summary the changes proposed included:

- Changing the name of the Committee from Internal Audit Committee to Audit and Risk Committee.
- Amending the authority section of the Charter to reflect the Committee being an advisory committee to Council.
- Aligning the responsibilities section of the Charter to the role of the Committee, in particular recognising the responsibilities to provide oversight and advice on risk management strategies, governance obligations and the effectiveness of management internal controls.
- Providing a mechanism for the Committee to meet with the internal and external auditors without management representatives and for the Committee Chair to report any issues or concerns raised in these meetings to the CEO.

The current Internal Audit Committee considered the proposed changes to the Committee Charter. Through discussion on the proposed changes, further amendments were discussed in relation to the duration of external member appointments. The current Charter requires the appointment of external members for a four (4) year term with a maximum of two (2) consecutive terms. Discussions highlighted the difficulty in attracting suitable external members willing to commit for a four (4) year term as well as the limitations placed on current external members only able to renominate for a maximum of two terms. In light of these discussions further changes have been proposed to the member section of the Charter, identified in blue in the marked up Committee Charter attached as Appendix B.

In summary these changes are:

- External members being able to be appointed for a term up to four (4) years in length.
- Allowing external members to be appointed to the Committee for up to eight (8) consecutive years.

These changes are proposed to create a balance between recruiting suitably skilled members for a variable term based on their availability and create a mechanism for the turn over of membership in order to bring alternate viewpoints and expertise to the Committee and in turn advise Council.

Having considered the proposed Committee Charter, the Committee resolved to recommend to Council:

1. That the Internal Audit Committee be renamed to the Audit and Risk Committee; and
2. The proposed Audit and Risk Committee Charter be adopted in accordance with discussions regarding the duration of external member appointments.

8. Issues and Risk Management

Issues:

Nil

Risk:

Risk management has been considered in the preparation of this report and no risks with a high or extreme rating have been identified in this process.

9. Strategic Planning Environments

Strong and Engaged Communities: No impact

Resilient Economy: No impact

Healthy Environment: No impact

Balanced Services and Infrastructure: No impact

Responsible Management: The establishment of an Audit and Risk Committee fulfils Council's legislative obligations under the *Local Government Act 1989*. The Committee provides oversight and advice to Council on the appropriate management and internal controls related to financial and performance reporting, risk management and compliance with relevant legislation.

10. Consultation

The current Internal Audit Committee reviewed the proposed Audit and Risk Committee Charter at its meeting held in January 2018.

7.4. QUARTERLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Author:

Ailsa Box, Finance Manager

Attachments:

7.4. Quarterly Statements Reporting Pack

1. Purpose

To present to Council a quarterly income statement and additional financial reports to provide a summary of the financial position of Council for the quarter ended December 2017.

2. Recommendation

That Council adopt the December 2017 Quarterly Statements.

3. Conflict of Interest

In accordance with Section 80B of the *Local Government Act 1989*, the officer preparing this report declares no conflict of interest in regards to this matter.

4. Charter of Human Rights

This report has considered and complies with the Human Rights and Responsibilities contained in the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

5. Instrument of Delegation

This report has considered and complies with the Instrument of Sub-Delegation by the Chief Executive Officer in so far as this report is not contrary to the existing policy or strategy previously adopted by Council.

6. Background

The Local Government Act 1989 s138(1) requires that a statement comparing budgeted revenue and expenditure for the financial year with actual revenue and expenditure year to date is presented to the Council at a Council meeting which is open to the public.

7. Content

A pack of the financial statements is included as attachment 7.4 and contains:

Income Statement	Comparison of 2017/18 budget, 2017 actuals and 2016 actuals for the six months ended 31 December 2017.
Balance Sheet	Comparison of 2017/18 budget, 2017 actuals and 2016 actuals for the six months ended 31 December 2017.

Cash Flow Statement	Comparison of 2017/18 budget, 2017 actuals and 2016 actuals for the six months ended 31 December 2017.
Statement of Capital Works	Comparison of 2017/18 budget, 2017 actuals and 2016 actuals for the six months ended 31 December 2017.
Financial Performance Indicators	Comparison of 2016/17 Actual and 2018 Actuals for six months ended 31 December 2017.

Income Statement

The major variations to budget for the three months ended 31 December 2017 are:

- Timing of grant payments, fifty percent of the 2017/18 allocation of Financial Assistance Grants was pre-paid in June 2016/17, variance for the September quarter is \$2.8 million, this will carry across the remainder of the 2017/18 year.
- Materials and services costs favourable due to timing of work programs and their associated spend, however service delivery is on track.

Capital Works Statement

The following comparisons can be made with reference to Statement of Capital works:

- The majority of the capital works program is in planning and design phases, spend will increase to be in line with budget as actual works commence

8. Issues and Risk Management

Risk:

This is a quarterly report that monitors Councils performance against the budget, any major variances have been explained in the report. There is no perceived risk that would prevent Council achieving budget targets in the 2017/18 financial year.

Risk management has been considered in the preparation of this report and no risks with a high or extreme rating have been identified in this process.

9. Strategic Planning Environments

Strong and Engaged Communities:	No Impact
Resilient Economy:	No Impact
Healthy Environment:	No Impact
Balanced Services and Infrastructure:	No Impact
Responsible Management:	To provide Council and community with a summary of our financial performance for the period ended 31 December 2017

10. Consultation

General Manager - Corporate Services

11. Officer Comment

The Quarterly Statements give Council and the community the opportunity to monitor and understand Council's ongoing performance.

Council's operational performance year to date is in line with expectations after a few timing variations. These variances will not have an impact on Council's service delivery.

8. COUNCIL INFORMATION

8.1. OPEN ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORDS

Author:

Sharolyn Taylor, Council Support Officer

Responsible Manager:

Governance Manager

1. Purpose

To present to Council the open records for the Assemblies of Councillors held in the month of January 2018.

2. Recommendation

That Council note the open records of Assemblies of Councillors as outlined in this report.

3. Conflict of Interest

In accordance with Section 80B of the *Local Government Act 1989*, the officer preparing this report declares no conflict of interest in regards to this matter.

4. Charter of Human Rights

This report has considered and complies with the Human Rights and Responsibilities contained in the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

5. Instrument of Delegation

This report has considered and complies with the Instrument of Sub-Delegation by the Chief Executive Officer in so far as this report is not contrary to the existing policy or strategy previously adopted by Council.

6. Background

The Local Government Act provides a definition of an assembly of Councillors where conflicts of interest must be disclosed.

A meeting will be an assembly of Councillors if it considers matters that are likely to be the subject of a Council decision, or, the exercise of a Council delegation and the meeting is:

1. An advisory committee of the Council that includes at least one Councillor; or
2. A planned or scheduled meeting that includes at least half the Councillors (5) and one member of Council staff.

The requirement for reporting provides increased transparency and the opportunity for Councillors to check the record, particularly the declaration of conflict of interest.

7. Content

The following Assemblies of Councillors were held in the month of January 2018:

Meeting Information		
Meeting Name/Type	Campaspe Briefing Session	
Meeting Date	23 January 2018	
Start time:	10:00am	Finish time: 5:08pm
Matters Discussed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tour of 52-56 Murray Esplanade & Retaining Wall 2. Welcome, present & apologies 3. Declaration of Interests 4. Delegation – Echuca Regional Hospital 5. Former Welton Primary School Site 6. Council Policy Review – January 7. Local Government Bill Exposure Draft 8. Proposed Application Fee for Permits to Burn 9. Victoria Park Infrastructure & Service Plan 10. Back 9 Golf Course 11. Delegation – VicRoads 12. Northern Highway Echuca Entrance Bollards 13. Riverboat Dock Project 16. Australian Consolidated Milk 17. SPC Ardmona 	
Attendees		
Councillors	Cr Adrian Weston (Mayor), Cr Vicki Neele (Deputy Mayor), Cr Daniel Mackrell, Cr Kristen Munro, Cr Neil Pankhurst, Cr Leanne Pentreath, Cr Annie Vickers, Cr John Zobec	
Staff	Jason Russell (11:03am – 5:08pm), Paul McKenzie (11:00am – 5:08pm), Emma Dalton (10:00am – 5:08pm), Fleur Cousins (11:12am – 5:08pm), Frank Crawley (11:44am – 2:00pm), Sharolyn Taylor	
Apologies		
Councillors	Cr Leigh Wilson	
Staff	Keith Oberin	
Conflict of Interest disclosures		
Matter No.	Councillor/officer making disclosure	Left meeting: Yes/No
6	Cr Mackrell	Yes
9	Cr Mackrell	Yes

Meeting Information		
Meeting Name/Type	Campaspe Briefing Session	
Meeting Date	30 January 2018	
Start time:	9:34am	Finish time: 3:44pm
Matters Discussed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome, present & apologies 2. Declaration of Interests 3. Community Engagement Framework 4. Council Meeting Agenda – Open Q & A 6. Pre-Briefing Koyuga Hall & Recreation Reserve Committee of Management 7. Delegation - Koyuga Hall & Recreation Reserve Committee of Management 8. 2018/19 Budget Briefing 9. Waste, Recycling and Garden Organics Guidelines 10. Riverboat Dock Update 11. Local Government Bill Exposure Draft 12. Back 9 Golf Course Progress Update 13. Department Update: Engineering Design 14. Mayor & Committee Representatives Report 15. Future Meetings 16. Briefing Minutes Review 17. Communication Reports 18. Monthly Reports – November & December 2017 	
Attendees		
Councillors	Cr Adrian Weston (Mayor), Cr Vicki Neele (Deputy Mayor) (9:35am – 3:44pm), Cr Daniel Mackrell (9:39am - 3:44pm), Cr Kristen Munro (9:40am – 3:44pm), Cr Neil Pankhurst, Cr Leanne Pentreath, Cr Annie Vickers, Cr Leigh Wilson, Cr John Zobec	
Staff	Jason Russell, Fleur Cousins, Keith Oberin, Emma Dalton, Paul McKenzie, Frank Crawley, Sharolyn Taylor	
Apologies		
Councillors		
Staff		
Conflict of Interest disclosures		
Matter No.	Councillor/officer making disclosure	Left meeting: Yes/No
4 - 6.4	Cr Mackrell	Yes
4 – 7.3	Cr Mackrell	Yes

8. Issues and Risk Management

Nil.

9. Strategic Planning Environments

Strong and Engaged Communities: No impact

Resilient Economy: No impact

Healthy Environment: No impact

Balanced Services and Infrastructure: No impact

Responsible Management: No impact

10. Consultation

Nil.

8.2. LETTERS OF APPRECIATION

The following have been received:

- Tony Andrews – thank you for the prompt repair of the pot holes on Headworks Road, Torrumbarry.
 - Barb Dureau – thank you for the prompt repairs to the Echuca Guide Hall ceiling.
 - Echuca Historical Society Inc – thank you for the funding provided through the Responsive Grants Program to reprint 5,000 Heritage Walk brochures. The brochure will give visitors a better insight into our local heritage.
-

Recommendation

That Council note the letters of thanks and appreciation as listed.

8.3. PETITION – REMOVAL OF PARKING BAYS IN FENAUGHTY STREET, KYABRAM**Author:**

Danny Moloney, Road Services Coordinator

Responsible Manager:

Assets Manager

Attachments:

8.3 Petition

1. Purpose

To advise Council of the receipt of a petition and outcome of the subsequent investigation for the removal of car parks in Fenaughty Street, Kyabram.

2. Recommendation

That Council note the use of the Asset Manager's delegated power to erect and remove any works or structures to protect, passengers, pedestrian and drivers or to regulate traffic on a road from Schedule 11, Clause 8 of the Local Government Act 1989.

3. Conflict of Interest

In accordance with Section 80B of the *Local Government Act 1989*, the officer preparing this report declares no conflict of interest in regards to this matter.

4. Charter of Human Rights

This report has considered and complies with the Human Rights and Responsibilities contained in the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

5. Instrument of Delegation

This report has considered and complies with the Instrument of Sub-Delegation by the Chief Executive Officer in so far as this report is not contrary to the existing policy or strategy previously adopted by Council.

6. Background

Council received a petition requesting the removal of car parks in Fenaughty Street, Kyabram on 12 December 2017. The petition requests the removal of "one or two" car parks in Fenaughty Street to improve motorists vision of east bound traffic when waiting in the southern leg of the Fenaughty Street and Union Street intersection.



Image 1 – Aerial photograph of the Fenaughty Street and Union Street intersection. (2017). Note: Approximate location of car parking bays shown by red lines.

An acknowledgement letter was sent to the nominated contact person on 2 January 2018. This letter prompted a return call from the customer who outlined that irrespective of whether the sign is a Give Way, or changed to a Stop Sign, it is difficult to see traffic approaching from the east.

When Council officers receive requests of this nature a traffic investigation is undertaken to ensure that a driver's sight line meets the minimum requirements for either a Give Way or Stop Sign. This may result in the alteration of line marking, signage or a combination of the two.

7. Content

Traffic

Fenaughty Street is an urban collector road that runs east-west and carries an average of 1,800 vehicles per day.

Union Street is an urban access road that runs north-south and carries an average of 750 vehicles per day.

There is a considerable amount and variety of traffic that travel through this area. The Kyabram Transit Centre is located near this intersection and provides facilities for the town buses, town taxis and provides a small amount of off-street parking to the surrounding area.

There is a bicycle lane on the east bound and west bound lanes of Fenaughty Street.

This results in a busy intersection that has a number of large vehicle movements along with general traffic flows.

Intersection layout

The intersection of Fenaughty Street and Union Street is a four legged intersection where the two roads intersect perpendicularly. (refer to Image 1 above)

There is car parking on all legs of the intersection which is controlled by a combination of line marking, signage and indented parking bays. It is the location of the car parking on the south eastern side of the intersection that has been raised as the concern in the petition. The extent of car parking in this area is controlled by a No Standing sign which prohibits parking any closer to the intersection.

There are no defined car parking bays on the south side of Fenaughty Street. The approximate length of two car parking bays is 12 metres and this has been shown on Image 1.

Crash history

Council officers have reviewed VicRoads CrashStats data to determine if there is a history of crashes at this intersection. There have been no fatal or serious injury crashes at this intersection in the past five years.

Engineering Investigation

Council officers have completed an investigation to determine if the existing regulatory signage meets the sight line requirements of the Australian Standards.

It has been determined that the car parking bays east of Union Street are too close to the intersection to meet the requirements of a Give Way sign.

It is possible to correct this by relocating the No Standing signage further east along Fenaughty Street which will result in the minimum sight line distance being achieved. Alternatively, the existing Give Way sign could be replaced with a Stop Sign as the available sight line distance already meets the minimum distance requirements.

The Australian Standards does not dictate any hierarchical use of Give Way or Stop signage for the control of an intersection. The use of either type of signage is dependent on the geometry of the intersection and the available sight distance for entering traffic.

8. Issues and Risk Management

Issues:

Issue 1: Control of the intersection

The intersection is incorrectly controlled as the available sight distance does not meet the minimum requirements of the existing Give Way signage.

The petitioners have outlined that they can't see approaching traffic as vehicles parking on Fenaughty Street are blocking their vision of approaching traffic.

Issue 2: Impact on parking

The intersection is located close to the main street of Kyabram and provides over flow parking in times of high demand. If a Give Way sign is to remain in this location then it will be necessary to remove up to three car parks to achieve the minimum sight distance required.

Whilst there is an occasional over flow of parking to this area, this area is generally underutilised as a parking area and the loss of three car parks will not create a substantial loss of parking in the area. The impacts from the removal of parking will be:

- An additional 15 metres of walking for anyone parking at the revised No Standing signage; and

- The loss of parking area adjacent to 49 Union Street (there will still be approximately 20m of property frontage that the residents could park next to after the relocation of the No Standing signage).

Risk:

Risk management has been considered in the preparation of this report and no risks with a high or extreme rating have been identified in this process.

9. Options

Option 1: Alteration of signage to support the existing Give Way signage

This option is recommended by officers.

This option has been implemented under the Asset Manager's authority as outlined in *S.7 Instrument of Sub-Delegation by CEO*. Under this delegation the Asset Manager has the "power to erect and remove any works or structures to protect passengers, pedestrians and drivers to regulate traffic on a road" from Schedule 11, Clause 8 of the Local Government Act 1989.

This will result in the relocation of the No Standing on the south eastern corner of the Fenaughty Street and Union Street further away from the intersection.

This option will ensure that council is providing a compliant means of controlling the traffic on the minor legs of the intersection and the community will achieve the result that they were petitioning for.

Option 2: Installation of Stop Sign signage and line marking on Union Street

This option is not recommended by officers.

This option would require the installation of new Stop Signs and line marking on the southern leg of Union Street and whilst it would result in a compliant means of controlling the intersection, it does not meet the petitioners request to improve the vision of approaching vehicles from the east.

The installation of a Stop Sign does not result in a safer intersection in this instance. There may be a higher risk of motorists choosing to ignore the Stop Sign based on previous experience at the intersection This may result in the diminishing of the value of Stop Signs as a control measure and result in a higher risk of accidents occurring in other locations.

10. Strategic Planning Environments

Strong and Engaged Communities:	The recommendation shows Council's commitment to the consideration of community requests.
Resilient Economy:	No impact
Healthy Environment:	No impact
Balanced Services and Infrastructure:	No impact
Responsible Management:	This recommendation shows council considers and manages its responsibility as a Road Authority to ensure that it maintains a compliant road network.

11. Consultation

- The lead petitioner was contacted by post and a subsequent phone call to better understand the petitioners concerns.
- Consultation was undertaken within the Road Services Unit during the investigation of the sight lines at this intersection.

8.4 INTERNAL AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Author:

Wayne Jenkin, Audit Committee Chairperson

Attachments:

8.4. Draft Minutes of the Internal Audit Committee meeting held on 24 January 2018.

1. Purpose

To note and adopt the Internal Audit Committee Meeting Draft Minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2018.

2. Recommendation

That Council note the Draft Minutes of the Internal Audit Committee meeting held on 24 January 2018 subject to confirmation by the Audit Committee.

3. Conflict of Interest

In accordance with Section 80B of the *Local Government Act 1989*, the officer preparing this report declares no conflict of interest in regards to this matter.

4. Charter of Human Rights

This report has considered and complies with the Human Rights and Responsibilities contained in the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

5. Instrument of Delegation

This report has considered and complies with the Instrument of Sub-Delegation by the Chief Executive Officer in so far as this report is not contrary to the existing policy or strategy previously adopted by Council.

6. Background

The Internal Audit Committee's role is to monitor, review and advise Council on matters of accountability and internal control.

The Audit Committee provides Council with Draft Minutes after each meeting. The Draft Minutes are then formally adopted at the following meeting. To enable officers the ability to present the Minutes to Council in a timely manner the process has been changed. It is appropriate that Council is presented with the outcomes from the Audit Committee meetings as soon as practical after meetings. This will necessitate the noting of the Draft Minutes and adoption of the final Minutes once formally adopted by the Audit Committee at the following meeting.

7. Content

Meeting: 24 January 2018

The 24 January 2018 Internal Audit Committee meeting was attended by:

Members: Michael Bennett, Suzanna Barry, Wayne Jenkin, Cr Neil Pankhurst, Cr Leanne Pentreath

Officers: Jason Russell (CEO), Fleur Cousins (General Manager Corporate Services), Ailsa Box (Finance Manager), Sharolyn Taylor (Council Support Officer)

Internal Auditor: Brad Ead (AFS & Associates) (12:46pm – 1:32pm)

External Auditor:

Apologies:

Items discussed at the meeting were:

- Summary of Actions from Audit Committee Meeting
- Adoption of Previous Minutes
- Charter of Human Rights
- Local Government Bill – Exposure Draft
- Internal Audit Committee Charter Review
- Quarterly Financial Report
- Investment Portfolio Review
- Update of Outstanding Audit Actions Register
- Audit Committee and Internal Audit Performance Assessment
- Appointment of New External Auditor
- Procurement Policy Review
- Overview of Budget Process
- Audit Committee Work Plan
- CSC Strategic Risk Register
- Internal Audit Program Status Update

Refer to Attachment 8.4 for copy of the Draft Minutes of 24 January 2018

Internal Audit Committee Agenda and Attachments can be found on the Councillor Portal.

8. Issues and Risk Management

As this report is for noting, there are no applicable issues or risks outside of those noted in the Minutes.

9. Options

Council can note or decline to note the Minutes.

10. Strategic Planning Environments

Strong and Engaged Communities: No impact

Resilient Economy: No impact

Healthy Environment: No impact

Balanced Services and Infrastructure: No impact

Responsible Management: Audit reviews and findings are a critical aspect in the implementation of appropriate governance within the organisation. Control risks are reviewed, identified and actions implemented ensuring organisational risk and exposure are minimised

11. Consultation

The Audit Committee includes three external people to provide wider consultation and participation.

9. COUNCILLOR REPORTS

Cr Adrian Weston	
1 February 2018	VLGA Briefing and consultation on the Local Government Bill 2018
1 February 2018	Regional Mayors Meeting
1 February 2018	Kyabram Golf Club Meeting
2 February 2018	Loddon Campaspe Councils Meeting
2 February 2018	Australia Day Award Winners Civic Reception
7 February 2018	Fairley Leadership Program 2018 Launch
8 February 2018	Planning information session - PIn362/2017 (126 Mockler Road, Echuca West)
8 February 2018	C4EM CEO Meeting
8 February 2018	Southern 80 Launch
9 February 2018	MAV Local Government Bill Exposure Draft - Consultation Session
11 February 2018	Southern 80
12 February 2018	Richmond Football Club Welcome Luncheon
12 February 2018	Colbinabbin CFA Meeting
12 February 2018	Rushworth Easter Festival Committee Meeting
14 February 2018	Senior Combined Partners Meeting
14 February 2018	Stanhope Development Committee Meeting
15 February 2018	Funding Announcement for Moore Street/Market Reserve
15 February 2018	Queens Baton Relay for Commonwealth Games Relay
16 February 2018	Official Launch of Riverboats Music Festival
16-18 February 2018	Riverboats Music Festival

Cr Daniel Mackrell	
2 February 2018	Australia Day Award Winners Civic Reception
14 February 2018	Echuca East Recreation Reserve Committee AGM
16 February 2018	Official Launch of Riverboats Music Festival
16-18 February 2018	Riverboats Music Festival

Cr Kristen Munro	
5 February 2018	CCLLEN Board Meeting
8 February 2018	Southern 80 Launch
9 February 2018	Campaspe Community Children's Centre 20th Birthday Celebration
13 February 2018	Breakfast with Richmond Football Club
14 February 2018	Echuca East Recreation Reserve Committee AGM
16 February 2018	Official Launch of Riverboats Music Festival
16-18 February 2018	Riverboats Music Festival

Cr Vicki Neele	
-----------------------	--

Cr Neil Pankhurst	
2 February 2018	Australia Day Award Winners Civic Reception
5 February 2018	EMFM Radio
12 February 2018	Richmond Football Club Welcome Luncheon
13 February 2018	Breakfast with Richmond Football Club
15 February 2018	Queens Baton Relay for Commonwealth Games Relay
16-18 February 2018	Riverboats Music Festival

Cr Leanne Pentreath	
2 February 2018	Australia Day Award Winners Civic Reception
8 February 2018	Planning information session - Pln362/2017 (126 Mockler Road, Echuca West)
15 February 2018	Queens Baton Relay for Commonwealth Games Relay
16 February 2018	Official Launch of Riverboats Music Festival
16-18 February 2018	Riverboats Music Festival

Cr Annie Vickers	
1 February 2018	Integrated MEMPC meeting
2 February 2018	Australia Day Award Winners Civic Reception
6 February 2018	Rotary Breakfast with the Chief- Kathryn Mackenzie, Echuca Moama Tourism
8 February 2018	Southern 80 Launch
9 February 2018	Campaspe Community Children's Centre 20th Birthday Celebration
10 & 11 February 2018	Southern 80
12 February 2018	Richmond Football Club Welcome Luncheon
13 February 2018	Breakfast with Richmond Football Club
14 February 2018	Echuca East Recreation Reserve Committee AGM
15 February 2018	Queens Baton Relay for Commonwealth Games Relay
16 February 2018	Official Launch of Riverboats Music Festival
16-18 February 2018	Riverboats Music Festival

Cr Leigh Wilson	
31 January 2018	Help Build Rochester - Action Planning Workshop
1 February 2018	Rochester Plan Project Drop In Session
12 February 2018	Richmond Football Club Welcome Luncheon
15 February 2018	Funding Announcement for Moore Street/Market Reserve
16 February 2018	GVWRRG Board meeting
16-18 February 2018	Riverboats Music Festival
19 February 2018	Rochester Community House Meeting

Cr John Zobec	
2 February 2018	Australia Day Award Winners Civic Reception
15 February 2018	Queens Baton Relay for Commonwealth Games Relay
16-18 February 2018	Riverboats Music Festival

Recommendation

That the Councillor reports be noted.

10. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Activities and meetings attended since previous Council meeting:

- Meeting with DELWP Secretary
- Loddon Campaspe Councils Meeting
- Australia Day Award Winners Civic Reception
- VicRoads Second Murray River Bridge Stakeholder meeting
- Murray River Group of Councils CEO meeting
- Rural Councils Victoria Steering Committee meeting
- Richmond Football Club Welcome Luncheon in Rochester
- Richmond Football Club Breakfast on the PS Pevensey
- Queen's Baton for Commonwealth Games Relay
- Official Launch of the Riverboat Music Festival

Recommendation

That the Chief Executive Officer's report be noted.

11. PETITIONS/LETTERS

Nil

12. NOTICES OF MOTION

Nil

13. URGENT BUSINESS

14. QUESTION TIME

15. CLOSED SESSION OF THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

Recommendation

That pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Act 1989, the meeting will now be closed to members of the public to enable the meeting to discuss matters in items 16, 17, 18 and 19 which the Council may, pursuant to the provisions of Section 89(2) of the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act) resolve to be considered in Closed Session, being a matter contemplated by Section 89(2) of the Act, as follows:

- (a) personnel matters;
- (b) the personal hardship of any resident or ratepayer;
- (c) industrial matters;
- (d) contractual matters;
- (e) proposed developments;
- (f) legal advice;
- (g) matters affecting the security of Council property;
- (h) any other matter which the Council or special committee considers would prejudice the Council or any person;
- (i) a resolution to close the meeting to members of the public.

16. CONFIRMATION OF CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES & ATTACHMENTS

89(2)(h) Any other matter which the Council or Special Committee considers would prejudice the Council or any person

17. CONFIDENTIAL COUNCIL INFORMATION

17.1. CONFIDENTIAL ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORDS

89(2)(h) Any other matter which the Council or Special Committee considers would prejudice the Council or any person

17.2. CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION REPORTS & ATTACHMENTS

Nil

18. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

Nil

19. CONFIDENTIAL COUNCIL MEETING CLOSE

89(2)(h) Any other matter which the Council or Special Committee considers would prejudice the Council or any person

20. ITEMS DETERMINED TO BE NO LONGER CONFIDENTIAL

21. OPEN MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

Recommendation

That Council resolves to open the meeting to the public at

22. CLOSE MEETING

.....
JASON RUSSELL

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER