

NOTICE OF STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING

Dear Member

The next Ordinary Meeting of the Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes Local Laws, Strategy, Policy & Organisation Development Standing Committee Meeting to be held in the Council Chambers on Thursday, **14 July 2016** commencing at 5.30pm.

Signed by T Clynych



Date:

7 July 2016

Standing Committee Agenda Index – 14 July 2016

Subject	Page No
Acknowledgment of Country	2
Attendance & Apologies	2
Attendance of Gallery	2
Petitions/Deputations/Presentations	2
Comment on Agenda Items by Parties With an Interest	2
Confirmation of Minutes	2
SC.01/0716 Ordinary Meeting held 9 June 2016.....	2
Announcements/Briefings by Elected Members	2
Notification of Disclosure of Interest	3
Consideration of Motions of which Previous Notice Has Been Given	3
Reports of Officers	3
Policy	3
Local Laws	3
Strategy	4
SC.02/0716 Full Review of Strategic Community Plan – Community Engagement Proposals.....	4
SC.03/0716 Outsourcing Service Delivery at the Bridgetown Leisure Centre	8
Organisation Development	16
SC.04/0716 Rolling Action Sheet	16
Urgent Business Approved By Decision	17
Responses to Elected Member Questions Taken on Notice	17
Elected Members Questions With Notice	17
Briefings by Officers	17
Notice of Motions for Consideration at Next Meeting	17
Matters Behind Closed Doors	17
Closure	17
List of Attachments	17

AGENDA

For a Meeting of the Local Laws, Strategy, Policy & Organisation Development Standing Committee to be held in the Council Chambers on Thursday, 14 July 2016 commencing at 5.30pm.

Meeting to be opened by the Presiding Member

Acknowledgment of Country – Presiding Member

On behalf of the Councillors, staff and gallery, I acknowledge the Noongar People, the Traditional Owners of the Land on which we are gathered, and pay my respects to their Elders both past and present.

Attendance & Apologies

Presiding Member - A J Wilson

- J A Boyle

- S C Hodson

- D Mackman

- J R Moore

- J Nicholas

- A Pratico

- P Quinby

- P Scallan

In Attendance - T P Clynch, CEO

- M Larkworthy, Executive Manager Corporate Services

- E Denniss, Executive Manager Community Services

- T M Lockley, Executive Assistant

Gallery

Petitions/Deputations/Presentations

Comment on Agenda Items by Parties With an Interest

Confirmation of Minutes

SC.01/0716 Ordinary Meeting held 9 June 2016

A motion is required to confirm the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Local Laws, Strategy, Policy & Organisation Development Standing Committee held 9 June 2016 as a true and correct record.

Announcements/Briefings by Elected Members

Notification of Disclosure of Interests

Section 5.65 or 5.70 of the Local Government Act requires a Member or Officer who has an interest in any matter to be discussed at a Committee/Council Meeting that will be attended by the Member or Officer must disclose the nature of the interest in a written notice given to the Chief Executive Officer before the meeting; or at the meeting before the matter is discussed.

A Member who makes a disclosure under Section 5.65 or 5.70 must not preside at the part of the meeting relating to the matter; or participate in; or be present during, any discussion or decision making procedure relating to the matter, unless allowed by the Committee/Council. If Committee/Council allow a Member to speak, the extent of the interest must also be stated.

Consideration of Motions of Which Previous Notice has been Given

Reports of Officers

Reports of Officers have been divided into the following Categories:

- Policy
- Local Laws
- Strategy
- Organisation Development

Policy - Nil

Local Laws - Nil

Strategy

ITEM NO.	SC.02/0716	FILE REF.	
SUBJECT	Full Review of Strategic Community Plan – Community Engagement Proposals		
OFFICER	Chief Executive Officer		
DATE OF REPORT	5 July 2016		

Attachment 1	Community Engagement Strategy for the Full Review of the Strategic Community Plan
Attachment 2	Review of Strategic Community Plan: Report of Findings Community Survey 2015/16
Attachment 3	Review of Strategic Community Plan: Results of Community Survey Undertaken in 2015

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION that Council:

- 1. Notes the receipt of the following two reports and request the CEO to upload these reports onto the Shire website and place hard copies in the library for community information:*
 - Review of Strategic Community Plan: Report of Findings Community Survey 2015/16 (Attachment 2)*
 - Review of Strategic Community Plan: Results of Community Survey Undertaken in 2015 (Attachment 3)*
- 2. Note that the contents of the Community Survey 2015/16 will be used to inform the process for full review of the Strategic Community Plan including discussion and consideration at the proposed community workshops to be held in that review process.*
- 3. Endorses the Community Engagement Strategy (Attachment 1) for the full review of the Strategic Community Plan and authorises the CEO to engage an external facilitator to facilitate the proposed community workshops and community drop-in sessions as described in the Strategy.*

Summary/Purpose

The purpose of this report is to report to Council on:

- The findings of the community survey undertaken in 2015 as a precursor to the review of the Strategic Community Plan.
- The recommended community engagement process for the full review of the Strategic Community Plan in 2016/17

Background

Council, at its March 2016 meeting resolved:

C.08/0316 That Council:

- 1. Adopt the revised Strategic Community Plan 2016 following the desktop review process with the following minor changes:*
 - 2.7.3 Change wording to read: Identify a long term waste disposal and recycle option for the shire by monitoring regional initiatives and opportunities.*

- *2.8.3 Change wording to read: Prepare and implement a gravel strategy.*
 - *2.8.4 Add 'and gardens' after 'reserves'.*
 - *Add dot point 4.5.6 - Regularly review service level provision.*
 - *4.9.3 Remove the 'A' from LEMAC to read LEMC.*
2. *Undertake to complete a full review of the Strategic Community Plan, including further community engagement, by 30 June 2017.*
 3. *Request the CEO to report back on the findings of the community survey 2015 by July 2016.*
 4. *That the findings of the community survey 2015 and the "Bridge of Success" Workshop book of proceedings be used to initiate the community engagement process for the full review of the Strategic Community Plan in 2016/17.*
 5. *Request the CEO to report back by May 2016 on the recommended community engagement process for the full review of the Strategic Community Plan in 2016/17, including budget considerations.*

The purpose of this report is to report back as required under the above resolution.

Findings of the Community Survey

At its April 2015 meeting Council endorsed the wording of the 2015 community survey.

The survey was released in August 2015 and was available for interested members of the public to participate over a 6 week period. Notice of the existence of the survey and response advice was provided via an Insight Newsletter article, Facebook posts, email notification on the 'Shire Bytes' email notification service. The survey was able to be viewed online at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/bgstrategiccommunityplan2015>.

The preferred means of completing the Survey was via online means however persons unable to complete the survey online were able to contact the Shire customer service staff to arrange for a hard copy to be forwarded to your mailing address. No such requests were received and all respondents participated online.

The survey consisted of 14 questions:

- Questions 1-4 were for the purpose of identifying the characteristics of the respondent – residential location, age and household structure.
- Question 5 was for respondents to rate their level of satisfaction with 34 different services or facilities. Respondents were able to provide comments to explain their rating if they wished.
- Question 6 was for respondents to rate their level of satisfaction with the Shire's overall performance.
- Question 7 allowed respondents to rate how important 24 specific project proposals and new initiatives are for the future development and community well-being of the Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes.
- Question 8 allowed respondents to provide comments on the projects and initiatives listed in Question 7.

- Question 9 allowed respondents to list and comment on additional projects/initiatives which they considered to be important to the future development of the Shire.
- Question 10 asked respondents to list and/or describe their greatest wish for the Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes in 10-15 years?
- Question 11 asked respondents to describe what to them makes the Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes a special place to live.
- Question 12 asked respondents to describe how they would like the environment to be in 10-15 years' time.
- Question 13 asked respondents to describe how in 10-15 years' time what economic prosperity will mean to them and how should it shape the community.
- Question 14 asked respondents to describe how in 10-15 years' time what social well-being would mean to them and how it should shape the community.

The findings of the community survey can be viewed in the following documents:

Attachment 2 - Review of Strategic Community Plan: Report of Findings
Community Survey 2015/16 (summary report)

Attachment 3 - Review of Strategic Community Plan: Results of Community
Survey Undertaken in 2015 (complete results of surveys
including all comments provided by respondents)

Copies of both of these documents will be available for viewing in the library and online at www.bridgetown.wa.gov.au/your-shire/publications (click on "Strategic Community Plan").

A community engagement strategy has been prepared to guide the full review of the Strategic Community Plan and forms Attachment 1. This strategy proposes the following community consultation methods for the review process:

- Four community workshops – one each in Bridgetown, Greenbushes, Catterick and Yornup
- Community drop-in sessions the same week as the community workshops – locations to be determined

The results of the community survey as well as updates on specific community consultation conducted for the Sport and Recreation Strategic Plan, Youth Friendly Plan and Age Friendly Plan will be presented to the community workshops.

A suitable facilitator will be engaged to facilitate the community workshops and community drop-in sessions as well as producing a summary report on the findings of the community consultation.

Instead of reporting to the May 2016 meeting on the recommended community engagement process the CEO raised the issue for discussion at the budget workshop held on 4 May 2016. Via this discussion an amount of \$15,000 was recommended for allocation in the 2017/18 budget to cover the costs of an external facilitator to run the community workshops and any other community engagement initiatives. Subsequent to the budget workshop the Corporate Business Plan was

amended including noting the allocation of those funds for the project in the 2016/17 budget.

Statutory Environment

Section 5.56 of the Local Government Act 1995, requires WA local governments to Plan for the Future of the district. Amendments made in August 2011 to the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 state a Strategic Community Plan and Corporate Business, together form a Plan for the Future of a District.

Integrated Planning

- Strategic Community Plan
Self-explanatory in the body of this report

- Corporate Business Plan
Action 4.1.4.2 – Externally facilitated community engagement and survey to inform full review of Strategic Community Plan – additional operating expenditure in 2016/17 of \$15,000

- Long Term Financial Plan - Nil

- Asset Management Plans - Nil

- Workforce Plan - Nil

- Other Integrated Planning - Nil

Policy - Nil

Budget Implications

The amount of \$15,000 for external facilitation of the community consultation has been included in the draft 2016/17 budget.

Fiscal Equity – Not Applicable

Whole of Life Accounting – Not Applicable

Social Equity – Not Applicable

Ecological Equity – Not Applicable

Cultural Equity – Not Applicable

Risk Management – Not Applicable

Continuous Improvement

The integrated planning and reporting framework developed by the Department of Local Government provides a process for local governments to:

- Ensure community input is explicitly and reliably generated
- Provide the capacity for location and specific planning where appropriate
- Infirm the long term objectives of the local government with these inputs
- Identify the resourcing required to deliver against the long term objectives
- Clearly articulate long term financial implications and strategies

Voting Requirements – Simple Majority

ITEM NO.	SC.03/0716	FILE REF.	460.1
SUBJECT	Outsourcing Service Delivery at the Bridgetown Leisure Centre		
OFFICER	Chief Executive Officer and Executive Manager Community Services		
DATE OF REPORT	5 July 2016		

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION That Council:

- 1. Commit to running the Bridgetown Leisure Centre for a period of 2 years prior to exploring the options available to outsource/privatize service delivery at the Bridgetown Leisure Centre via a tender process.*
- 2. Note the importance of clearly identifying and quantifying the reasons, purposes and desired outcomes it wishes to achieve in pursuing outsourcing/privatisation of service deliver at the Bridgetown Leisure Centre.*
- 3. Note the value of accruing usage and financial data pertaining to the operations at the Bridgetown Leisure Centre over a 2 – 3 year period to allow internal operating assessments of performance and internal benchmarking of any future tender submissions received for the outsourcing/privatisation of service delivery at the Bridgetown Leisure Centre.*

Summary/Purpose

The recommendation seeks report back on the May 2016 Council resolution regarding the process of outsourcing management of operations of the Bridgetown Leisure Centre.

Background

At the April 2014 meeting, Council resolved (in part) as follows (C.11/04/14):

- 1. Notes receipt of the “YMCA Cost Benefit Analysis of Outsourcing the Management of the Bridgetown Recreation & Aquatic Centres” at Attachment 5.*
- 2. Defer any consideration of potential outsourcing of the management of the Bridgetown Recreation & Aquatic Centres until such time as the new swimming pool development is completed and a determined period of time operating the integrated facilities has passed to enable a comprehensive review and assessment of operations to be completed.*

At the May 2016 meeting, Council resolved as follows (C.05/0516)

That the CEO prepare a report to Council on the process required for Council to investigate the potential outsourcing of management/operations of the Bridgetown Leisure Centre. In preparing the report the CEO is to consult with the Department of Sport and Recreation and any other appropriate authority on merits or otherwise of the outsourcing option.

Officer Comment

The process to outsource the management/operations of the Bridgetown Leisure Centre (BLC), due to the value of the service delivery being in excess of \$150,000, would be an official tender process.

The preparation of a comprehensive scope of works including accurate patronage/usage, expenditure and income data (to allow a potential tender applicant to undertake a robust analysis of such information in the preparation and costing of their tender submission) would be required. Should Council determine to undertake this process, it is envisaged that the services of WALGA Procurement would be utilised to run the tender process, however officers would need to be involved in the preparation of the scope of works.

This process and outcome is not recommended by officers at this point in time following meetings with a variety of stakeholders including:

- Troy Jones, Regional Manager Department of Sport & Recreation
- Rob Didcoe, Director of Facilities & Camps Department of Sport & Recreation
- Brett Treby, Strategic Planner/Research Manager Facilities and Camps Department of Sport & Recreation
- Rohan Gunton, State Manager WA, Belgravia Leisure
- Daniel Webb Centre Manager Loftus Recreation Centre (Belgravia Leisure managed facility)
- Ross Kirwood, CEO YMCA WA
- Jurek Stopczynski, General Manager South West, YMCA WA

Summary of Department for Sport & Recreation Consultation

Discussions with Department of Sport & Recreation representatives confirmed that there are specific risks and benefits relevant to any sport and recreation centre management structure, due to the reality that very few centres operate at a profit, regardless of management structure.

A short review of two types of management structure (local government authority and outsourced management option) follows.

The objectives of facilities managed directly by local government will vary between local government authorities however the broad objectives which remain consistent are:

- To minimize the operating deficit
- Encourage broad community use and participation
- Provide quality customer service

The strengths of local government management model are:

- Centre is financially underwritten by the local government (to deliver social, health, wellness and economic benefit to the community).
- Encourages usage by a broad cross section of the community
- Limits ownership and control of the facility by powerful groups/sporting associations to encourage equity of access
- Encourages a commitment to asset management (protecting infrastructure investment by local governments).

The weaknesses of a local government management model are:

- Financial risk to local government authority
- Limited contribution towards sports development
- Can be slow in responding to change
- Financial viability reduced due to commitment to servicing broad community needs
- Political interference in management
- Limited commitment to the development of coaches, officials, administrators and community volunteers

The financial risks associated with a local government management model are:

- Full financial risk is assumed by the local government authority
- Often associated with high corporate services costs (activity based costing)

In comparison, the objectives of an outsourced/privatised management model tend to solely focus on financial performance, including:

- Financial profitability
- Provision of quality programs and services
- Increasing participation in programs
- Returning a dividend to the shareholders/profits to management company
- Minimising operational costs
- Minimising long term, large capital/building maintenance/asset management costs (as asset is not owned by service provider)

The strengths of an outsourced management option include:

- Financial risk transferred from (or shared with) local government authority to private enterprise
- Greater flexibility in responding to change, programming and service provision
- Encourages entrepreneurial and innovative management and service delivery
- Industry specific economies of scale, networking, support and training
- Potential access to a wide range of qualified staff
- The challenges of attracting suitable and qualified staff is the responsibility of the private enterprise and not the local government
- Backfilling vacancies caused by annual leave or resignation of incumbent staff can be easier as the private enterprise would have a pool of staff and are contractually bound to provide a service to the local government

The weaknesses of an outsourced management option include:

- Generally there is a limited commitment to social viability and community development (no community service obligation)
- Loss of control over the objectives of the facility
- Limited commitment to equity of access and social service
- Limited commitment to the development of coaches, officials, administrators and community volunteers
- Disproportionate emphasis on financial viability.
- Good staff at smaller facilities (such as Bridgetown) could be earmarked for promotion and transferred to larger facilities (under same management as the private enterprise) at short notice
- Smaller facilities such as Bridgetown could be a “training ground” for prospective facility managers and once trained up they would be transferred to other facilities

The financial risks associated with an outsourced management model are:

- Financial risk is transferred fully (or shared with) private enterprise
- Competing priorities may result in minimal commitment to asset maintenance (This can be overcome by the requirement within an agreement for a maintenance reserve account to be established with both parties contributing).
- A margin (profit) is paid to the private enterprise to run the facility

The feedback from the Department of Sport & Recreation officers further identified the need for a flexible approach to outsourcing service delivery/privatization to enable contractual requirements (and negotiations) to balance financial viability and provide an outcome that was in the best of interest of the community as well as the needs of the two parties entering into the negotiations (the local government authority and the service provider). The importance of clarity regarding what objectives and outcomes Council desired to achieve through outsourcing was stated as being of high importance in achieving a satisfactory outcome should outsourcing service delivery/privatization be pursued. Consensus regarding the condition of all assets (building, equipment etc) was also identified as being of high importance to ensure satisfaction with the return of the asset/s at the end of a contracted term.

The feedback from the Department of Sport and Recreation also highlighted the benefit of 2 – 3 years data collection in relation to usage statistics, expenditure and income. This level (and depth) of data is considered appropriate to allow for both Shire based performance assessments and the development of a realistic tender document and accurately priced submission from potential service providers. Two - three years' worth of data provides consistent averages on all usage and financial matters associated with the provision of services to allow a comprehensive analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats inherent with the provision of services from either Council's perspective or a potential external service provider. It was further identified that following an identified data collection period, an external risk assessment and independent audit on the operations of the BLC be considered. This process would serve to guide officers and elected members in the future operational/management direction of the Centre (which may or may not reflect the benefits of outsourcing).

This approach is supported by officers for 2 reasons:

1. The independent/external review would be based on qualitative data accumulated over the identified 2 -3 year period.
2. The independent/external review removes any possibility of real or perceived bias by officers in relation to process and the outcome.

Discussion with the Department for Sport and Recreation officers also identified the increased exposure to risk (both financial and reputational) that can accompany the outsourcing of service delivery. This risk can include:

- The financial cost of staff redundancies;
- The financial risk of paying a management/operations service provider a management fee while at the same time still being responsible for any operating deficit;
- The financial and reputational risk associated with a possible decline in service delivery
- The financial risk associated with a facility not being maintained to the same standard a local government authority may set, while still being the asset of the local government authority, and the cost associated with upgrading a facility after expiration of the term of the management/service contract.
- The potential lack of continuity in management structure at the facility as the BLC could be one of the smaller facilities under the management of the private enterprise and good managers could be pushed up the line to work at larger facilities.

Officers' note that these risks could be mitigated within the scope of works prepared in a tender process and subsequent negotiations and contract with a potential service provider.

Summary of Potential Service Provider Consultation

Officers consulted with representatives from the two primary providers of recreation centre outsourcing/privatisation in Western Australia, being Belgravia Leisure and YMCA WA. Representatives from both organisations identified the importance of Council clearly identifying the purpose for exploring outsourcing/privatisation – was it simply to share the risk or to find a partner to assist in improving all elements of health, well-being, sport and recreation service delivery to the community? This clarity would assist officers in developing any future scope of works, tender criteria weighting and subsequent contract with a potential service provider. This clarity will also assist potential tenderers to accurately respond to a request for tender in preparing the content and pricing associated with a tender submission.

The officers noted that there was a distinct difference in the fundamental approach of both potential service providers, in so far as one (Belgravia Leisure) was predominantly a commercial based approach, while the other (YMCA WA, as a not-for profit) was a combination of a commercial and community based approach. YMCA WA clearly stated they were not interested in partnerships that were solely commercial based, as their model of centre management and service delivery revolved around adding value to the community via enhanced financial partnership, investing any surplus (on deficit targets) back in the community and improving

existing partnerships both locally and regionally. This included, but was not limited to sport and recreation connections, care and support of young children, parents and youth. Officers noted that this was in alignment with Council's existing Community Services Strategy which seeks to add value to Council's investment in infrastructure by increasing service delivery within Council's facilities.

Both potential service providers identified that they could (and have in the past) prepared proposals to take on the management of recreation centres without qualitative data regarding the usage/patronage and financial operations associated with service delivery. However, they both noted that any such proposal would require a conservative approach to mitigate their exposure to risk due to the lack of data to base their proposals (and management costings) on. So while there is capacity for these potential service providers to prepare such a proposals given the lack of qualitative data (real vs forecast) regarding the usage and financial operations of the newly integrated facility, officers and Council would have difficulty in assessing the value for money of any such proposal due to the inability to benchmark against existing service delivery and the cost of providing that service delivery in-house.

One of the service providers explained they could offer two options for outsourcing:

- Option A – Fee for Service Model: Under this model the local government would pay the private enterprise the difference between revenue and expenditure.
- Option B – Fixed Price Contract Model: Agreed operational deficit calculated and any improved financial performance would go to the private enterprise. This model includes an element of risk to the private enterprise and this obviously has to be factored into the contract.

If Council did resolve to go down the path of outsourcing it could be possible to commence with a fee for service model and after 2-3 years seek to transfer to a fixed price contract model.

As mentioned earlier in this report the DSR did express concerns about the lack of building maintenance and asset management that would occur at a facility under an outsourcing model. This issue was raised with Belgravia Leisure and YMCA WA and both advised that the responsibility for maintenance and asset management would be built into a contract with typically the private enterprise being responsible for maintenance to a capped amount – both per item and per annum for the whole facility. An example given was that the capped amount per item could be \$2,500.

Officers also queried the process of staff change over, should a contract be entered into, with both potential service providers. It was explained by both potential service providers that the standard approach is to explore the performance and viability of rolling over (retaining) the existing staff (and accrued benefits) however this is generally undertaken via a consultation process with the facility owner (in this case the Shire) to identify any existing staff related challenges and performance. It is noted that while such potential service providers can be requested, via the tender criteria, to reflect a commitment to retain as many staff as possible there is generally no obligation for them to do so. However, both potential service providers identified the reality that it is generally more efficient to retain the majority of staff (in rural

areas especially) and invest in their training and development. Organizations such as YMCA WA and Belgravia Leisure have greater capacity to do this effectively in-house, within industry, than local government authorities (due to the industry specific nature of this area of service delivery).

Summary of Officer Comment

Consultation with potential service providers identified positive and tangible benefits regarding the option of outsourcing service delivery/privatisation of service delivery at the BLC. These include:

- The capacity to share the financial risk associated with service delivery
- The ability to work with industry leaders with industry specific expertise, purchasing power, back up staff, program delivery and marketing
- The ability to improve financial performance
- The ability to improve customer service
- The ability to respond quickly to change and to deliver innovative programming
- The ability to shift accountability (perceived and real) from Council to industry specific leaders with capacity to respond swiftly to issues and complaints

In preparing the recommendations to Council associated with this report, officers have considered the consistency of response from all stakeholders regarding the need for accumulating relevant data (usage/patronage and financial operations) as the first step in the process. This step was previously identified by staff, and supported by Council, as reflected in the investment in leisure centre specific operating software to capture usage and financial data to form the basis for future decision making. The ability to collect such information (there was no such software in place prior to the recent integration, and the integration in a sense has created a 'new' facility in terms of services offered within the BLC) will enable Council to fully assess the cost associated with managing the Centre and will provide a point of comparison against any future tender submission. This is why a 2 year period is recommended to allow for the collation of data, identified improvements in management/service delivery to be implemented.

Officers also note that the process of conducting a tender to privatise/outsource service delivery will be a complex process that will require an investment of time to achieve the best possible outcome. This will include development of concise and clear expectations around the purpose for the tender, the preparation of a comprehensive scope of works for the tender (including the establishment of desired service levels such as facility opening hours, programming types and expectations, etc.), assessing the tenders and finalising contractual negotiations with a successful tender applicant prior to actual change of management occurring. This is why an additional 1 year period is considered necessary within the proposed 2 - 3 year time frame. Council may also wish to explore the suggestion by Department and Sport and Recreation to appoint an external consultant to assess the viability of the BLC at the end of the recommended 2 year data collection and change implementation period (change resulting from the integration of the two former standalone facilities) and this could also be factored in to the proposed 2 – 3 year time line.

Whilst acknowledging that some staff and performance issues have negatively impacted the operations of the BLC, the threat of outsourcing (twice in 2 years) has

negatively impacted on the culture and enthusiasm of staff. A period of 2 -3 years to commit to achieving improvements, making required organisational adjustments and other key changes will enable senior management a time frame to effectively manage change. To date this hasn't been possible due to the focus on infrastructure development and integration of the two former separate facilities.

Statutory Environment – Not applicable

Policy - Nil

Strategic Implications

➤ Strategic Community Plan 2016

Objective 3 – our community enjoys a high quality of life

Outcome 3.1 – maintain a high standard of lifestyle, recreational and cultural facilities

Strategy 3.1.1 – ensure the Bridgetown Leisure Centre provides a wide range of activities and services

Strategy 3.1.4 – implement the Sport and Recreation Strategic Plan

Objective 4 – a collaborative and engaged community

Outcome 4.5 – long term financial viability

Strategy 4.5.3 – seek efficiencies in planning and operations

➤ Corporate Business Plan

Strategy 3.1.1 - ensure the Bridgetown Leisure Centre provides a wide range of activities and services

Action 3.1.1.1 - Implement Integrated Recreation Complex Business Plan

➤ Long Term Financial Plan - Nil

➤ Asset Management Plans – Nil

➤ Workforce Plan - Nil

➤ Other Integrated Planning - Nil

Budget Implications

There are no budget implications arising from the officer recommendation. If Council determines to explore the outsourcing of the management/operations of the BLC there will be cost implications associated with utilising WALGA Procurement services to conduct the tender process.

Fiscal Equity - Not Applicable

Whole of Life Accounting

The recommendation achieves whole of life accounting principles by ensuring comprehensive data is collated to inform (and subsequently direct) senior management and elected members as to the future direction (operational and strategic) of the Bridgetown Leisure Centre.

Social Equity – Not Applicable

Ecological Equity – Not Applicable

Cultural Equity – Not Applicable

Risk Management

The recommendation achieves risk management principles by ensuring appropriate levels of advice are sought in decision making and comprehensive data is collated to inform (and subsequently direct) senior management and elected members as to the future direction (operational and strategic) of the Bridgetown Leisure Centre.

Continuous Improvement

The recommendation achieves the principles of continuous improvement by ensuring comprehensive data is collated to inform (and subsequently direct) senior management and elected members as to the future direction (operational and strategic) of the Bridgetown Leisure Centre.

Voting Requirements - Simple Majority

Organisation Development

ITEM NO.	SC.04/0716	FILE REF.	209
SUBJECT	Rolling Action Sheet		
OFFICER	Chief Executive Officer		
DATE OF REPORT	1 July 2016		

Attachment 4 - Rolling Action Sheet

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION that the information contained in the Rolling Action Sheet be noted.

Summary/Purpose

The presentation of the Rolling Action Sheet allows Councillors to be aware of the current status of Items/Projects that have not been finalised.

Background

The Rolling Action Sheet has been reviewed and forms an Attachment to this Agenda.

Statutory Environment – Nil

Policy/Strategic Plan Implications - Nil

Budget Implications – Nil

Fiscal Equity – Not Applicable

Whole of Life Accounting – Not Applicable

Social Equity – Not Applicable

Ecological Equity – Not Applicable

Cultural Equity – Not Applicable

Risk Management – Not Applicable

Continuous Improvement – Not Applicable

Voting Requirements – Simple Majority

Urgent Business Approved by Decision

Responses to Elected Members Questions Taken on Notice

Elected Members Questions With Notice

[Elected Members Questions with Notice should be submitted to the Executive Assistant prior to 10.00am on the day of the Standing Committee Meeting]

Briefings by Officers

Notice of Motions for Consideration at Next Meeting

Matters Behind Closed Doors

Closure

The Presiding Member to close the Meeting

List of Attachments

Attachment	Item No.	Details
1	SC.02/0716	Community Engagement Strategy for the Full Review of the Strategic Community Plan
2	SC.02/0716	Review of Strategic Community Plan: Report of Findings Community Survey 2015/16
3	SC.02/0716	Review of Strategic Community Plan: Results of Community Survey Undertaken in 2015
4	SC.04/0716	Rolling Action Sheet

Agenda Papers checked and authorised by CEO, Mr T Clynych		7.7.16
---	---	--------