# Purpose

The purpose of this document is to summarise the key outcomes of the 2021 review of Council’s Road Management Plan (RMP). It is a requirement of the Road Management (General) Regulations 2016 that each Council must conduct and complete a review of its RMP during the same period as it is completing its Council Plan and make publicly available a written report summarising the findings and conclusions of the review.

# Scope

The Road Management (General) Regulations 2016 states that:

*In conducting a review of its road management plan, a road authority must ensure that the standards in relation to, and the priorities to be given to, the inspection, maintenance and repair of the roads and classes of road to which the plan applies are appropriate.*

The Code of Practice for Road Management Plans requires that standards set in the plan take into consideration: infrastructure type, community expectations; risk; available resources; the use of temporary measures and warning systems; potential impacts on utilities; and environmental and cultural factors. It is in this context that the standards to inspect repair and maintain road infrastructure have been reviewed.

In addition to reassessing the standards, the review has considered changes to Council’s systems and processes for managing assets and changes to the structure of the RMP to bring it in line with Council’s policy guidelines.

The review includes the preparation of a draft amended plan, to be notified in accordance with the Regulations.

# Background

Council’s RMP was developed in accordance with the Road Management Act (2004) and supporting regulations and codes of practice. It was last reviewed on 15 August 2017.

The purpose of a Road Management Plan as set out in the Road Management Act is to:

1. to establish a management system for the road management functions of a road authority which is based on policy and operational objectives and available resources; and
2. to set the relevant standard in relation to the discharge of duties in the performance of those road management functions.

# Outline of Review Process

The review was initiated through a Casey Conversations survey seeking feedback on the current RMP followed by a series of internal workshops involving staff from City Presentation and City and Asset Planning Departments. Following the workshops, a Review Panel analysed the issues arising, with particular emphasis on ensuring standardsin relation to, and the priorities to be given to, the inspection, maintenance and repair of the roads and classes of road to which the plan applies are appropriate and an effective use of the available resources.

Feedback from Casey conversation survey and staff responsible for the implementation of the plan was taken into account in the preparation of changes to inspection, repair or maintenance activities. Tables summarising these considerations is shown in appendix 1. Refer to the separate *2021 – Road Management Plan insights report* for the feedback on key themes identified in the survey.

The RMP provides Council with a policy defence against civil liability claims associated with management of the road network, provided Council has met the standards established in its Plan. Standards therefore are set on the basis that they can be complied with at all times, rather than targets which may not be achieved in all circumstances. Targets are more appropriately set in customer charters or operational plans and practices. Changes to the RMP have been recommended on the basis of minimising overall risk within available resources.

The review panel comprised staff holding the following positions:

* Head of Assets and Capital Works, City and Asset Planning
* Head of Facilities and Infrastructure, City Presentation
* Head of Open Space and City Greening, City Presentation
* Team Leader Roads and Drains, City Presentation
* Team Leader Sports Turf and Pathways, City Presentation
* Coordinator Paths, Trails and Bridges, City Presentation
* Risk Management Coordinator, Governance
* Senior Asset Management Planner, City and Asset Planning

Road Management Plans made by neighbouring municipalities were also considered as a factor in determining the appropriateness of assessment frequencies and interventions.

Council has considered service levels (i.e. maintenance intervention levels, maintenance response times, hazard inspection frequencies) of the following nearby Councils in this review:

* Cardinia Shire Council
* City of Greater Dandenong
* Knox City Council
* Monash City Council
* Whitehorse City Council
* Frankston City Council

In general, Council’s service levels appear reasonable when compared with those of neighbouring municipalities, although a direct comparison is not always accurate due to the differences in processes and descriptions. In some instances, City of Casey documents a relatively high level of service to respond to local community need and expectation, but for most part its service levels sit around the average.

# Summary of changes to Activities and Service Levels

As a result of this Review, amendments to the RMP as tabled below are proposed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix** | **Asset** | **Activity** | **Current Level** | **Proposed Changes** | **Explanation** |
| C | Line Marking  Trunk Collector/ Collector Roads | Maintenance Inspection of line marking on all relevant roads (including controlled intersections) and car parks | 2 years  3 years | Yearly  Yearly | Consolidation of Sealed Road line marking into one single category with frequency of “yearly” and maximum interval of “15 months” |
| Local and Limited Access Roads |
| C | Road Bridges | Level 1 hazard and  maintenance inspection | 12 weeks | 24 weeks | This brings the frequencies in line with what is recommended from VicRoads Road Structures Inspection Manual 2018 |
| D | Sealed Roads | Isolated pavement failures (up to 5sq.m of pavement surface area | 10 working days | No longer a separate response | The items are incorporated into the more general equivalents under the same section |
| D | Sealed Roads | Regulation of wheel ruts and depressions | 3 months | No longer a separate response |
| D | Sealed Roads | Placement of shoulder materials | 10 working day | No longer a separate response |
| D | Shared paths | Vertical Clearance above shared paths | 70 working days | No longer a separate response | Shared path service standards are aligned with footpath service standards |
| D | Shared Paths | Cyclist envelope (horizontal clearance) | 70 working days | No longer a separate response |
| D | Shared Paths | Horizontal sight line. | 70 working days | No longer a separate response |
| D | Drainage | Severely damaged or missing pit lids | 30 working days | 10 working days | Severely damaged or missing pit lids are assessed as high risk and they required a quicker response than a damaged pit lid. |

# Conclusion

Amendments to the RMP are required to satisfy the outcomes of this review, which require the process outlined in Regulation 10 of the Road Management (General) Regulations 2016 to be followed. A marked-up copy of the RMP showing these proposed amendments is provided as a separate document.

# Recommendations

That a notice be given to amend the road Management Plan as in the attached revision, in accordance with Regulation 10 of the Road Management (General) Regulations 2016.

# Appendix 1 – Feedback from staff responsible for the RMP Review

Issues raised by Council officers in the course of this review have also been considered by the review panel. These are summarised in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Issue** | **Outcome** |
| 1 | Sealed Roads line marking inspection should be rolled into one as all roads are inspected annually | The review panel accepted the recommendation and decided to roll all line marking inspections into one. |
| 2 | Road bridges level 1 hazard and maintenance inspection should be aligned with the Department of Transport (DoT) inspection frequency. | The review panel accepted the recommendation and decided to align the road bridges level 1 hazard and maintenance inspection to the Department of Transport inspection frequency. |
| 3 | Sealed roads isolated pavement failures (up to 5sq.m of pavement surface area); regulation of wheel ruts and depressions and placement of shoulder materials should be removed because, they are incorporated into the more general equivalents under the same section | The review panel accepted the recommendation and decided to remove the activities. |
| 4 | Shared path specific service standards should be aligned to footpath service standards in line with the neighbouring Councils. | After assessing the neighbouring Councils road management plans, the review panel accepted that the recommendation is in line with most of the neighbouring Councils standards, and hence decided to align the shared path specific service standards with the footpath standards. |
| 5 | Severely damaged or missing pit lids are replaced in shorter time frame in consideration with the potential risk involved. | The review panel conducted a risk assessment and agreed to review the response time for severely damaged or missing pit lids. |