

Frankston City Council Road Management Plan Review



May 2021

Lifestyle Capital of Victoria

Document Control

Version	Description	Distribution	Date
V1.1	Initial Draft	Key Internal Stakeholders	22 March 2021
V1.2	Final Draft – Incorporates all feedback provided.	Council	31 May 2021

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Purpose of a Road Management Plan	4
3. Review Scope.....	5
4. Assessment of Community Satisfaction	5
4.1 Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey Results (2012 - 2020).....	5
4.2 Community Feedback on the Current RMP	7
5. Comparison with other Road Authority Plans.....	7
5.1 RMP Format.....	8
6. Assessment of Recent Performance.....	9
6.1 RMP Compliance – Frankston Asset Management Information System (FAMIS) Report	9
6.2 Internal/External Audits	13
7. Feedback from Staff.....	14
8. Next Steps.....	15
8.1 Finalisation of the Review	15
8.2 Amendment of the Road Management Plan	15
Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to the RMP 2019.....	16
Attachment 2 – Other Authority RMP Comparison	20

List of Tables

Table 1: Community Satisfaction Survey Results - Condition of local streets and footpaths	6
Table 2: FAMIS Maintenance Results	10

1. Introduction

A road authority that has made a Road Management Plan (RMP) must conduct a review of that plan in accordance with the regulations at the intervals prescribed by the Road Management (General) Regulations 2016 (Regulations) — see section 54(5) of the Road Management Act (the Act).

Council has undertaken a review of its current RMP (2019), in accordance with the Act and Regulations, and has prepared this report to document findings. The Review is to 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 Road Management Plan applies are appropriate.

Proposed amendments to Council’s current RMP (2019) are described within this report and may be implemented as part of the formal amendment process as described in the Act.

2. Purpose of a Road Management Plan

Section 50 of the Road Management Act 2004 (RMA) states that the purpose of a Road Management Plan (RMP) is:

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.

If complied with, the RMP provides Council with a policy defence against civil liability claims associated with management of the municipal road network.

3. Review Scope

The Review of Council's RMP has been undertaken in accordance with the current Road Management Act 2004 and Part 3 of the Road Management (General) Regulations (2016).

The Review summarised in this report, includes consideration of the following:

- Recommended amendments to the current RMP 2019 (refer to Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to the RMP 2019).
- Assessment of community satisfaction:
 - Local government community satisfaction survey results (2012 - 2020).
- Comparison with neighbouring Council's Road Management Plans (refer to Attachment 2 – Other Authority RMP Comparison)
- Assessment of recent performance:
 - RMP compliance as reported in Council's asset and works management information system (FAMIS).
- Feedback from Council staff responsible for implementation of the RMP.

4. Assessment of Community Satisfaction

4.1 Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey Results (2012 - 2020)

Council participates in the annual Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey (LGCSSS), which is coordinated by the Department of Environment, Land, Water, and Planning. The survey benchmarks Council's performance against other participating Victorian Councils (62 Councils in 2020).

Although the survey is at a relatively high level, it provides participating Councils with information about how their performance is rated by the communities they serve. Table 1 shows community satisfaction on the condition of local streets and footpaths between 2012 and 2020. Scores are rated out of 100 with higher scores translating to a higher level of satisfaction.

Over this period, survey results suggest that the community is generally satisfied with Council's current approach to the management of its road and footpath assets. Frankston's 9 year average is 63, one point below the Melbourne metropolitan council average of 64.

When the Survey was adjusted in 2015, Council has since received lower scores than the metropolitan average scores indicating there may still be room for improvement in road and footpath management across Frankston City.

Table 1: Community Satisfaction Survey Results - Condition of local streets and footpaths¹

Survey Area	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Average (9 years)
Frankston	61	62	65	64	63	59	64	66	60	63
Melbourne Metropolitan	59	58	59	59	67	66	68	69	67	64
State Wide	57	58	58	55	54	53	53	56	54	55

Whilst there has been a reduction in community satisfaction from 2019 to 2020, road asset management data indicates that management of the municipal road network has not changed over recent years.

Expenditure on road management has remained at an appropriate level across maintenance and capital works and the road network condition has remained in a healthy condition (as evidence from the road condition audit results from 2018/19).

A reduction in community satisfaction during this period may be as a result of the various roadworks occurring throughout the municipality and the congestion being experienced by road users as opposed to issues related to Council's RMP.

Additionally, some survey participants may not realise that the main roads (arterials) and/or freeways within the municipality are coordinated by the Department of Transport and are not the responsibility of Council.

It is recommended that future surveys relating to the condition of the road network expand on questions around satisfaction of local roads and streets to better understand where there are enhancement opportunities.

¹ Condition of local streets and footpaths' performance measure was changed in 2015 to 'Condition of sealed local roads in your area'

4.2 Community Feedback on the Current RMP

Under the Road Management (General) Regulations (2016), it is not a requirement to seek community feedback on the Review of the current RMP. As such, no feedback has been sought from the community as part of this Review.

Should the Review recommend amendments to the current RMP, the process to facilitate these adjustments in accordance with regulation 10, requires Council to submit a public notice on the proposed amendments, should they be of a lesser standard than what is currently within the RMP. Aggrieved persons may make a submission on the appropriateness of those proposed amendments.

5. Comparison with other Road Authority Plans

The Frankston RMP 2019 was compared with the plans prepared by other road authorities including:

- VicRoads
- City of Casey
- City of Greater Dandenong
- City of Kingston
- Mornington Peninsula Shire

The purpose of this comparison was to benchmark Council's RMP against the RMPs of other road authorities, including neighbouring Council's, in order to assess the reasonableness of Frankston City Council's current RMP. It must be noted that it was difficult to make a direct comparison due to the subtle differences in processes and descriptions adopted by each authority.

This comparison has influenced the recommended changes to the structure and contents of the Frankston RMP. Differences between the plans, including inspection and maintenance service level standards, are identified in Attachment 2 – Other Authority RMP Comparison.

5.1 RMP Format

The majority of neighbouring Councils include the following information in their RMPs consistent with Frankston's RMP:

- Purpose
- Scope
- Defect Intervention Levels
- Rectification Timeframes
- Reactive Maintenance
- Defect Inspections
- Road Hierarchies

Notable differences when comparing Frankston's RMP with other road authorities are:

- Length of document – Frankston's RMP is significantly longer than other plans (this is largely due to the inclusion of the Public Road Register within the document).
- Inclusion of Public Road Register in the RMP – all other road authorities have this as a separate document / register to manage.
- Some other road authorities have adopted different defect intervention levels for different road hierarchies, whilst Frankston uses the same standard across all roads and path hierarchies.

Council purposely takes this approach to ensure all defects are identified and rectified in the same manner regardless of the road hierarchy. Council does however undertake routine defect inspections at different frequencies as higher use (and often higher speed) roads such as Major and Collector Roads require regular inspection due to asset criticality and increased risk when compared to low use (and often lower speed) roads such as Laneways, Service Roads and Local Access Roads.

- One Council distinguishes between urban and rural roads within the road hierarchy.
- Frankston's RMP includes information on routine maintenance activities/scheduling whilst others cover only routine defect inspections and associated maintenance activities and timeframes. Some Council's note these practices are explained further in their respective Road Asset Management Plans.
- Overall, Frankston's RMP seems to be more detailed than other road authority's RMPs, particularly around the management of other ancillary assets within the road reserve, responsibility of property owners and utility service providers and their assets within the road reserve, and the level of detail provided in descriptions of reactive works.

6. Assessment of Recent Performance

6.1 RMP Compliance – Frankston Asset Management Information System (FAMIS) Report

Council is able to assess compliance with its RMP through reporting functions in the Frankston Asset Management System (FAMIS).

Since July 2017, almost 30,000 routine defect inspections have been undertaken in accordance with the RMP. These include:

- Internal Drainage Pit Defect Inspections
- Road & Road Related Defect Inspections
- Unsealed Road Defect Inspections
- Night Inspections
- Roadside Vegetation Line Clearance Low Voltage Inspections
- Path & Path Related Defect Inspections
- Roadside Vegetation Line Clearance Inspections

91% of these inspections were completed within a one month timeframe in accordance with the RMP, as compared to 84% on average from the previous RMP review. This indicates that the defect inspection frequencies are set at an appropriate level and do not need to be altered significantly. Where possible, inspections will be optimised to assist with the management and completion of initial assessments, temporary works and rectification works. Any proposed changes to inspections are listed in Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to the RMP 2019.

An assessment has been completed on Council's ability to meet initial assessment, temporary works and rectification works timeframes as set out in the RMP. Performance across these areas over the period beginning 1 July 2017 are as follows:

- Of the 30,831 initial assessments undertaken, 26,327 (85.4% average) were completed on time in accordance with the RMP.
- Of the 353 temporary work orders raised, 246 (69.1% average) were completed on time in accordance with the RMP.
- Of the 24,991 rectification work orders raised, 21,464 (85.9% average) were completed on time in accordance with the RMP.

When comparing these results with results from the previous RMP review undertaken in 2017, there has been significant improvement to the completion of initial assessments within given timeframes. 85.4% of initial assessments were completed on time as compared to 63% in the previous review (2014/15 – 2016/17).

In the former Review, it was noted that the previous changes made to the RMP in 2007 to implement initial assessments to judge risk of the work orders required further staff support and training to implement successfully. Since then, an effort has been made to improve the understanding of the initial assessment process, and data from the past 4 years now demonstrates this improvement.

A detailed breakdown of performance across maintenance activities can be seen in Table 2 below. A target of 90% compliance with the RMP has been set.

Table 2: FAMIS Maintenance Results

Maintenance Activity		2017-18 % Complete on Time	2018-19 % Complete on Time	2019-20 % Complete on Time	2020-21 (1 Jul 2020 to 10 Mar 2021) % Complete on Time
Bridges & Major Culverts	Initial Assessment	67%	60%	50%	0%
	Temporary Works	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Rectification Works	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Drainage	Initial Assessment	85%	91%	93%	91%
	Temporary Works	42%	80%	64%	80%
	Rectification Works	90%	94%	92%	92%
Footpaths	Initial Assessment	79%	77%	80%	84%
	Temporary Works	61%	55%	57%	100%
	Rectification Works	87%	86%	71%	88%
Kerb & Channel	Initial Assessment	91%	93%	90%	91%
	Temporary Works	0%	N/A	N/A	0%
	Rectification Works	93%	92%	77%	96%
Local Area Traffic Management	Initial Assessment	96%	94%	95%	91%
	Temporary Works	0%	0%	100%	N/A
	Rectification Works	100%	71%	92%	100%
Minor Structures	Initial Assessment	84%	72%	53%	78%
	Temporary Works	0%	100%	N/A	N/A

Maintenance Activity		2017-18 % Complete on Time	2018-19 % Complete on Time	2019-20 % Complete on Time	2020-21 (1 Jul 2020 to 10 Mar 2021) % Complete on Time
	Rectification Works	88%	86%	67%	100%
Road Furniture	Initial Assessment	87%	89%	94%	85%
	Temporary Works	50%	60%	100%	83%
	Rectification Works	64%	81%	96%	93%
Road Pavement	Initial Assessment	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Temporary Works	N/A	0%	N/A	N/A
	Rectification Works	100%	100%	87%	50%
Roadside Vegetation	Initial Assessment	86%	87%	84%	83%
	Temporary Works	80%	80%	71%	67%
	Rectification Works	91%	95%	91%	97%
Sealed Road Surface	Initial Assessment	81%	75%	80%	85%
	Temporary Works	33%	100%	100%	100%
	Rectification Works	34% ²	47%	76%	80%
Shared Path	Initial Assessment	83%	81%	92%	92%
	Temporary Works	25%	100%	100%	N/A
	Rectification Works	88%	64%	82%	94%
Signs	Initial Assessment	80%	90%	92%	85%
	Temporary Works	50%	69%	90%	56%
	Rectification Works	88%	97%	96%	95%
Unsealed Road Surface	Initial Assessment	89%	79%	89%	63%
	Temporary Works	N/A	0%	100%	100%
	Rectification Works	91%	88%	95%	91%
Total	Initial Assessment	84%	85%	87%	85%
	Temporary Works	52%	71%	77%	75%
	Rectification Works	80%	86%	88%	91%

² 528 of the 668 sealed road surface work orders which were not completed on time in 2017/18 related to Pavement Marking Maintenance (RS-REA-005). Following process improvements and staff education, Council has been more effective at raising and completing these reactive work orders in recent years.

Given the results above indicate that performance for initial assessments and rectification works is very close to the 90% target, it is considered that significant amendment or lowering of the service standards or inspection frequencies is not required, and that remedial action/minor enhancements can be made in the first instance.

A barrier to achieving the target compliance is that often insufficient information is provided at the time of raising the work order and maintenance crews are unable to locate the defect or understand the issue which needs to be resolved. This delays work orders as further information must be sought before works can commence.

Occasionally there are also minor system and process issues that are noticed which can also result delays in the work orders. Some recent examples include:

- Some customer requests relating to trees were stored in the same location as RMP work orders and it was difficult to prioritise works. Work orders have now been separated and issues resolved.
- Slight differences in interpretation of the RMP can sometimes lead to delays.
- Due to the system being highly customised, there are sometimes unexplainable issues that occur where work order workflows are disrupted and work orders become delayed. This requires investigation and often manual reallocation of work orders so that they may be closed. Whilst this doesn't happen often, it is still an issue which Council recognises as needing to be resolved.

It is also important to note that due to the Covid-19 pandemic, Council's CEO (as delegate) made the decision to suspend all service and intervention levels and works priorities set out in the RMP for the period between 16 September 2020 and 20 November 2020, in accordance with Section 83 of the Victorian Wrongs Act 1958. Only critical works assessed as high risk were able to be undertaken, and as such, this may have impacted results during this period.

Whilst Council has made improvements in RMP work order performance, it is evident that further improvement is still required to achieve total compliance. In order for Council to maintain its policy defence as afforded under the Act, compliance must be achieved and any issues must be resolved swiftly.

The following improvements can be made to enhance Council's road management processes and practices:

- Providing ongoing training and support to existing and new staff on the interpretation and application of the Road Management Plan. Also provide ongoing training and support for use of Kern Mobile and FAMIS software and devices;
- Continue to invest in FAMIS;

- Continue to undertake internal audits of the RMP to seek independent advice on how to improve and strengthen Council's road management practices and improve its policy defence and;
- Enhance the reporting and monitoring framework to effectively measure ongoing performance against the RMP allowing any deficiencies to be addressed quickly.

In order to comply with the RMP and any proposed amendments, in particular any changes to the maintenance and inspection service levels, it is critical that Council has and maintains an effective Frankston Asset Management Information System (FAMIS) to facilitate and monitor compliance and to facilitate analysis for improvement opportunities or reallocation of resources.

6.2 Internal/External Audits

As part of the internal audit services provided to Council, an audit of the Road Management Plan has been undertaken in 2020 as part of the 2019-2020 Internal Audit Program. The objective of the internal audit was to evaluate Council compliance with the Road Management Act 2004, the internal controls and processes relating to the Road Management Plan and to identify any potential risks and/or opportunities to improve related practices.

The report concludes that Council has a robust framework (and associated policies and procedures) in place to manage road assets and ensure compliance with relevant legislative obligations. However, some minor opportunities of improvement were identified.

The two findings and recommendations made in the report are listed below:

1. Instances identified where reactive maintenance work orders were either not closed or closed after due date (risk rating assessed as medium).

Recommendation: Ensure that reactive maintenance work orders are closed within target timeframe.

2. Compliance Register for Road Management Act 2004 needs enhancement (risk rating assessed as low).

Recommendation: Consider revising the Compliance Register and incorporate areas mentioned in the "Observations Column" of the audit report.

Since the audit in February 2020, Council has already implemented actions to address the above risks identified.

In terms of the Compliance Register for the Road Management Act 2004; a Compliance Management Framework has been adopted by Council at its meeting in February 2020, which makes provision for internal

audits to be conducted by Governance on a regular basis, to ensure policies, procedures and compliance requirements are in place and are being adhered to.

Additionally, the Compliance Register (RelianSys) contains subscribed legislation which is allocated to a responsible Manager to provide regular reporting updates on identified high and medium risk obligations. This includes any provisions within various Acts / Regulations where Council must have a Policy.

A number of actions have also been taken to ensure reactive work orders, including initial assessment response times should be actioned and closed within the target timeframe.

Improvements have been made to address to the ongoing monitoring and reporting of reactive works orders. These improvements will ensure a dynamic and proactive approach to works management. Improvements include:

- Work order reporting requirements have been reviewed and identified with Coordinators, Team Leaders and Supervisors at the Operations Centre. These requirements have resulted in modifications to existing reports within FAMIS to meet these needs.
- Newly created dashboard reports have been made available to track 'Open' work orders for each of the City Works Team Leaders to view on a daily basis when launching FAMIS.
- Newly created reports and training has been provided to relevant Team Leaders in Parks & Gardens to ensure completion of work orders in KERN by the target timeframe. These work orders are now being actioned on an ongoing basis.
- Officers have investigated which work orders have not been completed in time from a system perspective and have taken measures to ensure proactive management and enhanced monitoring of reactive works management.

Council will continue to undertake independent audits of its Road Management Plan in order to identify any issues with road management practices, and any opportunities to improve.

7. Feedback from Staff

Representatives from the following Council departments were consulted for this Review:

- Capital Works Delivery
- Commercial Services

- Engineering Services
- Operations
- Sustainable Assets

Officers were asked to provide feedback on the current RMP (2019), including any changes that can be made to the document to provide clarity and an improved policy defence or any adjustments to service levels and timeframes which may be needed.

Various feedback was received relating to different elements of the Plan including document layout/wording (administrative suggestions), defect intervention levels, reactive and routine maintenance and the Public Road Register. Proposed amendments recommended from internal staff consultation are provided in Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to the RMP 2019.

Significantly, it was noted that Council needs to further refine its management of roadside vegetation defects, particularly relating to trees encroaching road, footpath and shared path envelopes. Council is currently seeking external professional advice how to improve the management of roadside vegetation and associated risks.

8. Next Steps

8.1 Finalisation of the Review

The review and subsequent amendment process is defined in the Road Management (General) Regulations (2016). Firstly, this report on the findings and conclusions of the review must be made publicly available.

8.2 Amendment of the Road Management Plan

The procedure for amendment and notification of amendment defined by Part 3, Division 2 and regulations 10, 11, 12 and 13 must be followed. The regulations do not specify the timing for implementation of amendments.

It is recommended that Council work towards undertaking the amendment process for its Road Management Plan during 2022 to completely implement the recommended changes in a timely fashion.

Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to the RMP 2019

Amendment No.	Proposed Amendment	RMP Reference
Administrative		
1.	Include a note under the desirable physical features of roads and footpaths that it needs to be subject to Council's discretion.	3.1 – Road & Path Hierarchies
2.	Update references to Council's construction standard drawing in RMP where required.	Entire Document
3.	Include water meters in list of assets managed by utility service providers.	C.6
4.	Include information of management of hazards / safety issues caused by other service providers assets – Council may wish to seek reimbursement if required to manage these hazards for an extended period.	C.6
5.	Update referenced regulations including: Road Management (General) Regulations (2016) and Road Management (Works and Infrastructure) Regulations (2015).	C.6
6.	Clarify figure 5 – the line at the road is the face of kerb (edge of trafficable width).	C.3 – Driveways (Vehicle Crossovers)
7.	Table 6 – change Local Access Road desirable kerb to rollover or barrier.	B.1 – Road Hierarchy
8.	Table 6 – change KCAA posted speed limit to 30-40km/h.	B.1 – Road Hierarchy
9.	Footpaths standards to be updated to 1.5m.	B.2 – Path Hierarchy
10.	Add bike grates to drainage defects (DE-006) so that they are addressed as part of reactive maintenance.	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
11.	Add in new footpath defect for damaged grates located in a footpath. These need to be replaced per Council's Standard Drawings.	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
12.	Provide further clarification on the road grading program. Grade road and unsealed road shoulder surface to maintain safety on 6 month cycle (more frequent on high traffic roads). Shape will be reassessed every 2 years and brought back to design standard with additional material if required.	E.4.2 – Routine Maintenance
13.	Include photos of defects within table 10 showing signs, line marking, reflectors etc. with less than 50% reflectivity.	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
14.	Include on page 125 under 'not included in this RMP', off street carparks and associated signs and line marking.	C1 – Assets Managed in Accordance with this Plan

Amendment No.	Proposed Amendment	RMP Reference
15.	Provide a map and/or Council's schedule of zone works in the RMP, and include references to this map & schedule in routine maintenance and inspection sections of the Plan.	Appendices
16.	Include reference to the reporting and monitoring framework including RMP service levels and works management performance to ensure compliance to the RMP and enable any deficiencies to be identified and rectified promptly.	4.4 Performance Monitoring & Review
17.	RV-REA-005 Stump Removal – clarify what is potentially 'hazardous' to users (RV-012) – use same wording as in RV-012	E.4.1 Reactive Maintenance
18.	Change RV-REA-007 Weed Control activity description to - Removal of weeds/grasses resulting in fire management risk or affecting sight distance for vehicles and traffic management.	E.4.1 Reactive Maintenance & Defect Intervention Levels (Table 10)
19.	Include bollards and boundary fencing for assets constructed by a property owner and provide direction on how to handle these if they are hazardous and posing high risk to road users.	C.5 Assets Constructed by Property Owner
20.	Remove the Public Road Register from the Road Management Plan document and keep as a separate appendix. This will make updating the register easier to manage.	Attachment A – Public Road Register
21.	Update Code of Practice for Electric Safety (Electric Line Clearance) Regulations 2015 to 2020 in defect RV-001.	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
22.	Include "fencing" as an example of assets constructed by property owner.	C.5 Assets Constructed by a Property Owner
23.	Update description of DI-003 to "DI-003 Broken frames that no longer support the pit lid securely".	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
Managing Unexpected Renewal Works		
24.	Increase distressed area of asphalt and concrete footpaths to 20 square meters or greater.	E.5 – Managing Unexpected Renewal Works
25.	Increase distressed area of asphalt and concrete shared paths to 25 square meters or greater.	E.5 – Managing Unexpected Renewal Works
26.	Increase distressed area of sealed roads from 10 square meters to 50 square meters or greater.	E.5 – Managing Unexpected Renewal Works

Amendment No.	Proposed Amendment	RMP Reference
27.	Change kerb and channel unit of measure to “lineal” meters	E.5 – Managing Unexpected Renewal Works
Defect Intervention and Maintenance Service Levels		
28.	Change RV-002 to maintain a minimum 1m trafficable width in accordance with Australian Standards and vegetation height must be 25mm or greater (pathway tripping defect) and representing a tripping hazard.	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
29.	RV-REA-002 Pruning - Street Trees & Shrubs – roadway height clearance of 4.5m (RV-004) and lateral clearance of 200mm from back of kerb (RV-005) is not achievable in some situations, particularly on local roads. This intervention is appropriate for Major and Collector roads but more discretion is needed for Local Access Roads, Service Roads and Laneways. Where clearance cannot be met, cautionary signage is to be provided however this may result in numerous signs being installed in a close proximity. Need to better define defect intervention levels for vegetation management and distinguish between low risk and high risk defects. External professional advice is being sought and will be incorporated in the amended RMP.	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
30.	Change RV-015 to – Weeds/Grass >500mm high, within 1.5m of back of kerb/shoulder during the fire danger period	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
31.	Add new shared path defect intervention for hazard clearance – Hazard which may result in cyclist losing control or being injured if struck within 1m of either side of the shared path (or 0.3m if the hazard is a fence or smooth obstacle aligned parallel to the path) as per the Australian Standards. Include defect in SP-REA-005 Clear Obstructions - Shared Path	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10) & E.4.1 – Reactive Maintenance (table 19)
32.	Add new shared path defect intervention – Slope/batter within 1m from edge of shared path steeper than 1:6 as per Australian Standards. Include defect in SP-REA-005 Clear Obstructions - Shared Path	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10) & E.4.1 – Reactive Maintenance (table 19)
33.	Update SP-REA-005 Clear Obstructions - Shared Path reactive work activity description to include: If the hazard cannot be removed that it needs to be managed appropriately with signage/reflectors/fencing etc. where available to do so.	E.4.1 – Reactive Maintenance (table 19)
34.	Change B-REA-003 to raise a request with Melbourne Water to clear out debris around bridges / major culverts and log the reference number as Council is not permitted to clear the debris.	E.4.1 – Reactive Maintenance (table 19)

Amendment No.	Proposed Amendment	RMP Reference
35.	Crack Sealing RS-REA-003 – should be based on a square meter as opposed to linear meter. Change RS-005 intervention level to 15mm wide and more than 5m2.	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
36.	Update frequency of routine drainage maintenance D-ROU-001 Clear Blocked Drainage Pits and D-ROU-002 Open Drain Maintenance to a 4 yearly cycle and include monthly/quarterly frequencies for critical drainage assets as identified.	E.4.2 – Routine Maintenance
37.	Include warning signs as part of Road and Road Related defect inspections	E.2.5 Road & Road Related Defect Inspections
38.	Add new defect intervention level for wheel rutting / depressions which are >50mm depth under a 1.2m straight edge on sealed road surfaces.	E.2.1 - Defect Intervention Levels (table 10)
Public Road Register		
39.	Update road and pathway listing in the Public Road Register in accordance with the outcomes of the annual review.	Attachment A – Public Road Register
40.	The frequency of updating Council's Public Road Register should be annually at a minimum and as required throughout the year.	2.3 Approach to Maintaining the Public Road Register
41.	Separate date of creation and date of cessation into 2 columns in the Public Road Register.	Attachment A – Public Road Register