

10. REPORTS BY OFFICERS

- 10.1. REPORT TITLE: **HAMPDEN ROAD TO MOUNT BARKER
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT SEWER
TRUNK MAIN & NEW INLET PUMP STATION -
PRUDENTIAL REPORT****
- DATE OF MEETING: **18 MARCH 2021****
- FILE NUMBER: **DOC/21/37664****
- ATTACHMENTS: **1. DOC/21/37668 – HAMPDEN ROAD TO MOUNT
BARKER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
SEWER TRUNK MAIN & NEW INLET PUMP
STATION - PRUDENTIAL REPORT
2. DOC/21/38155 – OUTLINE OF KEY PROJECT
TIMELINES PRE TENDER AWARD****
- Key Contact **Sue Miller, Risk & Governance Officer****
- Manager/Sponsor **Brian Clancey, Deputy CEO/General Manager
Governance, Strategic Projects,
Wastewater/Recycled Water****

Community Plan 2020-2035:

Leadership and Good Governance

LGG Strategy 1.5 Demonstrate accountability through clear, relevant and easily accessible policies, corporate reporting and legislative compliance.

Community Wellbeing

Safety and Resilience

Objective 4.4 Provide wastewater treatment services to deliver public health.

Annual Business Plan:

GL2 Corporate Capacity and Leadership

GL4 Effective Management and Financial Sustainability

Mount Barker Wastewater Collection Network – Expansion and Upgrade

Audit & Risk Committee Terms of Reference:**1.9 Prudential Reports**

1.9.1 The Committee shall review the findings of any prudential reports prepared for Council and provide advice to Council.

1.10 Wastewater and Recycled Water Strategy

1.10.1 The Committee shall provide advice on the management of risk and the implications to Council associated with the provision of wastewater and recycled water services.

Purpose:

For the Audit and Risk Committee to consider the attached prudential report on the sewer main from Hampden Road to the wastewater treatment plant and inlet pump station project (the Project) and provide recommendations on this matter to Council.

Summary – Key Issues:

- The attached prudential report on the Project prepared by Dean Newberry Consulting concluded that:
 - a. Council’s Administration has addressed all of the prudential requirements for the sewer main from Hampden Road to the wastewater treatment plant on Springs Road and inlet pump station.
 - b. The seven prescribed requirements of Section 48 of the Local Government Act 1999 have been appropriately addressed by Council’s Administration in information provided/to be provided to the Elected Members:
- There are some matters identified in the prudential report that require follow up information provision – please see recommendation 2 below.

Recommendation:

That the Audit and Risk Committee recommend to Council that:

1. the attached prudential report prepared by Dean Newberry Consulting on the sewer main from Hampden Road to the wastewater treatment plant on Springs Road and inlet pump station be noted; and
2. prior to the award of the tender for the Project, a report be prepared by council staff for consideration at a future council meeting in relation to the matters arising from the prudential report, in particular the matters contained under the heading “Prudential Review Outcome: Key Matters recommended be noted by Council”.

Background:

1. The Prudential Report attached has been prepared in accordance with Council’s Prudential Management Policy to ensure that the Project:
 - is undertaken only after an appropriate level of “due diligence” is applied to the proposed project
 - is managed during the project and evaluated after the project to achieve identified public benefits or needs; and to minimise financial risks
 - gives consideration to Council’s strategic plans.

2. The Risk and Governance Officer facilitates the provision of information between the project sponsor and the entity engaged to undertake the prudential review, and provides reports to the Audit and Risk Committee, Council and other key stakeholders.
3. Following an open tender call and assessment, Dean Newbery Consulting was engaged by Council to undertake the Prudential Report for the Project.
4. Council has legal obligations to provide a new sewer main from Hampden Road to the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and inlet pump station. The Project is an integral part of the Council's wastewater network and is the next priority wastewater project for procurement.
5. An information item on the Project was considered at the Audit and Risk Committee meeting held on 17 December 2020. That item was essentially an introduction to the Project and it was flagged that further agenda items would be prepared for consideration by the Audit and Risk Committee.
6. A business case was prepared and predicated on a number of key assumptions and included capital and whole of life forecasts for expenditure and revenue and identified key risks to the successful delivery of the Project and beyond.
7. At the Audit & Risk Committee meeting held 11 February 2021 the Committee received a report 'New Sewer Main and Inlet Pump Station – Business Case' with the purpose being to review the business case for the new sewer main (from Hampden Road to the wastewater treatment plant) and inlet pump station; and make recommendations on same to Council.
8. At the Audit & Risk Committee meeting held 11 February 2021 the Committee resolved to recommend to Council that :

the business case (attachment 3) for the sewer main from Hampden Road to the wastewater treatment plant and inlet pump station be noted with the intention of endorsement subject to the Committee review of the Wastewater 40 Year Financial Modelling and assumptions; and

formal reporting to the Committee and council meetings occur as a minimum on a quarterly basis and/or as required given the nature of the project and the key assumptions and risks identified in the business case.
9. The recommendations of the Audit and Risk Committee were subsequently endorsed at the council meeting held on 1 March 2021.

10. A presentation and accompanying agenda item on the Wastewater 40 Year Financial Modelling and assumptions is scheduled for the meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee to be held on 20 May 2021.
11. An open tender call for the Project was released on 2 March and closes on 11 May 2021.
12. Council Members exposure to the Project has included a confidential informal gathering in late October 2020, an agenda item that was considered at the council meeting held on 2 November 2020 (which included acknowledgement of the advisory role to council of the Audit and Risk Committee on this Project) and consideration of the recommendation from the Committee on 1 March 2021 as per above.

Discussion:

13. The prudential report (attached) includes the redaction of some \$ amounts so as not to compromise the commercial position of Council given that the tender is open.
14. A key element of the prudential report appears under the heading of “Prudential Review Outcome: Key Matters recommended be noted by Council:”
15. These points are the subject of recommendation 2 above. Some of these points are specific to the Project e.g. point 3.8 re legal confirmation that development approval is not required. Some of the points are far broader than the Project and relate to arrangements for the provision by council of a wastewater service e.g. points 3.3 and 3.4 regarding the need to regularly review fees and charges for wastewater.
16. Work has commenced on providing further information in relation to these points. As per recommendation 2, it is intended that this further work be considered at a future council meeting prior to the award of the tender.
17. The prudential report references the timing imperative for the delivery of the Project including the impact of the Federal Government HomeBuilder stimulus package.
18. Importantly the prudential report also reinforces the purpose of the report (a further input to decision making on the Project by the council members) and concludes with: “***Given all the information provided/to be provided, in my opinion the Elected Members of Council will be in a position to make a well informed decision regarding the Project.***”
19. Consistent with this conclusion, the provision of the further information as per recommendation 2 is proposed pre decision making on the tender award. The preparation of this further information has commenced.

20. An outline of the key timelines pre the tender award is included as attachment 2.

Community Engagement:

Informing only	Council's website
----------------	-------------------

Policy:

Prudential Management Policy

Long Term Financial Plan:

Assumed to have capital expenditure for the Project in 2020/21 and 21/22 and to receive revenue from developers annually.

Budget:

In the 2020/21 budget there is an allocation of adequate funds for the Project including design, preparation for tender and the very early stages of construction.

Statutory/Legal:

The Prudential Report has been prepared pursuant to section 48 of the Local Government Act 1999 (included in page 1 of the Attachment).

Staff Resource Requirements:

The Prudential Report required staff input.

Environmental:

N/A to the prudential report.

Social:

Applicable to the prudential report in relation to: (a) the critical timing of delivery of the Project from a public health perspective; and (b) the need to regularly review the amount of the annual service charge payable by ratepayers.

Risk Assessment:

The Prudential Report includes reference to the Project's risk register.

Asset Management:

When the Project is completed the Asset Management Plans will be updated.

Conclusion:

The prudential report has concluded that the Council Members will be in a position to make a well informed decision regarding the Project upon the provision of some further information which is being prepared.

Previous Decisions By/Information Reports to Audit & Risk Committee/Council

Meeting Date	1 March 2021 (Council)	HPRM Reference	DOC/21/22603
Title	New Sewer Trunk Main and Inlet Pumping Station – Business Case		
Purpose	For Council to endorse the recommendations of the ARC 11 February 2021.		

Meeting Date	11 February 2021 (ARC)	HPRM Reference	DOC/21/13596
Title	New Sewer Trunk Main and Inlet Pumping Station – Business Case		
Purpose	For the ARC to review the attached business case for the new sewer main (from Hampden Road to the Springs Road wastewater treatment plant and WWTP inlet pumping station) and make recommendations on same to Council.		

Meeting Date	17 December 2020 (ARC)	HPRM Reference	DOC/20/177951
Title	New Sewer Trunk Main and Inlet Pumping Station Project		
Purpose	To make the ARC aware of the new wastewater sewer main (from Hampden Road to the Springs Road wastewater treatment plant and WWTP inlet pumping station project).		

Attachment 1 to Item 10.1



MOUNT BARKER DISTRICT COUNCIL

PRUDENTIAL REPORT

(PRUDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES: SECTION 48 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT
1999)

HAMPDEN ROAD TO MOUNT BARKER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT EFFLUENT/SEWER
TRUNK MAIN & NEW INLET PUMP STATION

4 MARCH 2021

Return to Order of Business

CONTENTS

1. Report.....3

APPENDIX

2. Council Reports Supporting Prescribed Prudential Requirements of the Act.....9



1. Report

Don Venn, Principal, Dean Newbery Consulting (“DNC”), has been engaged by the District Council of Mount Barker (“Council”) to undertake a prescribed Prudential Review of the Hampden Road to Mount Barker Wastewater Treatment Plant Sewer Trunk Main & New Inlet Pump Station (“Project”).

This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 48 of the South Australian *Local Government Act 1999* (“the Act”) which requires a council to consider a report addressing the prudential issues set out in the Act before engaging in a project where the capital cost over the ensuing five years is likely to exceed \$4,000,000 (indexed from 1 January 2010).

The purpose of a Prudential Review is to independently review and make an assessment whether the Elected Members have available from the Administration all of the prescribed information necessary to make an informed decision regarding a project.

It is not the purpose of a Prudential Review to provide advice to the Elected Members whether or not the Council should proceed or not with a project.

The Council area does not have access to SA Water’s wastewater network and for that reason, the Council owns and operates four Community Wastewater Management Systems (CWMS).

Effluent from Littlehampton, Mount Barker central business district, south west portion of Mount Barker and sewage from the recently commenced western and central sector urban growth areas converge at the north-eastern end of Hampden Road is then piped to the Springs Road Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP).

Engineering advice is that the existing wastewater infrastructure will be unable to service the demand from that urban development, which has been unexpectedly and significantly accelerated as a result of Federal and State government (pandemic) stimulus grants.

The Project is to address both existing and projected effluent/sewer flow volumes during both dry and wet weather conditions to the WWTP, comprising a new effluent/sewer trunk main line and inlet pump station, from Hampden road to the WWTP situated on Springs Road Mount Barker.

Given the limited capacity of the existing wastewater infrastructure to manage wastewater in-flows even in dry-weather, the timing of the proposed works is now considered by the Administration as near critical. This is because the existing infrastructure is now unable to cope in wet-weather conditions and forecasted to be unable to cope during dry-weather conditions from early to mid-2022, causing risk of sewerage overflows and the associated environmental and public health consequences as a result.

Quantity Surveyors acting for Council, Capicse QS, have projected that the Project will have a capital cost approximating **XX (CONFIDENTIAL)**, with the works scheduled to be undertaken over 2021, with completion scheduled around August 2022, providing no unforeseen issues arise. That completion date assumes that the Project works will require at least 12 months to complete, possibly longer.

Whilst Council will shortly call a tender for the Project, its policy is to defer a decision (to award the tender) until it has considered the Prudential Review and funding requirements, amongst other information sought from the Administration by the Elected Members.

The Administration advise that \$3.5M funding for the Project works is available in the adopted FY21 Budget of Council. The balance of capital funding required for the Project works proposed to be included in the FY22 Council Budget will comprise developer contributions, annual service charges, transfers from Council's Wastewater Infrastructure Reserve and Wastewater Maintenance Reserve, together with loan borrowings.

The Project is a 'stand-alone works'. The Mt Barker Wastewater Collection Network & Expansion Upgrading Plan include the Project as being an early stage of a proposed overall major upgrade to the Council's entire Wastewater infrastructure in coming years (Council's district comprises 7 townships with 4 segregated CWMS).

The indicative 'current day dollars' cost of all the proposed Council area wide wastewater upgrade works is in the region of \$110M – that indicative cost will change, possibly significantly reduce, as a result of pricing refinement work currently being undertaken by the Administration.

Council has recently appointed Frontier Economics to conduct a Service Delivery consultancy, essentially being an assessment of the current (historic) model of Council being the owner and operator of all wastewater infrastructure and to advise of alternative ownership/operator options and opportunities, including SA Water and the private sector.

As stated above, the Project the subject of this prudential review now has critical timelines and as such should proceed regardless of the outcome of the Service Delivery consultancy – but subject to Council addressing all prescribed requirements and committing to funding.

Regardless of the outcome of the Service Delivery consultancy, in terms of wastewater planning, Council are in a highly informed position, as it has advanced technical planning for area wide wastewater infrastructure upgrading requirements. Frontier Economics will no doubt rely on that advanced planning in their advice regarding service delivery/ownership options.

The Water Industry Act 2012 and the Water Industry Regulations 2012 set prescribed technical requirements and guidelines including for wastewater schemes throughout South Australia, whether they are owned/operated by SA Water, local governments or others including the private sector.

Under the Water Industry Act 2012, the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (**ESCOSA**) is responsible for the economic regulation of sewerage services, including CWMS.

ESCOSA require councils to apply pricing principles based on operating a CWMS on a full cost recovery basis, in accordance with the National Water Initiative Pricing Principles. Some councils have negotiated with ESCOSA to apply a transition period to apply full cost recovery basis in the setting of CWMS service charges. The ESCOSA pricing requirements apply to all CWMS no matter the age.

Historically, Council is the owner of all wastewater infrastructure throughout its district and as such is responsible for all operational matters, maintenance and replacement.

There are precedents where SA Water have agreed over time to take over a council's community waste water management system(s) – part of the City of Tea Tree Gully where council own and operate sewer services for approximately 4500 households and business premises is now in the process of being taken over by SA Water. A further example is where SA Water built a new wastewater treatment infrastructure for the Rural City of Murray Bridge (noting that SA Water already serviced Murray Bridge).

Council's Administration advise that communication with SA Water for it to take over ownership and operation of the wastewater infrastructure has been ongoing since 2010, when the State Government rezoned 1310 hectares from rural to urban development at Mount Barker. From my review, it is clear that Council has been proactive in its dealings with SA Water in that regard and it is assumed that Frontier Economics as part of their consultancy will further build on that dialogue for service delivery options.

Over the years, Council has developed considerable expertise and substantially invested in wastewater infrastructure for its area. Given the National Water Initiative Pricing Principles and ESCOSA requirements, it is mandatory that the 'whole of life' costs of Council's wastewater infrastructure be recovered by way of developer contributions and annual service charges. Noting the varying age and long economic working life of much of Council's wastewater infrastructure, it can be difficult to establish with reasonable certainty the 'whole of life' costs for the purposes of establishing service charges. For example, civil wastewater infrastructure normally should have useful economic lives approximating 80 years, pump stations 20 years, treatment plants 50 years, all with nil residual values. Asset depreciation is based on replacement value, not original cost. That places high importance on determining the 'commencement' annual service charge, in particular for new or substantially upgraded installations. Increasing annual service charges (either the CWMS Service Charge or the Sewer Annual Service Charge) by more than that applied to general rates creates a further financial burden on affected ratepayers. Given that statutory financial and asset management plans by South Australian local governments are over a ten year time frame, it would be prudent that Council consistently 'rework' annual service charges, ideally at three year intervals, based on condition based audits of the infrastructure. Three year intervals in my opinion would be appropriate given the substantial proposed wastewater infrastructure works in coming years and the many variables involved.

South Australian local governments are required to account for wastewater reserves in the equity component of their Balance Sheets and not all councils account on the same basis, making benchmarking difficult. Under the *Local Government Act 1999*, local governments cannot apply CWMS charges to general revenue. Where net cash in-flows generated by service charges and connection fees are applied to fund a council's working capital, arguably a pre-approval to borrow should be resolved to address any future call upon CWMS funding needs.

Notwithstanding that connection fees paid by developers are the outcome of commercial negotiations, it is important that Council periodically review the adequacy of such fees, given the substantial costs involved.

Councils that own/operate multiple CWMS ideally should account for them on a 'system by system' basis, in particular for service charges and wastewater equity reserves where varying service levels are provided to property owners.

The Mount Barker District Council references the two services as 'Wastewater' – which can be either CWMS or sewer service.

For properties having a septic tank system, the annual Service Charge by Council for FY20 was \$520.

For properties connected direct to Council's Wastewater Sewer System infrastructure (no septic tank system), the annual Service Charge for FY20 was \$635.

Council's Administration has prepared a comprehensive Business Case report dated 1 February 2021 for the Project (Hampden Road – WWTP Business Case Report).

Essentially, for the purposes of this Prudential Review and for the information of Elected Members, much of the required information is included within the Business Case, including the following reports:

- Hampden Road Transfer Mains – Options Assessment Report
- Project Management Plan – Hampden Road to WWIP New Inlet Pumping Station
- Communication Plan – Hampden Rd – New Inlet PS
- Risk Register – Hampden Rd Trunk Main Project
- Risk Management Plan Wastewater Collection Network
- Emergency Response and Contingency Plan (CWMS) – Revision 3
- Risk Mitigation Strategy Pre-Post February 2022 for Wastewater Collection Network
- Council's Community Plan 2020-2035
- Council's Development Plan
- Mount Barker Urban Growth Development Plan 2010
- South Australia Strategic Plan 2011

Given the extensive investigatory/preparatory work undertaken to date by Council's Administration, there can be no disputing the compelling reasons and relative urgency for undertaking the Project – the peak network in-flows is now projected to occur around February 2022, with the earliest that the Project completed being August 2022.

The Business Case Report prepared by the Administration appropriately summarises the key drivers for the Project:

- Wet weather capacity in the existing effluent/sewer infrastructure network has now peaked
- Dry weather capacity in the existing effluent/sewer infrastructure network is projected to peak in *“early to mid-2022”*
- The ability to undertake future development will be at high risk given the overall state of the existing network
- By undertaking the Project, ongoing recurrent and future capital costs and a wide range of risks associated with the existing effluent/sewer siphons located under Mt Barker Creek will be eliminated

The Prudential Review has examined all reports provided/to be provided to Council by the Administration, to make an assessment whether the Elected Members have all of the necessary information to make an informed decision for the Project, in accordance with the following prescribed prudential requirements:

- Relationship of the Project and relevant Strategic Management Plans
- Objectives of Council's Development Plan in the area where the works is to occur
- Contribution to Economic Development
- Community Consultation undertaken for the Project
- Revenue projections and potential financial risks
- Recurrent and whole-of-life costs for the Project
- Financial Viability of the Project and the short and longer term estimated net effect on the Project on the financial position of Council
- Risk issues associated with the Project

Prudential Review Outcome: Key Matters recommended be noted by Council

1. The Risk Register for the Project prepared by the Administration initially identified 24 risks considered to be 'High', together with 2 'Very High' – once putting in place what I consider to be constructive, considered measures to address such risks, only 2 'High' residual risks remain, being potential for contractual disputes (between Council and contractors to undertake the works) and quality management variables for the works. Unless managed well, these 2 residual risks have high potential to cause significant cost and or delay blowouts for the Project. Accordingly, Council needs to be satisfied that these residual risks have been appropriately mitigated.
2. It is important that before awarding a contract(s) to undertake the works, that it be conditional on the satisfactory outcome of an independent financial assessment as to the ability of the contractor(s) to fulfil its commitments at least over the contract period, including for defects – the cost to Council of its contractor(s) being unable to complete works should not be overlooked, in particular for public risk matters and engaging a new contractor to take over the Project. Such an assessment should be a highlighted precondition included in the tender specifications. The financial assessment should be fast tracked given the relative urgency of the timing of the works for the Project.
3. Council needs to make its own assessment of the many documented assumptions made for the financial projections for the Project, reflected in the updated Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP), together with the long term financial impact on Council. Notwithstanding that Council needs to make its own assessment of those assumptions, my comments follow:
 - 3.1 The proposed construction timeline of approximately 12 months for undertaking the works are critical given the existing state of the infrastructure to be replaced/upgraded.
 - 3.2 Noting the documented assumptions made for the Project and the updated LTFP, some costs for the Project may be excluded in the cost estimate by Capicse QS. Council needs to be satisfied that all costs for the Project are included in its LTFP.
 - 3.3 In accordance with ESCOSA policy, annual service charges must be based on 'whole of life' costs. A council must not subsidise service charges for CWMS from general rates revenue. Council's Wastewater Accounting Principles Policy and Wastewater Infrastructure Fees & Augmentation Costs Policy appropriately reflect the ESCOSA pricing requirements. Given the substantial proposed expenditure for wastewater infrastructure, it would be prudent that Council undertake a comprehensive review/update of 'whole of life' costs at three yearly intervals, based on condition based audits of the assets.
 - 3.4 Developer contributions for wastewater connection fees should also be comprehensively regularly reviewed/updated – these fees more often than not do not fully reflect the substantial costs involved, noting that they are usually set as a result of a commercial negotiation.
 - 3.5 Ideally, to ensure equity and transparency for property owners, each CWMS should have separate service charges and separate equity reserves, given their separate financial and service delivery circumstances. By way of example, property owners in Meadows have access to recycled water sourced from its local mechanical wastewater treatment plant (I note that ESCOSA are aware of the charging mechanism in place at Council).

- 3.6 Council should develop a formal policy for CWMS Reserve Fund accounting (methodology, including for service charges and connection fees).
- 3.7 The setting of service charges and connection fees at Council should be the result of the combined input of both finance and technical services officers, overseen by Council's Deputy CEO/General Manager-Governance, Strategic Projects and Wastewater/Recycled Water.
- 3.8 Council should confirm with its legal advisors whether a Development Application for the Project is required and if yes, that it can be the prescribed authority.
- 3.9 If possible, given the substantial expenditure involved, Council should formally consider the outcomes from the Service Review consultancy before committing to undertaking the remaining works in the Mount Barker Wastewater Collection Network & Expansion Upgrading Plan.

Conclusion

Council's Administration have addressed all of the prudential requirements for the Project and in my opinion the work completed is to a high standard.

I am satisfied that all of the following seven prescribed requirements of Section 48 *Local Government Act 1999* have been appropriately addressed by Council's Administration in information provided/to be provided to the Elected Members:

- Relationship of the Project with Council's Strategic Management Plans
- Consistency with Council's Development Plan
- The contribution of the Project to the Economic Development of the Council area
- The level of Community Consultation undertaken for the Project
- Financial Assessments undertaken for the Project
- Project Risk and Mitigation Strategies
- Project Delivery

Given all the information provided/to be provided, in my opinion the Elected Members of Council will be in a position to make a well informed decision regarding the Project.



DON VENN
Chartered Accountant
Principal: Dean Newbery Consulting
4 March 2021

APPENDIX

2. Council Reports Supporting Prescribed Prudential Requirements of the Act

Section 48(2)(a)

The relationship between the Project and relevant Strategic Management Plans.

- MDPA 2010 & SA Strategic Plan 2011
- Mount Barker, Littlehampton & Nairne Strategic Infrastructure Plan
- Council's Community Plan 2020-2025
- Council's Development Plan

Section 48(2)(b)

The objectives of the Development Plan in the area where the Project is to occur.

- Council's Development Plan

Section 48(2)(c)

The expected contribution of the Project to the economic development of the local area, the impact that the Project may have on businesses carried on in the proximity and, if appropriate, how the Project should be established in a way that ensures fair competition in the market place.

- Hampden Road - WWTP Business Case Report

Section 48(2)(d)

The level of consultation within the local community, including contact with persons who may be affected by the Project and the representations that have been made by them, and the means by which the community can influence or contribute to the Project or its outcomes.

- Hampden Road - WWTP Business Case Report

Section 48(2)(e)

If the Project is intended to produce revenue, revenue projections and potential financial risks.

- Hampden Road - WWTP Business Case Report

Section 48(2)(f)

The current and whole of life costs associated with the Project including any costs arising out of proposed financial arrangements.

- Hampden Road - WWTP Business Case Report

Section 48(2)(g)

The financial viability of the Project, and the short and longer term estimated net effect of the Project on the financial position of Council.

- Hampden Road - WWTP Business Case Report

Section 48(2)(h)

Any risks associated with the Project, and the steps that can be taken to manage, reduce or eliminate those risks (including by the provision of periodic reports to Council).

- Hampden Road - WWTP Business Case Report

Attachment 2 to Item 10.1

Attachment 2

Outline of key project timelines pre tender award

Sewer Main and Inlet Pump Station Project

2 March 2021 - Tender released

18 March 2021 – Audit and Risk Committee meeting considers the prudential report

5 April 2021 – Council meeting considers the Audit and Risk Committee recommendations on the prudential report

3 May 2021 – Council meeting considers the further information prepared that arises from the points in the prudential report

11 May 2021 – Tenders closes and the assessment of submissions received begins

20 May 2021 – Audit and Risk Committee meeting considers the 40 year financial modelling for wastewater

7 June 2021 – Council meeting considers the Audit and Risk Committee recommendations arising from the 40 financial modelling as it relates to the Project

TBA - Council meeting considers recommendation for the award of the tender for delivery of the Project

Return to Order of Business