

CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

MEETING MINUTES, POST AMALGAMATION MEETING 11

Venue: Gladstone Regional LG, Calliope Training Room, Don Cameron Dr, Calliope
Date and Time: Tues 13th March 2018
 9:30am – 3:30pm

Attendance: Scott McDonald (GRC), Jorge El-Khoury (GRC), Pierre Neethling (GRC), Graham Sweetlove (MRC), Brendan Fuller (CHRC), Grant Vaughan (RRC), Tilak Mudalidge (RRC), Mike Prior (LSC), Dev Krishnasamy (LSC), Allan Heit (BSC), Johny Purkaystha (ISC by Telephone), Chris Hegarty (Cardno), Monica Borg (Cardno)

Apologies: Jamie McCaul (RRC)

No.	Item	Action By
1	Actions from the previous meeting minutes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> RRPM's for valve and hydrant marking. Brendan from CHRC to follow up with emergency services and get a response. Rural property access LSC – Mike provided copies of marked up drawings for review. All to review and advise Mike if he is on the right track with the changes. Marked up drawings are attached. Use of pneumatic pump up bungs for sewer testing. LSC to wait for feedback first, then trial with a contractor. Wait for next meeting for decision and will have feedback from industry. Mike to look at consequential changes e.g. the pre-starting meeting list, construction specifications, CP1. No action required until LSC finalise the recommendation D6 Site Regrading – Sub Committee of Amal Meegahwattage (LSC), Jamie McCaul (RRC), and Chris Hegarty to review the document and advise. D6 Site Regrading - Phil McKone to check LGAQ legal site for any retaining wall related advice D11.09.04 – Both MRC and GRC will approve DN63 Poly for use in cul de sac heads. No document changes required. D11.11.02 wording is approved as <i>“fire hydrants shall be at 80m spacing for all non trunk water supply network mains and 20m from the last property frontage”</i> D11 New network analysis fire design table: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> MRC to be the same as LSC. Cardno to action. BSC, CHRC, ISC to remain as “TBA” until advice is received. D14 Floodways <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cardno to revise D14 using the new layout and document structure provided by RRC Table D14.09.01 needs revision and clarity eg d₅₀ SPA and IDAS references need to be amended CMDG R-094 and R-094A Floodway drawings – there are only minor differences between drawings (slightly more robust – 180mm thick v 175mm, SL91 v SL81). There was discussion regarding adopting the one drawing – probably that conforms with the ISC version. There was some discussion as to whether SL91 mesh was more difficult to obtain and hence more expensive. All LGs to consider their position with a view to adopting the IRC Std Dwg. 	<p><u>CHRC</u></p> <p><u>LSC</u></p> <p><u>LSC</u></p> <p><u>LSC, RRC, Cardno</u></p> <p><u>LSC</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>BSC, CHRC, ISC</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>All LGs</u></p>

	<p>11. CP1 Construction Procedures – as constructed information</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All LGs review CP1.18 to CP1.23 to ensure the content is still relevant to their individual As Constructed requirements. GV stated that he believed the content was still relevant following the adoption of ADAC by several LGs Clause CP1.20.4 to be amended to remove the reference to As Constructed Drawings to be submitted. Table CP1.23.01 'As Constructed Submission Requirements' will be deleted and submission requirements shall be provided on the website only. 	<p><u>All LGs</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p>
2	<p>Governance Document</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 21: Regarding the CMDG Coordinator position <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2 has been selected (outsourced CMDG Coordinator position), since there are some LGs that would not have resources for Option 1 (LG hosted CMDG Coordinator on a rotational basis). Both options shall be kept within the governance document for proof that the options had been discussed and assessed. More detail for Option 2 (from Jorge's comment) shall be added within the document. Invitations for the CMDG Coordinator position to be sent out in the near future. This will be coordinated by GRC. The evaluation committee will be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jorge El-Khoury (GRC) Jamie McCaul (RRC) Mike Prior (LSC) Clause 35: Guideline/Drawing Change Process <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A CMDG change request form is to be created based on the GRC policy/forms for 'Standard Drawings Changes Request/Review', as well as the flowchart. This will formalise the process and require the person requesting the change to consider all affected documents and obtain approval from their LG before submitting to the CMDG Coordinator. These forms shall be added as an attachment to the governance document. When requests for approval of document changes are sent out all LGs must be given a 2-week period for consideration. The governance document is to be amended to confirm the 2 week period and that no response within the time period means "Yes". Clause 23: Meeting Frequency & Location <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The document is to be amended to indicate the last week of March and October of every year for a CMDG meeting, preferably Thursday. So, the next upcoming meeting is currently set for the 25th October 2018. All LGs are happy to stick with Calliope as the meeting place. Clause 25: Quorum <p>Nominees, back-up nominee <i>or authorised proxy</i> may be present at meetings. This statement to be added to Clause 39.</p> Signing of the finalised document <p>The final document will be forwarded for review by each LG. All LG's are to consider and obtain appropriate authority to sign the document. A hard copy will be sent by certified mail to BSC in the first instance with each LG signing and then sending to the next LG in alphabetical order.</p> Clause 32: RPEQ approval for change requests <p>Amend so it just states RPEQ, not one specifically from the local government.</p> The list of nominees is to be provided as an attachment to the agreement so that nominees can change without the need to amend the governance document. 	<p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>GRC</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>All LGs</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p> <p><u>Cardno</u></p>

3	<p>Industry Consultation</p> <p>The following businesses were listed to be added to the industry contacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Symons Ken's Plumbing – 0428362211 rockynorth@kens.com.au • Tradelink • Humes • Reece • Rocla • Boral • George Bourne Associates • Project Partners • Design Tech • Tanners Bitumen <p>When emails are to be send out for industry feedback, a 2-week deadline shall be set for response.</p>	<u>Cardno</u>
4	<p>D1 Queensland Streets reference</p> <p>There is likely to be a revision of Complete Streets released in October, so the decision as to whether Qld Streets shall still be used over AUSTRoads or Complete Streets shall be parked until the release of the new document.</p> <p>In the meantime D1 is to be amended (and any other documents as necessary) to change the order of priority to put Austroads ahead of Queensland Streets.</p>	<u>Cardno</u>
5	<p>D9 Pathways and Cycleways - Terminology</p> <p>There is a disparity of terminology between Qld Streets, Austroads and CMDG.</p> <p>After the meeting, GV submitted the following definitions for consideration and adoption by the group and to be used consistently throughout all CMDG documentation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Footpath – A pavement intended only for pedestrians, separated from the road or street carriageway, either within or outside a road reserve. Cyclepath - A pavement intended only for bicycle traffic, separated from the road or street carriageway, either within or outside a road reserve. Shared Path - A pavement intended for the shared use of pedestrians and bicycle traffic, separated from the road or street carriageway, either within or outside a road reserve. Separated Path - A pavement divided into separate sections, one of which is designated for the exclusive use of cyclists and the remainder for other path users, separated from the road or street carriageway, either within or outside a road reserve. Path - A generic term that refers to either a (i) Footpath, (ii) Cyclepath, (iii) Shared Path, or (iv) Separated Path, as described above. A path is the infrastructure. Pathway - A strip of land or corridor to accommodate the construction of a Path. <p>All LG's are to consider the changes and advise. Cardno will amended D9 terminology as above and send to all for review.</p>	<u>All LGs</u> <u>Cardno</u>
6.1	<p>C211 Control of Erosion– Document Review</p> <p>Minor changes all agreed. RRC to review the references.</p> <p>C211.03.02 In regard to the requirement for RPEQ certified ESCP's, GRC agreed to allow discretion to accept non RPEQ certified plans for minor works on a case by case basis.</p>	<u>RRC</u>

6.2	C213 Earthworks– Document Review <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the order of priority to reference all AUSTROADS documents (not just the one for blasting). 2. C213.12.03 Insert AUSTROADS as the standard for benches. 3. C213.30.02 Compaction standard – modify clause as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Amend the referenced compaction standard to be AS1289, rather than a specific test as is currently shown (incorrectly). b. It was noted that a compaction standard of 98% is currently required for subgrade and the top 300mm below subgrade, whereas TMR require only 97% (CMDG to continue with the 98% requirement). 95% Standard compaction required for all embankment except for subgrade and the top 300mm below subgrade. Cardno to amend the document to clarify. 	<u>Cardno</u>
6.3	C232 Pavement Drains– Document Review <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The edge drains section is to be removed. 2. Rename section to Pavement Drains (remove Edge Drains references in the document) 	<u>Cardno</u>
6.4	C261 Pavement Markings– Document Review The following document changes were approved: C261.11.10 <i>Ambient conditions for applying paint with glass beads. For optimum performance and durability, incorporate glass beads under the following conditions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air and pavement temperature: > 15°C. • Relative humidity: > 70%. • Air movement: 10 km/hr (reasonable air movement). C261.15.04 <i>..thermoplastic material....cold film thickness shall be 2-0 1.8mm with a tolerance of plus or minus 0.5mm</i> C261.22.03 <i>.....remove pavement markings from the wearing surface of pavements by resurfacing with 7mm stone</i> C261.23 Added: New Marking tolerances table C261.13.03 Glass beads shall be incorporated in thermoplastic material, in the proportion of 20 per cent of the total mass.....	<u>Cardno</u>
6.5	C262 Signposting– Document Review Remove the whole section on linemarking and refer to document MRTS14 from TMR instead. Sign Structure and warranty will therefore be in accordance with TMR requirements. Cardno to action this change.	<u>Cardno</u>
6.6	D9 Cycleway and Pathway Design– Document Review The following document changes were approved: Table D09.08.01 amend the shared pathway minimum width to 2.5 metres. Table D09.08.01 amend so that grades are all in percentages. D09.11.01 amend reference to be <i>minimum</i> 32 MPa concrete strength Document terminology to be amended as per item 5 above	<u>Cardno</u>

7	<p>D5 Stormwater Design – confirmation of AEP</p> <p>1. For Table D05.04.01, 'Major Collector & Minor Road' the layout shall be modified to match QUDM 2013 provisional Tables 7.3.1 & 7.3.2. The AEPs in the following table are agreed by all LGs.</p> <p>Table D05. Error! No text of specified style in document..1 - Design Annual Exceedance Probabilities</p> <table><tr><th colspan="2" rowspan="2">Development Category</th><th colspan="2">Design AEP, % (ARI, Years)</th></tr><tr><th>Major System</th><th>Minor System</th></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Central Business & Commercial</td><td>1 (100)</td><td>10 (10)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Industrial</td><td>1 (100)</td><td>18 (5)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Urban Residential (High Density – greater than 20 dwelling units/ha)</td><td>1 (100)</td><td>18(5)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Urban Residential (Low Density – greater than 5 & up to 20 dwelling units/ha)</td><td>1 (100)</td><td>18(5)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Rural Residential -2 to 5 dwelling units/ha</td><td>1 (100)</td><td>39 (2)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Open Space Parks, etc.</td><td>1 (100)</td><td>63 (1)</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="2">Major Collector / Distributor and higher</td><td>Kerb and channel flow</td><td>1 (100) [Note 5]</td><td>10 (10)</td></tr><tr><td>Cross drainage (culverts)</td><td>1 (100) [Note 5]</td><td><u>2 (50)</u></td></tr><tr><td rowspan="2">Minor road</td><td>Kerb and channel flow</td><td>5 (20) [Note 5]</td><td>[Note 4]</td></tr><tr><td>Cross drainage (culverts)</td><td>5 (20) [Note 5]</td><td>10 (10)</td></tr></table>	Development Category		Design AEP, % (ARI, Years)		Major System	Minor System	Central Business & Commercial		1 (100)	10 (10)	Industrial		1 (100)	18 (5)	Urban Residential (High Density – greater than 20 dwelling units/ha)		1 (100)	18(5)	Urban Residential (Low Density – greater than 5 & up to 20 dwelling units/ha)		1 (100)	18(5)	Rural Residential -2 to 5 dwelling units/ha		1 (100)	39 (2)	Open Space Parks, etc.		1 (100)	63 (1)	Major Collector / Distributor and higher	Kerb and channel flow	1 (100) [Note 5]	10 (10)	Cross drainage (culverts)	1 (100) [Note 5]	<u>2 (50)</u>	Minor road	Kerb and channel flow	5 (20) [Note 5]	[Note 4]	Cross drainage (culverts)	5 (20) [Note 5]	10 (10)	<u>Cardno</u>
Development Category				Design AEP, % (ARI, Years)																																										
		Major System	Minor System																																											
Central Business & Commercial		1 (100)	10 (10)																																											
Industrial		1 (100)	18 (5)																																											
Urban Residential (High Density – greater than 20 dwelling units/ha)		1 (100)	18(5)																																											
Urban Residential (Low Density – greater than 5 & up to 20 dwelling units/ha)		1 (100)	18(5)																																											
Rural Residential -2 to 5 dwelling units/ha		1 (100)	39 (2)																																											
Open Space Parks, etc.		1 (100)	63 (1)																																											
Major Collector / Distributor and higher	Kerb and channel flow	1 (100) [Note 5]	10 (10)																																											
	Cross drainage (culverts)	1 (100) [Note 5]	<u>2 (50)</u>																																											
Minor road	Kerb and channel flow	5 (20) [Note 5]	[Note 4]																																											
	Cross drainage (culverts)	5 (20) [Note 5]	10 (10)																																											
8	<p>D11 Water Reticulation Design and Construction – Thrust Block Design</p> <p>D11.14.02: The amended clause reads that NATA Geotech testing (for ground bearing) is required for all thrust block designs regardless of main diameter. After discussion it was agreed to remove the word “Geotechnical” from the clause. Cardno to action this change.</p>	<u>Cardno</u>																																												
9.1 – 9.16	<p>D1 Road Design – Document Review</p> <p>1. A detailed review of D1 did not progress as time ran out.</p> <p>2. All LGs are asked to review the GRC Spreadsheets that provide Acceptable Outcomes and Performance Outcomes for Urban and Rural Roads. If this format is supported, they will replace the D1.06 Tables and Typical sections from D1. Each LG is to develop their own tables Acceptable Outcomes and Performance Outcomes for Urban and Rural Roads.</p> <p>3. Cardno to construct a new design standard D15 Driveways (this will separate relocate rural and urban property access information from Driveways from D1 Road Design). MP stated that at LSC driveways are self-assessable if constructed in accordance with the CMDG Std Dwgs. Therefore, a standalone driveway Specification may be beneficial. LSC has had a legal opinion that Driveways are Operational Works, and it is not legal to assess as works in Road Reserve.</p> <p>4. Cardno to check to see if any of the standard drawings references need to be amended because of the creation of D15.</p> <p>5. All LGs are requested to review D1 draft changes and respond ASAP so the changes can be implemented (excluding development of new spreadsheets if to be implemented). Refer to comments in the electronic copy when reviewing as Scott has provided details on the basis and origin of suggested changes.</p>	<u>All LGs</u> <u>All LG's</u> <u>Cardno</u> <u>Cardno</u> <u>All LGs</u>																																												

10	D12 Sewerage Design and Construction - Lampholes Clause D12.09.03 Amend the maximum length of a terminal segment where a lamphole can be used from 40m to 90m.	<u>Cardno</u>
11	D12 Sewerage Design and Construction – Access chamber use in areas such as cul de sac heads There was brief discussion but no resolution for document changes except the reference in D12.09.02 to Table D12.09.03 should be corrected to D12.09.02.	<u>Cardno</u>
12	CMDG-S-31 Sewage Pump Station - inlet CMDG-S-061 is to be amended to show a drop pipe on the inlet (same as GRC drawing CMDG-S-050D). Currently CMDG-S-31 shows the inlet dropping directly onto the pumps.	<u>Cardno</u>
13	Purchase Specifications Mike to approach Phil McKone (LSC) to see if he has time to produce these purchase specifications before he retires.	<u>LSC</u>



