

2010-11 Boating Safety and Facilities Program - Application Assessment

Boating Facilities

Applicant	East Gippsland Shire Council
Project title	Mallacoota Ocean Access Boat Ramp
Description of project	Replace existing 50 year old boat ramp at Bastion Point
Amount sought	\$ 600,000

PROCESSING CHECKLIST		
Acknowledgement letter sent?	Yes/No	Comments/Date:
Application eligible to be assessed?	Yes/No	Comments:
If application rejected - Letter sent?	Yes/No	Date:

RECOMMENDATION - TO BE COMPLETED BY ASSESSMENT PANEL

TOTAL SCORE	
Add up the score from each section (excluding risk rating) and write the total here ->	
Recommended for funding - Yes/No	Amount recommended - \$
Reason for not funding Note - this is the text that will appear in the letter to the grant applicant.	
Does the Assessment Panel recommend any special conditions be placed upon the funding provided to this applicant?	
Risk rating on the likely success of this project. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likelihood of recipient not delivering on grant Consequence of non-delivery Likelihood of any grant conditions not being met Past performance of this group on other grants (media/launch responsibilities etc.) Amount being sought Location of project 	High - 5 Medium - 3 Low - 1 Risk Rating =

INITIAL ASSESSMENT AND INFORMATION FOR THIS APPLICATION			
Is this application in the correct category?	Yes/No:	Yes	Moved to:
Is there enough information for the application to be assessed?	Yes/No:	Yes	Comments:
Did the applicant complete a pre-registration form for this project?	Yes/No:	Yes	Comments:
Grants team comments on this application. E.g; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the application clear about the intended outcome? Are there likely to be issues of planning permits/consents? Are there detailed costings attached? 	Demand for the project is based on a highly contentious Economic Impact Analysis. Significant permits (CMA, Native Title, Cultural Heritage and Native Vegetation) are still to be applied for. Estimate of costs prepared by engineering and environmental consultants, with no evidence they have any experience in this type of development.		
What strategic/policy documents relate to this application? (E.g. Boating CAP; Feasibility study etc.)	Boating CAP. Economic Impact Analysis. EES.		

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

In the following tables, the Assessment Panel is to apply a score that accurately reflects the degree to which the application meets the program criteria under each section. Scores are to be allocated in the range shown against each category. Comments are also required as to how the score was arrived at.

PROJECT GOALS AND OUTCOMES (Part 3)		
Consider the degree to which the Aims of this category will be met, eg:	Out of 15	Justification comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of safe public boating access. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of natural features (shelter, all tide, all weather etc.) ○ Designed with safety of users in mind. ○ Consideration for impact on other waterway users. • Assurance of public access at all reasonable times. 	10	<p>Substantial structure to improve access for recreational boaters who would not normally consider boating in the open ocean from the existing facility. Will separate boats from swimmers. May negatively impact a local surf break in some conditions.</p>
PROJECT COSTS AND GRANT SOUGHT (Part 6)		
The project appears to provide value for money after considering the location/ environment in which the work is to occur. Demonstrated by:	Out of 25	Justification comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory quotes (with supporting evidence) provided • Lowest quote selected, or adequate explanation. • Breakdown of costs into major components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capital works - Infrastructure ○ Capital works - Drainage/power etc. ○ Project management/documentation • Details of the applicant's contributing of at least 20% (eg. held/promised/in-kind & excludes other gov't funds) • Confidence (as demonstrated through accurate design work) that the costs seem accurate for a project of this type. 	5	<p>Cost estimate prepared by consultants. Major funding comes from State Government (RIDF). Work to be done by MPV. Council has allocated \$300,000 of own funds. Conditions on consents still to be granted may affect costs.</p>
FACILITY DEMAND (Part 4)		
The need for this facility at this site has been demonstrated or is known to exist. Consider:	Out of 25	Justification comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is an upgrade of existing facility necessary? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usage statistics for existing facilities. • Why is a new facility required? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are usage estimates for new facilities realistic? • Will the development of this facility address known safety concerns? • Potential involvement of Commercial operations (eg. financial contribution?) • What other boating facilities are nearby? 		<p>Mixed demand from both commercial and recreational boaters. Commercial operators seek better facilities to make work safer. Economic Impact Assessment report claims recreational boating will increase from 800 launches pa to 4200 pa. This claim is violently disputed by a very divided community. Even at this higher figure, demand is not considered to be high.</p>
PROJECT PLANNING & STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT (Part 5 & 7)		
Demonstration of project planning undertaken to date. Evidence that the applicant has the capacity (ie. knowledge and experience) to undertake this project successfully. Consider:	Out of 30	Justification comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to any applicable strategy/planning documents or studies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boating Coastal Action Plan • Local Council strategic planning documents • Safety audit supplied (where application by waterway manager) • Evidence of support from key stakeholders such as waterway manager and other permit authorities (eg. landlords, environmental, planning) • Is the applicant an appropriate body to undertake a project of this scale (consider whether the project requires engineering supervision, contract preparation etc) • Demonstration of community support. 	15	<p>Although EGipps is the applicant, the project will be delivered by Major Projects Victoria. Project Development Group is overseeing approvals from Coastal Management Act, Cultural Heritage, Native Vegetation Removal, Native Title. MSV prepared a safety audit on the proposed new design, with a comprehensive list of items to be incorporated in the design to ensure boater safety. Local community is seriously divided over the chosen facility design. No letters of support provided with the application.</p>

MAINTENANCE (Part 8)		
Who is the appropriate authority? Have they indicated they will be responsible for ongoing maintenance, and confirm there is no reason to believe that the facility will not be adequately maintained.	Out of 5	Justification comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is evidence provided that the relevant body clearly accepts ongoing responsibility for the maintenance of the site (in writing)? • Will revenue from usage of the facility be directed to maintenance and upkeep? Comment. 	5	Council is the appropriate body to maintain this facility.

	Initials	Date
Prepared by:	CS	23/8/10
Reviewed by:	RP	23/8/10
Reviewed by:		
Reviewed by:		

Released Under the Freedom of
 Information Act 1982
 Department of Transport

File No: 9319-07/19630-08

Program	East Gippsland Shire Council - Local Government	Funds Manager	Managing own Funds - GST Status Not Set
Status	Boating Safety and Facilities Program-2010-11>Boating Facilities	Project Name	Mallacoota Ocean Access Boat Ramp
Managing Officer	Assessment - Requesting \$600,000.00		

Released Under the Freedom of Information Act 1982
Department of Transport

Fax		TTY	
Email	.au @egipps.vic.gov	Web Address	
Released Under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 Department of Transport			
What Communities will benefit?			Mallacoota Community
Address Line 1			Primary Physical Project Location
Address Line 2			Copy Applicant's street address details to the fields below
Suburb			
State	VIC	Post Code	
Map Type	Vicroads	Page	70
		Map Reference	Grid Reference
			E7
Local Govt Auth		Upper House	
		Grant Location	Lower House

East Gippsland Shire Council	Eastern Victoria Region	Gippsland East District
Waterway Name Statewide	Waterway Type Statewide	
Victorian Place Names - List of LGA's for a suburb Victorian Property Report - Identify LGA based on address Australia Post - List of postcodes VEC Maps - VEC Maps / Victorian Electoral boundaries		
Click's		
The amount requested in this application \$600,000.00 is over the Max Application Limit of \$280,000.00 for this Program		
Requested Amount From SVS Programs Application Maximum		

Released Under the Freedom of Information Act 1982
 Department of Transport

Requested Amt From MSV Vs Total Exps		Exceeds Ratio \$200,000.00
Total Expenditure	\$250,000.00	expenditure to be offset by MSV funds
Site Preparation		
Project Construction		
Project Management	\$250,000.00	
Preferred Quote	\$5,250,000.00	
Permits		
Regulatory Signage		
Navigational Aids		
Other Amount		
Description		
Total Project Income/Confirmed	\$5,250,000.00	Total funds confirmed \$0
Amount requested from MSV	\$600,000.00	
Community Support Grants		
Total funds from other sources	\$4,650,000.00	
Contributions In-kind	\$0.00	
Income Items		Amounts already confirmed
Government		
Amount requested from this program	\$600,000.00	
Other amounts from MSV		
Other State Government	\$4,350,000.00	
Local Government		
Federal Government		
Total Government	\$4,950,000.00	
From your Organisation		
Funds from your Organisation	\$300,000.00	
In-kind from your Organisation		

Total from your Organisation \$300,000.00 Community Investment Community Fund Raising In-Kind Support Business Contribution Philanthropic Contributions Other Amount Description		
<p style="text-align: center;">Program Specific Checklist Items Date</p>		
1	Attached: CURRENT SITE OVERVIEW • Current Plans and photos of the	-
2	Attached: PLANS for the FUTURE SITE. Clear plans of how the site will	-
3	Attached: QUOTE(S) The appropriate amount of quotes - up to	-
4	\$25	-
5	Attached: PERMITS. Permits to carry out all necessary work on the Attached: LETTERS of SUPPORT. Letters of Support for the project	-
Declaration Details Name Position Date Hard Copy Data Entry Completed		
All Assessment Tasks completed Date: Officer assigned to Assess Project: Act Compliance Section <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Task Descriptions Date</p>		
1	Verify: CURRENT SITE OVERVIEW • Current Plans and photos of the e	-
2	Verify: PLANS for the FUTURE SITE. Clear plans of how the site will	-
3	Verify: QUOTE(S) The appropriate amount of quotes - up to \$25 0	-
4	Verify: PERMITS. Permits to carry out all necessary work on the s	-

5 Verify: LETTERS of SUPPORT. Letters of Support for the project by

Verify: CURRENT SITE OVERVIEW[cr][cr] Current Plans and photos of the existing (if any) facilities at the site including parking availability[cr][cr] Describe the existing facilities at the site including current access to the proposed site and parking availability.[cr][cr] If the site is Crown Land please provide details of the reservation[co] the Statutory Management Authority (SMA) and your relationship to the SMA.[cr][cr] Please give details of the nearest comparable facilities in the locality.[cr][cr] Advise if the facility is available for use by the general public at all times. Are there any restrictions to availability?[cr][cr][cr] Verify: PLANS for the FUTURE SITE. Clear plans of how the site will look after development.; Verify: QUOTE(S) The appropriate amount of quotes [cr] up to \$25[co]000 one quote[cr] between \$25[co]000 and \$150[co]000 three written quotes are required[cr]- Applications of \$150[co]000 and over require a public tender process.[cr][cr]A breakdown of any in-house work to be carried out.; Verify: PERMITS. Permits to carry out all necessary work on the site.; Verify: LETTERS of SUPPORT. Letters of Support for the project by the Land owner and other community organisations.30/12/1899
 30/12/1899
 30/12/1899
 30/12/1899 Note: if you add a new assessment task, add a new date.

Applicant's Responses to Additional Questions

	Question	Response
1	Have any previous grants for upgrade been provided for this facility?	No
2	Is it expected that commercial vessels will utilise the proposed facility?	No
3	If yes please describe what financial contribution they will make	No answer given
4	towards the w	Yes
5	Is it expected that Search and Rescue organisations will utilise the	Victoria Police Sta
6	facility?	Cape Conran 37'48" S
7	If yes please detail the organisation.	Yes
8	Where is the nearest similar facility Located? Please answer in	No answer provided
9	nautical miles a	East Gippsland Shire
10	Is the facility to be available to the public at all reasonable times?	No
11	Please detail any restrictions to availability	No
12	Who will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility?	Yes
13	Has the facility Manager given written confirmation that they will	No answer provided
14	continue to m	No answer provided
15	Is a user charge levied or intended to be levied on the facility?	Will be competitive
16	Will a user levy be solely used for maintenance and upkeep of the	Refer attachment
17	facility?	No
18	If no where will the revenue be directed?	Craig Stoodley
19	If more than one quote is required and you have not selected the lowest quote pl	No answer provided
	If the number of required quotes has not been provided please explain why.	
	Provide all details of permits that have been obtained or are required	
	Have you submitted a pre-registration form for this project?	
	If you have contacted the Grants Administration Team about this project who was	
	Detail any connection by way of membership or any other means between the organ	

All Eligibility Criteria have been considered Date:

Requested Amounts
 \$600,000.00

Ratios
 Exceeds Ratio \$200,000.00

Program Cap

	Applicant Response	Eligibility Criteria
1	Yes	Local waterway authorities government agencies committees of management and community groups.
		Eligibility Criteria: Local waterway authorities, government agencies, committees of management and community groups.
	Applicant Comments	Response: Yes
	Calculated Eligibility	All Matched
	Program Manager	No
	OverRide	No

OverRide Reason					
Definitive Eligibility Ineligibility Reason		All Matched			
This reason will be used in InEligible letters					
All Criteria have been scored		Date:			
Type	Question	Question Weighl	Raw Score	Weighted Score	
1	Why	Why is this project	30	4	120
2	How	necessary.	30	3	90
3	Who	How will the project	5	5	25
4	What	be delivered?	35	7	245
		Who will be involved in the project?			
		What will the project achieve? How will safety in the marine environment be improved through these enhancements?			
Read Print Issues not reflected in funding criteria score:			Total:	480	
			Read in conjunction with TRIM DOC/10/393112		
Panel Recommendation: Panel Reason:			Not Recommended		
			The applicant has not referred to the MSV Safety Audit or addressed the ongoing safe management of this site. The application has not established demand - the project does not respond to existing demand by recreational boaters but seeks to increase future usage by its presence. There is no detailed picture of how projections of future use are arrived at or what time-frame they would be achieved over. The case of demand from recreational boaters has not been made. Assumptions about revenue in the application are not supported by the Buchan Report (charging for launches).		
Recommendation Approval					

Released Under the Freedom of Information Act 1982
 Department of Transport

Final Recommendation Outcome		
Final Grant Amount Recommended to/Approved by Minister		
Date of Ministers Decision Batch Number	Ministers Approval	No Decision Yet
Approved Project Records Management No. 9319-07/19630-	Date approved project announced	
Details of highest completed recommendation :		
Name		
Strengths	Weaknesses	
Suggested Conditions		
Recommendation		
Recommended Funding Amount 0	Reason for difference from requested amount (if any)	

Date:	
Officer Assigned to Manage Project:	
Date Grant Agreement Received/Certified	
<u>File Progress Requirement Descriptions</u>	Date
Note: if you add a new progress requirement, add a new date.	
Date:	

Project Dates	Start Date	Completion Date
Anticipated		
Agreed		
"How will you know you have succeeded?" (Key Tasks and Outcomes)		
To record a Key Task, the document must first be in edit mode. Click the "Edit" button from the menu bar, then click the "Create" button and choose the "Key Task" Option.		

Date:	
<u>Acquittal Task Descriptions</u>	Date
Note: if you add a new acquittal task, add a new date.	
Performance Standards and Targets	
No	<u>Standards and Targets Descriptions</u>
Grant Comments	
Project Status: GPO Comments Log: GM Comments Log: 	
Transactions	
MSV Vendor Details verified OPA Task OPA Expenditure Type Approved Grant Amount \$0.00 \$0.00 Variations F i n a l G r a n t A m o	MSV Vendor Site Default OPA Tax Name GST Component \$0.00 Total Expenses \$0.00 Total Authorised \$0.00 Accrued

Unit Transactions				
	\$0.00	Total Presented Transactions	\$0.00	
Authorised to Date				
Balance left to Claim	\$0.00	Confirmed Balance	\$0.00	
Total Unspent Amount	\$0.00			
Moved Unspent Amount?				
	Clerks			
	Total Expenses Vs Program Application Maximum	Passed		
	Ratio Vs Total Expenses	Passed		
	Organisation's contribution to the project (%)	0.00 %		
Initial Payment Installments				
No	Initial Payment Installments Descriptions			

Total expense amounts:
Total claim amounts:

Released Under the Freedom of
Information Act 1982
Department of Transport