Shire of Boddington

Cemetery 'Other Structures'

Asset Management Plan

Document Control

| Rev No. | Date | Revision Details | Author | Reviewer | Approver |
|-----------------------|--------|------------------|--------|----------|----------|
| 0.1 | Nov-18 | Initial Draft | VL | | |
| Asset Renewal Funding | | | | | |
| 0.2 | | Ratio | | | |

Contents

| Contents | 3 |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| Background and Objectives | 5 |
| Purpose of this Asset Management Plan | 5 |
| Focus of this Asset Management Plan | 5 |
| Corporate Document Relationships | 5 |
| Time Period of the AMP and Next Review Date | 5 |
| Service Levels | 6 |
| Introduction | 6 |
| Service Level Performance | 6 |
| Stakeholder Key Service Attributes | 7 |
| Service Level Targets and Performance | 7 |
| Demand | 9 |
| Historic Demand | 9 |
| Future Demand | 9 |
| Demand Management | 10 |
| Lifecycle Management Plan | 11 |
| Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Condition | 12 |
| Data Confidence and Reliability | 18 |
| Lifecycle Management Strategies | 19 |
| Financial | 20 |
| Projected Expenditure Requirements | 20 |
| Plan Improvement and Monitoring | 21 |
| Performance Measures | 21 |
| Asset Consumption Ratio | 21 |
| Asset Sustainability Ratio | 22 |
| Asset Renewal Funding Ratio | 23 |
| Improvement Plan | 24 |
| Monitoring and Review Procedures | 24 |

Executive Summary

The Cemetery 'Other Structures' Asset Management Plan covers assets that are associated with the Shire of Boddington three cemeteries. These assets are located at the following facilities.

- Boddington
- Marradong
- Quindanning

This plan excludes the building asset types. These are captured in the 'Building and Land Asset Management Plan'.

This document is the Shire's Asset Management Plan (AMP) for Cemetery 'Other Structures.' It outlines the activities that will be carried out over the next ten years to provide and maintain the portfolio. It also details the service levels (standard) the Shire will provide and the resources required to deliver them.

While the document is comprehensive, it is also evolving with the Shire's practice maturity. As such there are a number of actions that have been identified that will improve the AMP's accuracy over time. All readers of this AMP must understand its limitations and applied assumptions before acting on any information contained within it.

Overall, the Cemetery 'Other Structures' assets in this plan have significant value estimated at \$300 thousand. Evidence suggests that the general condition of the Cemetery 'Other Structures' are 'Average' the assets are in fair overall condition, deterioration in condition would be obvious and there would be some serviceability loss. This position is supported with the asset portfolio asset consumption ratio 44% which is outside the target band of 50-75%.

Looking forward, a number of key improvement actions have been identified that would enable the Shire to better manage its Cemetery 'Other Structures' asset portfolio. These have been listed within the Improvement Plan for future implementation.

Background and Objectives

Purpose of this Asset Management Plan

This document is an Asset Management Plan (AMP) for the Shire's 'Other Structures' associated with buildings that have corporate use. The AMP documents shows how the Shire plans to manage these assets, to deliver services of a specified quality (service levels) and what the associated long term costs are.

Focus of this Asset Management Plan

The AMP focuses on the following asset type portfolio.

| Asset Class | Number of Assets | Current Replacement Cost |
|------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Other Structures | 16 | \$ 304,230 |

Table 1: Assets covered by AMP

Corporate Document Relationships

This AMP integrates with the other following Shire documents:

- = Strategic Community Plan
- = Corporate Business Plan
- = Long Term Financial Plan
- = Annual Budget.

Time Period of the AMP and Next Review Date

The AMP covers a 10 year period and will be next reviewed by 1 July 2019.

Service Levels

Introduction

The level of service is the defined service quality for the asset. Understanding the level of service required of an asset is vital for its lifecycle management, as this largely determines service are pivotal in asset management as they have a direct financial impact due to their importance in both operational and risk-based prioritisation.

Service levels are divided into two types:

- Community based; and
- Operations based

Community based levels of service relate to the function of the service provided and how the customer receives the service in terms of appearance, availability, comfort and safety.

Operations based levels of service relate to the technical measures and the outputs the customer receives in terms of quality, quantity, maintainability reliability and performance, responsiveness, capacity, environmental impacts and affordability.

Service Level Performance

Table 2 details the service level performance that the Shire provides.

| Key Performance Indicator KPI | Performance | Tactic |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Availability | Unknown | Monitoring performance |
| Safety | Unknown | Monitoring performance |
| Accessibility | Unknown | Monitoring performance |
| Function | Unknown | Monitoring performance |
| Responsiveness | Unknown | Monitoring performance |
| Condition | Unknown | Monitoring performance |
| Environment | Unknown | Monitoring performance |
| Cost/Affordability | Unknown | Monitoring performance |

Table 2: Service Level Performance

The Shire of Boddington has no record of monitoring their Performance of levels of services, so is not in a position to clearly articulate what its *current* levels of service are for 'Other Structures' assets under its responsibility. New levels of service has been considered in an asset management context. These will need to be refined in further versions of this Plan.

Stakeholder Key Service Attributes

The Shire has considered on behalf of each key stakeholder what they value and expect from 'Other Structure' assets. These needs and wants were captured and have been presented in the table below.

| Stakeholder | Expectations | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Councillors | Meeting community needs, sound management and allocation of resources, good governance | | | | | |
| Employees / Contractors | Safe working environment | | | | | |
| Community residents and businesses | Value for money, equitable and responsible service, well maintained assets | | | | | |
| Facility Users Well maintained assets specific to users' needs | | | | | | |
| Insurers | Appropriate risk management policies and practices, safe working environments, well maintained assets | | | | | |
| Tourists | Well maintained assets, accessible services, safe facilities | | | | | |

Table 3: Service Levels

The perception of what the customer wants will be investigated for future updates of the asset management plan.

Service Level Targets and Performance

By considering the potential service attributes from the Strategic Community Plan and stakeholder key service attributes, a total of eight KPIs have been selected. The following table outlines the KPIs used to monitor performance delivery.

| Key Performance Indicator | Level of Service | Performance Measure | Target Performance | Current Performance |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Availability | Provision of appropriate levels of Cemetery assets | Community survey to measure satisfaction with facilities and distance to them. | 80% of community are satisfied with the availability of assets. | Not measured. |
| Safety | Provide safe suitable facilities, free from hazards. | Number of hazards identified and remedied within performance guidelines. Insurance claim history. User feedback. | Appropriate action on all hazards according to risk management plan. | Quantity measured through action requests. |

| Key Level of Service Performar Measure Indicator | | Performance Measure | Target Performance | Current Performance |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Accessibility | Council's high use Cemetery facilities to be made accessible to all. | Feedback from community. Number of complaints received regarding lack of accessibility. | In accordance with current Disability Access and Inclusion Plan. | Not measured. |
| Function | Ensure that recreation facilities meet user requirements | Community survey to measure % of people satisfied with the level of Service provided by the assets. | 80% of community are satisfied with the facilities. | Not measured. |
| Responsiveness | Responses are prompt, clear and work appropriately prioritised | % of requested responded to within defined response times | 90% compliance with targets based on risk assessment. | Not measured |
| Condition | All Cemetery assets will meet condition standards defined by hierarchy. Facilities provide a quality experience for all users. | Ongoing condition assessments. Ongoing community feedback by various methods including surveys. | 70% of Cemetery assets assessed as good condition or better. | Not measured. |
| Environment | To ensure that Cemetery assets are renewed and maintained and operated in an environmentally sustainable manner. | Annual review of environmental impact assessments completed for projects. Review of energy consumption based on industry indicators. | All works in Cemetery comply with relevant legislation, publications, standards and specifications. | Not measured |
| Cost/Affordability | Provide recreation services in a cost effective manner | % of maintenance and renewal services & projects achieved on time, on budget and to appropriate standards. | All services and goods are delivered by internal or external resources that provide best value for money service. | Not measured. |

Table 4: Service Level Targets and Performance

Demand

This section summarises likely factors that may affect the demand for assets based services over the life of the AMP. Full details of past and future demand factors are recorded in the General Guidance Notes.

Historic Demand

A range of historical sources of service demand change have been considered. Their overall effect has been summarised as follows in Table 5.

| Driver Type | Effect | Demand Change |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Population | Shire population up by 441 people (+31%) from 1,401 (2001) to 1,844 (2016). | Possible <mark>Increase</mark> in demand. |
| Demographic | Population increase in all demographic age bands (2001 – 2016) except 30-39. | No change |
| | Median age has increased from 35 to 39 years (2001 – 2016). | |
| Recreation Participation | Participation rates continue to fall slightly year on year across the general population. Walking remains the most popular activity for recreation, followed by fitness/gym, jogging & running, swimming/diving and cycling/BMXing. | Possible <mark>Increase</mark> in demand. |
| Tourism | Tourist numbers in the 'golden outback' region grew from 1.5m (2012) to 2.1m (2017). This growth may have increase demand on the Cemetery facilities. | Possible <mark>Increase</mark> in demand. |
| Climate | Annual rainfall has fallen from approximately 730mm to 580mm per annum (1916 to 2017). Annual monthly mean maximum temperatures up from 29.2°C to 31.8°C (1935 to 2017). Address risks from climate changes a result. | Possible <mark>Increase</mark> in demand. |

Table 5: Historic Demand Drivers

Future Demand

Consideration was given to six possible future demand drivers (political, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental) that may influence demand on the provision of 'Other Structures' assets.

| Driver Type | Service Demand Change |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Political | Negligible |
| Economic | Increase from higher energy costs, and potential catastrophic funding constraints if a local mine closes. |
| Social | Increase due to tourism and vandalism. Changing needs due to demographic and recreation trend changes. |
| Technological | Opportunity to decrease maintenance costs through implementation of emerging technologies. |
| Legal | Increase in compliance obligations. |
| Environmental | Increase in costs due to climate change and implementation of appropriate asset management strategies. |

Table 6: Future Demand Drivers

Demand Management

A review of past and future demand factors shows that council does not anticipate demand change has occurred, and will also likely occur into the future. Looking forward, the following initiatives/improvements are proposed to meet demand changes.

- = Improving asset knowledge so that the data accurately records the asset inventory
- = Monitor how assets are performing and when assets are not able to provide the required service levels.
- = Improving our efficiency in operating, maintaining, replacing existing and constructing new assets to optimise life cycle costs.

Risk Management

A risk analysis of the current asset management deficiencies identified by the AMP has been undertaken. Table 6 outlines the top identified risks.

| Ref. | Risk | Level of Risk | Further Action |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | The Shire has no 'live' AMP for 'Other Structure' assets | Moderate | Develop AMP |
| 2 | A planned maintenance schedule does not exist. | Moderate | Implement the Synergy Soft AM module. |
| 4 | Shire has no long-term capital works programme. | High | Develop a 10 year works programme. |
| 7 | Shire has no monitored AMP service levels. | Low | Monitor the service levels recorded within this AMP. |

Table 7: Major Asset Management Risks

Lifecycle Management Plan

The lifecycle management plan details how the Shire intends to manage and operate its 'Other Structures' asset portfolio at the agreed service levels.

Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Physical Parameters

| Asset ID | Asset Name | Location | Current Replacemen t Cost | Fair Value | Annual Depreciatio n |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| IOTC1001005 | Graded gravel car park | Boddington | \$ 33,500 | \$ 8,375 | \$ 3,350 |
| IOTC1002005 | Pine log post and rail fencing | Boddington | \$ 6,900 | \$1,725 | \$ 251 |
| IOTC1003005 | Graded gravel roadway | Boddington | \$ 31,100 | \$ 7,775 | \$ 3,110 |
| IOTC1004005 | Metal and metal clad rotunda | Boddington | \$ 14,500 | \$ 5,438 | \$ 611 |
| IOTC1005005 | Brick niche wall | Boddington | \$ 10,500 | \$ 6,038 | \$ 160 |
| IOTC1006005 | Random stone wall | Boddington | \$ 7,590 | \$ 5,920 | \$ 92 |
| IOTC1007005 | Niche Wall | Boddington | \$ 10,400 | \$ 9,464 | \$ 135 |
| IOTC2001005 | Gravel Access Rd | Marradong | \$ 30,400 | \$ 11,400 | \$ 3,040 |
| IOTC2002005 | Seating | Marradong | \$ 3,680 | \$ 1,380 | \$ 155 |
| IOTC2003005 | Sculpture | Marradong | \$ 52,850 | \$ 19,819 | \$ 742 |
| IOTC2004005 | Fencing | Marradong | \$ 4,600 | \$ 805 | \$ 220 |
| IOTC3001003 | Gravel Car Park | Quindanning | \$ 58,600 | \$ 21,975 | \$ 4,935 |
| IOTC3002003 | Fencing | Quindanning | \$ 5,180 | \$ 1,295 | \$ 244 |
| IOTC3003003 | Seating | Quindanning | \$ 7,590 | \$ 3,795 | \$ 304 |
| IOTC1002997 | Gazebo | Quindanning | \$ 18,100 | \$ 15,385 | \$ 635 |
| IOTC2001997 | Steel mesh fencing | Quindanning | \$ 8,740 | \$ 3,278 | \$ 304 |
| | 1 | ı | \$ 304,230 | \$ 123,867 | \$18,288 |

Table 8: Cemetery 'Other Structures' Asset Physical Parameters

Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Condition

As at 30 June 2018, the Shire holds condition ratings for all the 'Other Structures' derived from the last asset valuation. While the condition ratings provide some indication as to where renewal works may be required, the ratings as not sufficiently robust to produce a long term works programme. An improvement action to implement a programme of inspections across the portfolio has been listed.

The following section outlines the Shire's 'Other Structures' at the Cemetery as of 30 June 2018.

| Asset ID | Image | Image | Asset Name | Asset Type | Asset Sub Type | Current Replacement Cost | Fair Value | Annual Depreciation | Remaining Useful Life (Years) | Condition 0-10 |
|-------------|----------|-------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| IOTC1001005 | | | Graded gravel car park | Hardstand and Internal Roads | Internal Road - Gravel | \$ 33,500 | \$ 8,375 | \$ 3,350 | 3 | 6 |
| IOTC1002005 | T T HUIT | | Pine log post and rail fencing | Fences | Timber Post and Rail | \$ 6,900 | \$1,725 | \$ 251 | 7 | 6 |
| IOTC1003005 | | | Graded gravel roadway | Hardstand and Internal Roads | Internal Road - Gravel | \$ 31,100 | \$ 7,775 | \$ 3,110 | 3 | 6 |
| IOTC1004005 | | | Metal and metal clad rotunda | Park Assets | Shelter | \$ 14,500 | \$ 5,438 | \$ 611 | 9 | 5 |

| Asset ID | Image | Image | Asset Name | Asset Type | Asset Sub Type | Current Replacement Cost | Fair Value | Annual Depreciation | Remaining Useful Life (Years) | Condition 0-10 |
|-------------|--------|-------|---------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| IOTC1005005 | | | Brick niche wall | Retain Walls | Brick | \$ 10,500 | \$ 6,038 | \$ 160 | 11 | 6 |
| IOTC1006005 | | | Random stone wall | Retain Walls | Rock | \$ 7,590 | \$ 5,920 | \$ 92 | 20 | 4 |
| IOTC1007005 | | | Niche Wall | Retain Walls | Brick | \$ 10,400 | \$ 9,464 | \$ 135 | 48 | 2 |
| IOTC2001005 | May at | | Gravel Access Rd | Hardstand and Internal Roads | Internal Road - Gravel | \$ 30,400 | \$ 11,400 | \$ 3,040 | 4 | 5 |

| Asset ID | Image | lmage | Asset Name | Asset Type | Asset Sub Type | Current Replacement Cost | Fair value | Annual Depreciation Total | Remaining Useful Life (Years) | Condition 0-10 |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| IOTC2002005 | | | Seating | Park Assets | Bench Seats | \$ 3,680 | \$ 1,380 | \$ 155 | 9 | 5 |
| IOTC2003005 | Declinated for the Propriets of Marradong and Roddington The service of the Propriets of Marradong and Roddington The service of the Propriets of the Service of the Serv | | Sculpture | Miscellaneo us | Features and Sculptures | \$ 52,850 | \$ 19,819 | \$ 742 | 27 | 5 |
| IOTC2004005 | No image available | | Fencing | Fences | Wire (Perimeter and Stock) | \$ 4,600 | \$ 805 | \$ 220 | 4 | 7 |

| Asset ID | lmage | Image | Asset Name | Asset Type | Asset Sub Type | Current Replacement Cost | Fair value | Annual Depreciation Total | Remaining Useful Life (Years) | Condition 0-10 |
|-------------|-------|-------|-----------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| IOTC3001003 | | | Gravel Car Park | Hardstand and Internal Roads | Hardstand - Gravel | \$ 58,600 | \$ 21,975 | \$ 4,935 | 4 | 5 |
| IOTC3002003 | | | Fencing | Fences | Wire (Perimeter and Stock) | \$ 5,180 | \$ 1,295 | \$ 244 | 5 | 6 |
| IOTC3003003 | | | Seating | Park Assets | Bench Seats | \$ 7,590 | \$ 3,795 | \$ 304 | 13 | 4 |
| IOTC1002997 | | | Gazebo | Park Assets | Shelter | \$ 18,100 | \$ 15,385 | \$ 635 | 24 | 2 |

| Asset ID | Image | lmage | Asset Name | Asset Type | Asset Sub Type | Current Replacement Cost | Fair value | Annual Depreciation Total | Remaining Useful Life (Years) | Condition 0-10 |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| IOTC2001997 | A TOTAL OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR | | Steel mesh fencing | Fences | Post and Chain Link | \$ 8,740 | \$ 3,278 | \$ 304 | 11 | 4 |
| | | | | | | \$ 304,230 | \$ 123,867 | \$18,288 | | Ave 5 |

Table 9: Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Condition

Data Confidence and Reliability

Table 11 details the reliability and confidence levels of the current asset data the Shire holds. It is the Shire's intention to progress towards a position whereby data confidence levels for all areas are classified as either a 1 or 2.

| Confidence Grade | Description | Accuracy |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| 1 – Excellent | Accurate | 100% |
| 2 – Good | Minor inaccuracies | ± 5% |
| 3 – Average | 50% estimated | <u>+</u> 20% |
| 4 – Poor | Significant data estimated | ± 30% |
| 5 – Very Poor | All data estimated | ± 40% |

Table 10: Data Confidence Measures

| Asset Type | Inventory | Condition | Valuation |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Corporate use | 1 | 2 | 1 |

Table 11: Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Data Confidence Levels

Lifecycle Management Strategies

Maintenance Strategy

The Shire currently employs a mixture of reactive and ad-hoc planned maintenance practices. Typically, annual budgets are based on historical levels of expenditure with an applied inflation factor. The available level of budget determines the level of planned maintenance that occurs.

Adequate maintenance is necessary for the proper operation of Cemetery facilities 'Other Structures'. The lack of maintenance is one of the most common causes of failure of assets.

Looking forward, the Shire wishes to improve this practice by increasing the level of planned maintenance activity and linking schedules to annual budgets. The development of a formal Cemetery 'Other Structures' maintenance programme has been listed as an improvement action.

Cemetery 'Other Structures' AMP

This document that sets out the Shire's long term management tactics for Cemetery 'Other Structures' assets.

Service Level Agreements

The Shire generally has little by way of formal Service Level Agreements with users of the tennis club, basketball groups and the youth. The development of a template agreement has been listed as an improvement action.

Renewal Strategy

All Cemetery 'Other Structures' assets are periodically inspected to determine their condition, on a 0 (new/excellent) to 10 (very poor/failed) scale. Condition results will be used to predict assets' potential year of renewal.

Staff then reinspect these assets to determine the timing, scope and budget of any future renewal project.

Projects are then listed on a long term works programme and reported within this AMP, any work on renewing assets would be regarded as Capital expenditure.

The renewal strategy in this plan is predominately providing for asset renewal once the asset condition is 6 or greater, as is demonstrated in the condition table. There are assets that are currently a 6 or higher and will need to be actioned on.

Strategic Goals

A significant high level asset data collection and condition assessment process was conducted in 2018 assets. It is recommended that Council budget for capital expenditure that focuses its spending on poor condition assets graded at level 7 or higher.

New Strategy

The need for new and/or upgraded assets (e.g. to meet a service deficiency) are identified from several potential sources. Each potential asset is investigated by staff and where valid, often prioritised against similar projects. Approved projects are then listed onto the works programme. At present, the Shire does not have a formal prioritisation framework for upgrade/new assets, where their 'strategic fit' against the Strategic Community Plan can be determined. An improvement action to consider this has been listed.

Disposal Strategy

Cemetery 'Other Structures' assets are not frequently disposed of (this is where the asset is not replaced/renewed). Where a potential need is identified, then this is considered by staff, and in some cases, Council.

Financial

There are minimal funds at present in the current 10 year financial year for 'Other Structure' assets, this is in most part as a consequence that the Shire of Boddington has never had an effective Asset Management Plan in respect of these 'Other Structures' Cemetery. These assets will require further inspection and a review will be required.

Projected Expenditure Requirements

| Expense Type | Year 1 2018/19 | Year 2 2019/20 | Year 3 2020/21 | Year 4 2021/22 | Year 5 2022/23 |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Operations | | | | | |
| Maintenance | | | | | |
| Renewal | | | | | |
| Upgrade | | | | | |
| New | | | | | |
| Disposal | | | | | |

| Expense Type | Year 6 2023/24 | Year 7 2024/25 | Year 8 2025/26 | Year 9 2026/27 | Year 10 2027/28 |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Operations | | | | | |
| Maintenance | | | | | |
| Renewal | | | | | |
| Upgrade | | | | | |
| New | | | | | |
| Disposal | | | | | |

Table 12: Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Expenditure Requirements

Planned Renewal Expenditure over the next 10 years (Renewal/Upgrade) \$ 0

Plan Improvement and Monitoring

This Section of the AMP outlines the degree to which it is an effective and integrated tool within the Shire. It also details the future tasks required to improve its accuracy and robustness.

Performance Measures

The effectiveness of the AMP will be monitored by the performance of the three statutory ratios that the Shire reports on. The Shire's current performance is recorded in Table 17.

Asset Consumption Ratio

The ratio is a measure of the condition of the Shire's physical assets, by comparing their condition based fair value (what they're currently worth) against their current replacement cost (what their replacement asset is currently worth as new). The ratio highlights the aged condition of the portfolio and has a target band of between 50%-75%. Non-depreciating assets (e.g. land etc.) should be excluded from the calculation.

Asset Consumption Ratio = <u>Depreciated Replacement Cost (Fair Value) of Depreciable Cemetery 'Other Structures'</u>

Current Replacement Cost of Depreciable Cemetery 'Other Structures'

This ratio seeks to highlight the aged condition of a local government's stock of physical assets. If a local government is responsibly maintaining and renewing / replacing its assets in accordance with a well prepared asset management plan, then the fact that its Asset Consumption Ratio may be relatively low and/or declining should not be cause for concern – providing it is operating sustainably.

| Asset ID | Asset Name | Current Replacement Cost | Fair Value | Asset Consumptio n Ratio % |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| IOTC1001005 | Graded gravel car park | \$ 33,500 | \$ 8,375 | 25% |
| IOTC1002005 | Pine log post and rail fencing | \$ 6,900 | \$ 1,725 | 25% |
| IOTC1003005 | Graded gravel roadway | \$ 31,100 | \$ 7,775 | 25% |
| IOTC1004005 | Metal and metal clad rotunda | \$ 14,500 | \$ 5,438 | 38% |
| IOTC1005005 | Brick niche wall | \$ 10,500 | \$ 6,038 | 58% |
| IOTC1006005 | Random stone wall | \$ 7,590 | \$ 5,920 | 78% |
| IOTC1007005 | Niche Wall | \$ 10,400 | \$ 9,464 | 91% |
| IOTC2001005 | Gravel Access Rd | \$ 30,400 | \$ 11,400 | 38% |
| IOTC2002005 | Seating | \$ 3,680 | \$ 1,380 | 38% |

| Asset ID | Asset Name | Current Replacement Cost | Fair Value | Asset Consumption Ratio % |
|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|
| IOTC2003005 | Sculpture | \$ 52,850 | \$ 19,819 | 38% |
| IOTC2004005 | Fencing | \$ 4,600 | \$ 805 | 18% |
| IOTC3001003 | Gravel Car Park | \$ 58,600 | \$ 21,975 | 38% |
| IOTC3002003 | Fencing | \$ 5,180 | \$ 1,295 | 25% |
| IOTC3003003 | Seating | \$ 7,590 | \$ 3,795 | 50% |
| IOTC1002997 | Gazebo | \$ 18,100 | \$ 15,385 | 85% |
| IOTC2001997 | Steel mesh fencing | \$ 8,740 | \$ 3,278 | 38% |
| | | \$ 304,230 | \$ 123,867 | Average 44% |

Table 13: Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Consumption Ratios

The average Asset Consumption Ratio of the Cemetery 'Other Structures' does not meet the standard range of 50% - 75%. The Average is 44%

Asset Sustainability Ratio

The ratio is a measure of the extent to which assets managed by the Shire are being replaced as they reach the end of their useful lives. The ratio is essentially past looking, and is based upon dividing the average annual depreciation expense of the Cemetery 'Other Structures' asset portfolio by the average annual renewal expenditure, for a number of past years (e.g. 3).

| Asset | F | Renewal Expenditi | ure | Average Renewal |
|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|-----------------|
| | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Expenditure |
| Other Structures | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |

Table 14: Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Sustainability Ratios

Asset Sustainability Ratio = Past Cemetery 'Other Structures' Renewal Expenditure
Cemetery 'Other Structures' Asset Depreciation

= 0%

Asset Renewal Funding Ratio

The ratio is a measure as to whether the Shire has the financial capacity to fund asset renewal as and when it is required over the future 10 year period. The ratio is calculated by dividing the net present value of planned renewal expenditure over the next 10 years in the LTFP, by the net present value of planned renewal expenditure over the next 10 years in the AMP. The same net present value discount must be applied in both calculations.

| Planned Renewal Expenditure | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| 2018/19 2019/20 2020/21 2021/22 2022/23 2023/24 | | | | | | | | |
| Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | | | |
| \$ 0 | \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | | | | | | | |

| Planned Renewal Expenditure | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|
| 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | Total sum |
| Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 1 - 10 |
| \$ 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Table 15: Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Planned Renewal Expenditure at 0% per year

| Required Renewal Expenditure | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2018/19 |
| Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 |
| \$ 18,288 | \$ 18,654 | \$ 19,027 | \$ 19,407 | \$ 19,796 | \$ 20,191 |

| Required Renewal Expenditure | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | Total sum |
| Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 1-10 |
| \$ 20,595 | \$ 21,007 | \$ 21,427 | \$ 21,856 | \$ 200,248 |

Table 16: Cemetery 'Other Structures' Assets Required Renewal Expenditure at 2% per year

Asset Renewal Funding Ratio = NPV of LTFP Planned Renewal Expenditure over the next 10 years

NPV of AMP Required Renewal Expenditure over the next 10 years

Asset Renewal Funding Ratio =
$$\frac{\$}{\$}$$
 200,248

Asset Renewal Funding Ratio = 0%

| Year | Asset Consumption Ratio | Asset Sustainability Ratio | Asset Renewal Funding Ratio |
|---------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2018/19 | 44% | 0% | 0% |

Table 17: AMP Performance Measures

Improvement Plan

The asset management improvement plan generated from this AMP is shown in Table 18.

| Task No. | Task | Responsibility | Timeline |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| 1 | Complete the implementation of the Synergy Soft AM module. | | |
| 2 | Update new assets when handed over to the council | | |
| 3 | Identify future technologies that can facilitate more effective and cost-efficient asset management practices. | | |
| 4 | Provision of detailed work program for renewal | | |
| 5 | Monitor the service levels recorded within this AMP. | | |
| 6 | Implement an ongoing programme of Cemetery 'Other Structures' condition inspections. | | |
| 7 | Develop a Cemetery 'Other Structures' maintenance schedule, with associated budgets. | | |
| 8 | Develop an upgrade/new project evaluation and prioritisation framework. | | |

Table 18: AMP Improvement Plan

Monitoring and Review Procedures

This AMP will be reviewed during annual budget preparation and amended to recognise any changes in service level and/or resources available to provide those services as a result of the budget decision process.