


CITY OF COCKBURN



SPECIAL COUNCIL

AGENDA PAPER

FOR

THURSDAY, 6 MAY 2010

CITY OF COCKBURN

SUMMARY OF AGENDA TO BE PRESENTED TO THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING TO BE HELD ON THURSDAY, 6 MAY 2010 AT 6:00 PM

	Page
1. DECLARATION OF MEETING	1
2. APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER (IF REQUIRED).....	1
3. DISCLAIMER (TO BE READ ALOUD BY PRESIDING MEMBER)	1
4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF WRITTEN DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST (BY PRESIDING MEMBER).....	1
5. APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	1
6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	1
7. DECLARATION BY COUNCILLORS WHO HAVE NOT GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE BUSINESS.....	1
8 (SCM06/05/2010) - PURPOSE OF MEETING	1
9. COUNCIL MATTERS.....	2
9.1 (SCM06/05/2010) - TENDER NO. RFT44/2009 - SECURITY SERVICES (MOBILE PATROLS ETC.) (RFT 44/2009) (D GREEN) (ATTACH)	2
10. (SCM06/05/2010) - RESOLUTION OF COMPLIANCE (SECTION 3.18(3), LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995).....	11
11. CLOSURE OF MEETING	11

CITY OF COCKBURN**AGENDA TO BE PRESENTED TO THE SPECIAL COUNCIL
MEETING TO BE HELD ON
THURSDAY, 6 MAY 2010 AT 6:00 PM**

1. DECLARATION OF MEETING**2. APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER (If required)****3. DISCLAIMER (To be read aloud by Presiding Member)**

Members of the public, who attend Council Meetings, should not act immediately on anything they hear at the Meetings, without first seeking clarification of Council's position. Persons are advised to wait for written advice from the Council prior to taking action on any matter that they may have before Council.

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF WRITTEN DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST (by Presiding Member)**5. APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE****6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME****7. DECLARATION BY COUNCILLORS WHO HAVE NOT GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE BUSINESS****8 (SCM06/05/2010) - PURPOSE OF MEETING**

The purpose of the meeting is to consider Tender No. RFT44/2009 – Security Services (Mobile Patrols, etc).

9. COUNCIL MATTERS

9.1 (SCM06/05/2010) - TENDER NO. RFT44/2009 - SECURITY SERVICES (MOBILE PATROLS ETC.) (RFT 44/2009) (D GREEN) (ATTACH)

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- (1) accepts the tender submitted by Wilson Security for Tender No. RFT 44/2009 – Security Services - for the provided contract value of \$1,462,713.51 (GST exclusive) and the rates for additional services, as contained in the Schedule of Rates (GST exclusive);
- (2) provide funds of up to \$30,000 for the immediate establishment and fit out of office space and base for the service, located adjacent to the current Ranger services accommodation at the Council Operations Centre;
- (3) provide funds of up to \$10,000 in the 2009/10 Municipal Budget to provide for the employment of a Contract Supervisor / Service Support Officer to assist in the initial establishment and administration and the ongoing monitoring of the service;
- (4) provide funds of up to \$50,000 in the 2009/10 Municipal Budget to enable an adequate promotion campaign to be effected prior to the commencement of the Service and
- (5) draw funds required for the implementation of (2) to (4) above from the Community Surveillance Levy Reserve Fund.

TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL

COUNCIL DECISION

Background

Council at its meeting of 10 September 2009 resolved as follows:

- (1) *advises the City of Melville that it intends to withdraw from the current Community Safety Service (CSS) partnership arrangement upon the expiry of the current term on 30 June 2010;*

- (2) *calls tenders for the provision of a similar security patrol service to be contract managed internally by the City of Cockburn;*
- (3) *requires a fully costed internal community security service, based on the expansion of Council's Ranger services to an 'around the clock' operation, to be provided as a comparison to the external provision of this function.*
- (4) *include in the service brief that options for the delivery of the service other than on a "24/7" basis will be considered; and*
- (5) *conduct a workshop of Elected Members following the October 2009 Council elections to ensure they are all fully conversant with the intent and purpose of the proposed service.*

In accordance with the Council decision tender documentation was prepared and advertised on 4 November 2009. Elected Members were provided with a briefing on the tender on 19 November 2009 and a copy of the presentation was also emailed to all Elected Members.

An alternative proposal for an expanded Ranger service was prepared by the Rangers and Community Safety Manager in lieu of a tendered security patrol service. This was prepared and evaluated completely independent of the external security tender. A copy of relevant content of the proposal is attached to the Agenda.

At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 11 March 2010, Council deferred the item for the purpose of conducting a workshop with Elected Members, prior to the matter being represented to Council in April 2010.

A workshop was conducted with Elected Members on Saturday 27 March 2010, at which a number of issues were raised relevant to both the tendered proposals and the internal submission. Further information has since been consolidated and forwarded to Elected Members.

The matter was again deferred at the Council Meeting held on 8 April 2010, for the purposes of arranging a further briefing on the matter to Elected Members facilitated by an external consultant and to review the process undertaken so far.

Accordingly, a presentation was provided by the Executive Manager, Office of Crime Prevention, Mr Michael Coe, who has had extensive experience in the establishment and operation of security patrols in both the private sector and local government. Mr Coe's experience extends to the management of both in-house and out-sourced security patrols during his Local Government employment. A copy of the presentation has been included in the attachment.

Submission

The security services (Mobile Security Patrols etc) Request for Tender (RFT) 44/2009 closed on 19 November 2009. There were 8 tenders received.

1. Charter Group Security Pty Ltd
2. Wilson Security
3. Southern Cross Protection Pty Ltd
4. Australian Assets Protection Pty Ltd
5. Accord Security Pty Ltd
6. ANSS Australian Pty Ltd
7. Kencross Pty Ltd T/A TMS Services
8. MCW Corporation Pty Ltd T/A Perth Security Services

Report

Of the 8 tenders received 7 were deemed compliant. The tender submission from Australian National Security Service was deemed non compliant with regards to Price Schedule and Conditions of Tendering. Wilson Security deemed themselves non complaint as they have been advised by their own legal firm that they would be unable to comply with the indemnity clauses in the tender. The City's insurers have advised that the requirements related to Insurance Indemnity in the standard tender are not appropriate for the specific tender for the security service and hence the tender from Wilson Security can be accepted.

Compliance Outcome

	Tenderer's Name	Compliance Criteria Overall Assessment
1	Charter Security	Compliant
2	Wilson Security	Compliant
3	Southern Cross Security	Compliant
4	Australian Asset Protection	Compliant
5	Accord Security	Compliant
6	TMS Services	Compliant
7	Perth Security	Compliant
8	Australian National Security Services	Non Compliant

Assessment Criteria	
Price	35%
Demonstrated experience	20%
Response times and Contactability	15%
Tenders Personnel	15%
Tenders resources	15%
TOTAL	100%

The services required include but are not limited to:

- Random and targeted mobile security patrols available on a twenty-four (24) hours a day 365 days a year basis.
- Community relations role on behalf of the Principal.
- Liaising with and reporting to Western Australia Police.
- Provision of a staffed Control Room; twenty-four (24) hours a day 365 days a year, with the ability to include CCTV monitoring at a future stage.
- Provision of an opening and closing (securing) service for specified facilities
- Provision of security escort services of the Principal's staff at nominated facilities or on an 'as requested' basis.

The 'Scope of Services' included in the Tender documentation, including the Key Performance Indicators (KPI's), is attached to the Agenda.

Tender submissions were evaluated by:

1. Robert Avard - Manager Community Services.
2. Nelson Mauricio - Manager, Management Accounting and Budgeting.
3. Philip Crabbe - Facilities and Plant Manager.

Scores:			
Tenderer's Name	Non-Cost Criteria Assessment Score	Cost Criteria Assessment Score	Total Score
Charter Security	41.50%	22.95%	64.45%
Wilson Security	57.75%	30.36%	88.11%
Southern Cross Security	51.25%	25.55%	76.8%
Australian Asset Protection	50.75%	34.09%	84.84%
Accord Security	44.25%	33.31%	77.56%
TMS Services	38.00%	32.27%	70.27%
Perth Security Services	53.75%	35%	88.75%

Perth Security Service is a small firm with local government experience at the Cities of South Perth and Gosnells both of whom gave extremely

positive feedback on their contract performance. Their price is very competitive and their industrial pay arrangements stable. Perth Security Service have committed to establishing a 24/7 control centre to meet the needs of the City and will have the allocated premises located at the City's Depot as the Cockburn operational base. The core team proposed for the City contract is experienced and appear competent.

However, as some Elected Members have registered a concern that the level of service previously recommended was going to reduce the presence of the patrols in the community from 1 July 2010, a review of the capacity of the top two assessed tenderers to deliver a similar level of service as is currently provided was undertaken.

Under this scenario, and given the limited timeframe available for providers to prepare for a 1 July 2010 commencement of patrols, the capability of Wilson Security would appear better placed to manage this outcome, when compared to the lesser resourced Perth Security Service.

Accordingly, it is considered that Wilson Security would offer a lower risk in capability and provide greater surety in the commencement of the level of service comparative to that currently supplied by the City of Melville (ie. 4 vehicles 24/7). Of course, this additional resource is provided at extra cost and amounts to \$175,000 per annum over that provided by Perth Security Service. However, given the original tender assessment was undertaken in November 2009, and anticipated a Council decision which would have allowed 3-4 months for the establishment process to be completed, it is considered prudent to recommend the higher priced option, on the basis that Wilson Security will be able to deliver the service in a more expeditious manner.

In-house submission

In accordance with Councils decision of September, 2009, a comprehensive submission was prepared by Council staff based on utilising an expanded Ranger service to deliver a similar model as that requested by the Tender.

An abridged copy of the submission has been provided to Elected Members under separate cover as a confidential attachment, together with comments from senior Council Financial staff on the validity of the document.

In summarising the submission, it provides a credible alternative to the outsourced tender model, in that it would provide Council with complete control over the resources allocated to the service, together with the inherent benefit of flexibility that in house resources can provide.

However, with the initial establishment costs estimated to be around \$300,000 in excess of the preferred external Contractor for year 1 and between \$200,000 - \$250,000 per year thereafter, it is difficult to develop a case for choosing the in house submission, based on cost – benefit comparisons, ahead of the outsourced option.

Service Levels – Options

[a] Reduced Service Option

A primary consideration in recommending the outsource option is that the service can be tailored to suit any circumstances and additional resources can allocated / reduced/ re – deployed on an as needs basis to satisfy the requirements of the City. The preferred tenderer has provided an assurance that any reasonable request for the provision of additional resources would be effected within 6 hours of the requirement.

Given these circumstances, there is a compelling position for the original service standard to adopt a “minimum standard” approach, which provides for 24/7 coverage of the district by a minimum of 2 patrol vehicles for 3 days each week, 3 vehicles 2 days each week and 4 vehicles 2 days each week; the latter designed to cater for the traditional “peak” periods of weekend activity. This is the level of service which can be expected for the recommended tender price of \$950,000. Such an approach was previously recommended on the basis that there are extensive periods during the week when vehicles do little more than patrol the streets, without any specific task or objective being assigned. This is considered predominantly to be unproductive time for which the Council (and ultimately ratepayers) are paying unnecessarily.

It is intended that Council staff, in conjunction with the Patrol Officers, derive a more planned approach to the objectives of the service and target priority functions and allocate resources accordingly. This is obviously contingent upon the assurance that additional resources can be allocated from 1 July 2010. While this part of the service will necessarily require careful management and implementation, it is considered to be a more efficient method of resource utilisation, as an alternative to having non productive passive patrolling at periods of low activity.

[b] Full Service Option (Current Levels)

Accordingly, it is proposed that the 4 patrol vehicle option be adopted, based on a three(3) zone structure, as contained in the attachment to the Agenda. This provides for general and targeted patrols in each of the zones, supplemented by a random roaming vehicle across the District to provide assistance and co-ordinate activities, as necessary.

This is the level of service available from the recommended tender at the cost of \$1,462,713.51.

Should this be the level of coverage required by Council, then it is considered that the cost differential with a full in house provided service would be more significant and therefore an in house submission for comparative purposes has not been specifically calculated. Indicatively, it is estimated to cost in the vicinity of \$1.95M to establish initially and around \$1.9M ongoing to operate. In addition, a minimum of 3-4 months would be required to recruit and train in-house staff and establish the necessary infrastructure and equipment to support an in-house model.

Summary

Consequently, it is recommended that the outsourced option as tendered, with the capacity to call out additional service at short notice as necessary, be selected as the preferred methodology.

While there are valid reasons in considering the cost savings apparent in the recommended outsourced Tender model, it must also be recognised that delivery standards can sometimes be compromised where the service is ultimately controlled by another party. For this reason it is considered imperative that some in house resource be provided to the service in a support role to assist in the establishment and to ultimately monitor the ongoing standard and overall performance of the Contractor.

This methodology is apparent in many Council awarded construction contracts where Council staff work closely with builders to ensure the ultimate outcome of the project is consistent with initial expectations.

In this case, there are not the spare resources available in house to provide the necessary up front and ongoing support and supervision to ensure a high level of quality control is provided to monitor that the objectives of the service are being met on an ongoing basis.

It is proposed that a Contract Supervisor / Service Support Officer be employed as soon as possible to assist in the establishment and ongoing supervision of the Contract and its overall performance.

It is proposed that the advance expenditure required for both this and the establishment of a base facility for the service to be located at the Operations Centre (being the transportable building previously used at Coolbellup Library) be drawn from the Community Surveillance Levy Reserve Fund and funded as a cost against the Security Levy. In addition, a comprehensive advertising and marketing campaign will be required to be undertaken in advance of the launch of the service on 1 July, 2010.

The greater proportion of this expenditure will be required for the physical establishment, provision of utilities and fit out of a basic depot for the Patrol Officers, which also provides available space for the Contract Supervisor/ Service Support Officer to work from.

This will be offset to some extent in future by not having to employ a full time Clerical Support Officer for the Rangers / Community Safety Unit, which was proposed in the current (2008-2018) Plan for the District (New Staff Plan) for 2010/11, as part of the duties proposed for that position would have been to provide administrative support to the Security service, in whatever form it was to take in future.

Strategic Plan/Policy Implications

Lifestyle and Aspiration Achievement

- To deliver our services and to manage resources in a way that is cost effective without compromising quality.

Governance Excellence

- To conduct Council business in open public forums and to manage Council affairs by employing publicly accountable practices.
- To provide effective monitoring and regulatory services that administer relevant legislation and local laws in a fair and impartial way.

Budget/Financial Implications

In the 2008/09 financial year there was a total of \$2,050,075 spent on the security patrol service with an allocation of \$2,000,000 for 2009/10.

Should Council proceed with the current level of service which is 4 cars on the road 24 hours per day 7 days per week the cost of the service will be in the vicinity \$1,500,000.

A 24 hours per day 7 days a week service that has a minimum of 2 cars on the road at any one time and peaked at 4 cars on Friday and Saturday nights would cost in the vicinity of \$900,000.

The current security levy of \$50 per property may be reduced depending upon the decision of Council on the level and nature of the service required.

Besides the direct tender costs there will also need to be factored into the budget allocated internal costs which will be approximately \$90,000.

A service centre for the security staff to utilise is proposed to be established at the Council Operations Depot and accommodated in the

demountable building recovered from the Coolbellup Library redevelopment. The provision of services, furnishing and fit out costs are estimated to be in the order of \$35,000.

It is also proposed to incorporate a Contract Supervisor role for the initial 2 year term of the contract, to ensure consistent management and monitoring of all aspects of the service to the City's satisfaction at an estimated annual cost of \$75,000.

An extensive advertising and promotion campaign is anticipated in advance of the 1 July, 2010, establishment date at an estimated cost of \$50,000.

Costs for the initial establishment and staff requirements can be provided from the Community Surveillance Levy Reserve Fund.

Legal Implications

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 and Part 4 of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 refers.

Community Consultation

The tender appeared in the West Australian Newspaper on 4 November 2009 and attracted eight (8) responses by the closing date of 19 November 2009.

Attachment(s)

1. Extract from proposal for expanded Rangers service (provided under separate confidential cover).
2. Comments – City of Cockburn financial services staff (provided under separate confidential cover).
3. Compliance Criteria Checklist (provided under separate confidential cover).
4. Tender Evaluation Sheet (provided under separate confidential cover).
5. Tendered Prices (provided under separate confidential cover).
6. Extract from presentation by Mr M Coe, Office of Crime Prevention.
7. Scope of Services and Key Performance Indicators required by Council.
8. Proposed zones for patrol service (indicative only).

Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners

Those who lodged a tender on the proposal have been advised that this matter is to be considered at 6 May 2010 Special Council Meeting.

Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995

Nil.

10. (SCM06/05/2010) - RESOLUTION OF COMPLIANCE (SECTION 3.18(3), LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995)

RECOMMENDATION

That Council is satisfied that resolutions carried at this Meeting and applicable to items concerning Council provided services and facilities, are:-

- (1) integrated and co-ordinated, so far as practicable, with any provided by the Commonwealth, the State or any public body;
- (2) not duplicated, to an extent Council considers inappropriate, services or facilities as provided by the Commonwealth, the State or any other body or person, whether public or private; and
- (3) managed efficiently and effectively.

COUNCIL DECISION

11. CLOSURE OF MEETING

Nil