AGENDA
Far North Queensland Regional Roads and Transport Group
Meeting No. 57
12 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 1.00 PM
Cairns Regional Council, 119-145 Spence Street, Cairns

1 Chair’s Welcome & Acknowledgement of Traditional Owners

2 Apologies

3 Presentations
1.00 pm Andrew Armstrong, Trinity Engineering and Consulting, RRTG Project Prioritisation Tool

4 Confirmation of Minutes
• Minutes of Meeting held on 11 December 2017.

5 Confirmation of flying minute, 15 December 2017
• “That the FNQRRTG supports the submissions of a funding application to the State-wide Capability Development Fund for the FNQRRROC Regional Contract & Procurement Document project”

Support – Eight (CCRC, Cook, TRC, YASC, ESC, WWASC, Croydon, MSC)
Abstain – Three (CRC, DSC, TMR)
Not support - Nil

6 Business arising out of Minutes
111 The FNQ RRTG technical committee considers options or methodology for the allocation of TIDS funding on State controlled roads

7 Minutes of Technical Committee Meetings
• Minutes of Meeting No. 95 held on 2 February 2018

8 Discussion Paper – Allocation of TIDS funding on State controlled roads
• Recommendation from the Technical Committee Meeting No. 95, 2 February 2018

“*The RRTG Works Program Development and Management Process be amended to include the opportunity for state controlled LRRS roads to be considered only as a result of operational savings made during...*
Q1-Q3. Projects would be considered in the same manner and same weight as non-LRRS Roads, being subject to the maximum 20% allocation of total funding.

Any nominated project must first be assessed, prioritised and moderated as per the standard project prioritisation process. Funds with then be allocated on a priority basis, as per the Works Program Development and Management Process.

9 Update from the Roads & Transport Alliance
10 Works Program update
11 Joint Purchasing & Resource Sharing (if any issues)
12 Road Safety (if any issues)
13 Asset Management (if any issues)
14 General Business
15 Next Technical Committee - Meeting No. 96
   • 16 March 2018, Cairns
16 Next RRTG Meeting – Meeting No. 58
   • 9 April 2018, Ingham at 9 am
MINUTES OF THE 56TH BOARD MEETING OF THE FAR NORTH QUEENSLAND REGIONAL ROADS AND TRANSPORT GROUP

MONDAY 11 December 2017
Cairns Regional Council, Civic Reception Room, 119-145 Spence Street, Cairns
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Chair’s Welcome & Acknowledgement of Traditional Owners

The meeting commenced at 1.05 pm. Chair, Cr Peter Scott, Mayor Cook Shire Council welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Cr Scott acknowledged the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet today and paid respects to Elders past and present and emerging.

Apologies

As noted above.

Election of Chair and Deputy Chair

The Board positions were declared open.

Ms Darlene Irvine called for nominations for the position of Chair.

Cr Peter Scott

NOMINATED by Cr Julia Leu

SECONDED by Cr Trevor Pickering

Cr Scott accepted the nomination of Chair.

There being no further nominations, Cr Scott was declared elected as Chair of the FNQ RRTG.
The Chair called for nominations for the position of Deputy Chair.

Cr Tom Gilmore

NOMINATED by Cr Peter Scott

SECONDED by Cr Julia Leu

Cr Gilmore accepted the nomination of Deputy Chair.

There being no further nominations, Cr Gilmore was declared elected as Deputy Chair of the FNQ RRTG.

109 Presentations

Nil this meeting.

110 Confirmation of Minutes

MOVED: Cr Warren Devlin

SECOND: Cr Julia Leu

“That the minutes of the 55th Far North Queensland Roads and Transport Group held on 9 October 2017, as distributed with the agenda be confirmed.”

CARRIED

BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF MINUTES

111 Minute 96 – Cr Devlin to provide proposed projects on Gregory Development Road and current funding available to Ms Burke so that she may find alternative funding other than TIDS to fill the gap

Cr Devlin advised that Etheridge Shire Council provided a memo on the proposed projects for Gregory Development Rd (20/10/17) and he received a response from the Department of Transport and Main Roads advising that the Council is able to apply for TIDS funding or through the Roads to Recovery Program to undertake these works.

Cr Devlin noted that the Gregory Development Road is a State road and is strategically important for the Genex solar project, tourism and cattle industry. There are safety issues and he would like two passing lane opportunities; he would like to discuss with TMR the option of re-sheeting funds going towards passing lane opportunities. Cr Devlin looking at further discussions with the State Government Minister.

Cr Devlin advised that there was positive feedback from the community on Georgetown/Forsyth Road upgrade that previously secured TIDS funding.

Cr Devlin requested that the group work on a plan around protocols for TIDS funding to be allowed to be allocated on State roads.

Ms Irvine confirmed that the current FNQ RRTG policy does not allow for TIDS funding to be allocated on State roads.

Ms Lencz confirmed that the TIDS policy does allow funding to be allocated to State roads; it is up to the RRTG group. Other RRTG’s (western groups) do allow allocation on State controlled roads.

Cr Devlin would like Mayors of FNQROC and NWROC to come together to argue case for Royalties for Regions funds to be reinvested into infrastructure in the region.
Question raised by Cr Gilmore – Where western councils have put TIDS on state roads has this impacted on what the district has traditionally spent on that road?

Ms Burke advised that (within FN) the funds are redistributed to roads within that network.

Ms Burke confirmed that the purpose of the TIDS program is for Local Government Roads and the TIDS funds are relatively small.

Cr Gilmore asked if the State Government funding on State roads had reduced.

MOVED: Cr Warren Devlin
SECOND: Cr Desmond Tayley

The FNQ RRTG technical committee considers options or methodology for the allocation of TIDS funding on State controlled roads.

CARRIED

112 Minute 101 – Ms Burke to follow up on the status of the Beef Roads funding and confirm with Croydon Shire Council if the project proposals report has been submitted with the Commonwealth Government

Ms Burke confirmed that the project proposal report had been submitted to the Commonwealth Government.

113 Minute 102 – Ms Burke to follow up with Cr Kremastos on the planned road closures for the delivery of the Mt Emerald wind farm turbines

Ms Burke confirmed that she was meeting with Cr Kremastos later in the week.

114 Minutes of Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes for the RRTG Technical meeting, no. 95 held on 5 October were noted.

115 Works Program Update

Noted.

116 Update from the Roads and Transport Alliance

Ms Lencz provided a copy of the Annual Report and update:

- Waiting for announcement of new State Government Minister
- Expenditure report for State wide TIDS program – currently 23% as at end of Nov. FNQ at 19%. Drop from end of October figures. Concern across state regarding invoicing against accruals.
- TMR Regional Transport Plan, work continuing
- New FNQ LRRS map released

Ms Burke suggested that there needs to be a discussion around who from Council submits the accrual information to DTMR and that the process needs to be tightened up.

117 Joint Purchasing & Resource Sharing

Ms Hancock advised that she is seeking Councils indicative program for the 2018/19 Regional Bitumen Reseal arrangements by the end of January 2018.
118 Road safety

Ms Burke left 1.50pm

Cr Devlin raised the safety concerns about the bridge on the Gilbert River which is a safety issue for Etheridge and Croydon Shire Councils due to its narrow width and concerns with cracks.

Ms Irvine confirmed that the issue was raised at the Western Councils forum and FNQROC is following up with a request to DTMR for a copy of the bridge inspection report.

119 Asset Management

No issues.

GENERAL BUSINESS

120 TIDs funding on State Controlled Roads

Refer earlier discussion (111).

121 Torres and Cape York Councils Alliance (TCYCA)

Ms Burke returned 1.53pm

Cr Scott mentioned the group which comprises of the Mayors from the Cape, Torres Strait and Weipa Town Authority (WTA). Weipa Town Authority has offered to host the secretariat of TCICA.

Ms Burke returned 1.53pm

Cr Scott also advised members that there was a change on how NDRRA would work with an upfront payment model. Specific details are yet to be released.

122 Next RRTG Technical Committee Meeting

Ms Irvine advised that the next meeting for the RRTG Technical Committee will be held on 2 February 2018 in Cairns.

123 Next RRTG Board Meeting

The next RRTG meeting will be held in Cairns on Monday 12 February 2018.

124 Conclusion

Cr Scott wished everyone a Merry Christmas and happy and safe festive season.

There being no further business the Chair, Cr Scott declared the meeting closed at 1.57 pm.

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>The FNQ RRTG technical committee considers options or methodology for</td>
<td>FNQ RRTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the allocation of TIDS funding on State controlled roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. BACKGROUND

The question of the application of TIDS funding on State controlled Roads has previously been discussed within the RRTG as part of the 2016/2017 works program (Attachment A contains the original discussion paper), wherein it was requested that $686,600 be re-allocated from an endorsed project (4.6km of Seal on Forsayth-Einasleigh Road (LG LRRS Road), to Georgetown-Forsayth Road (13.57km of seal, State with remaining funding comprising of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2R 2016/17</td>
<td>$1,707,560</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIDS 2016/17</td>
<td>$ 686,600</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheridge Shire Council Reserves</td>
<td>$ 343,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2R 2017/18/19</td>
<td>$1,035,014</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,771,574</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concern with Etheridge’s proposal was that the Georgetown-Forsayth Road is a State LRRS. The FNQ RRTG has a policy not to allocated funding to a State LRRS road as there was no requirement for this funding to be matched by the State, effectively putting less ‘tar’ on the regional network.

During the RRTG meeting of the 8th August 2016, with the major points of discussion:

- ESC queried where the joint planning had been, given funding ($3.1m) that was being proposed. TMR advised that the unsealed road network controlled by TMR is in the order of 2000kms. The road had not been identified as a high priority under Beef Roads or from road accident or fatality data and therefore was not as high a priority as other TMR roads demonstrating such.
- Ms Irvine advised that the motion needs to be clear and detailed as it will set a precedent for all member councils going forward.
- Cr Devlin and Michael Kitzelmann were adamant that this was not setting a precedent.

After several proposed motions failed to get support Cr Peter Scott proposed the following motion:

“That the TIDS allocation of $686,600 to Etheridge Shire Council for the Forsyth Einasleigh Rd project be reallocated to the Forsyth Georgetown road on the basis that this project is their priority and ranks high once applying the prioritisation tool, in addition it is noted that Etheridge is applying an additional $3 million towards the project.”

This motion was subsequently moved and the project included into the 2016/17 works program. It was noted that the overarching issue of expending TIDS on a State road has not been resolved and may need further discussion.

At the RRTG meeting of the 11 December 2017, the subject was re- introduced and considered as part of the following minute:

‘Minute 96 – Cr Devlin to provide proposed projects on Gregory Development Road and current funding available to Ms Burke so that she may find alternative funding other than TIDS to fill the gap’

With the following notes:

- ESC had made a submission to TMR on proposed projects for Gregory Development Rd (20/10/17), with TMR subsequently advising that the option was available for ESC to apply for TIDS or Roads to Recovery
Program to undertake these works. ESC noted the importance of the road and related safety issues, with further discussions being undertaken with the State Government Minister.

- Current FNQ RRTG policy does not allow for TIDS funding to be allocated on State roads. RTA TIDS policy does allow for funding to be allocated to state roads.
- Where TIDS has been applied on a state road, TMR funding is redistributed to roads within the regional network.
- TMR confirmed that the purpose of the TIDS program is for Local Government Roads and the TIDS funds are relatively small.

The motion below was then made:

**The FNQ RRTG technical committee considers options or methodology for the allocation of TIDS funding on State controlled roads.**

This motion was subsequently moved.

Attachment B contains ESC’s submission to the RRTG on the back of this motion.

### 2. DISCUSSION

To clearly identify the influencing factors, a SWOT analysis was undertaken:

**Strengths**

1. Provides additional projects available for funding under TIDS.
2. Depending on option chosen, provides flexibility in expenditure of TIDS funding.

**Weaknesses**

1. Less value for funding/Less Tar on the Road (*RTA TIDS funding allocated to these projects is not required to be matched*)
2. The intent of the 20% cap on Non LRRS roads within TIDS funding appears to be put in place to limit the allocation of TIDS funding that is not spent on LRRS Roads. The allowance on state controlled roads (otherwise funded by state) could result in non LRRS projects not ranking high enough for funding.
3. State controlled roads have alternative funding sources other than TIDS.
4. There is no forward 2 year fixed and 2 year indicative works program for State LRRS roads.

**Opportunities**

1. Depending on option chosen - Provides opportunity to expend operational savings made during Q1-Q3.
2. Alternative Opportunity - Prioritisation of State controlled LRRS roads can be developed more efficiently/effectively through forward planning with TMR within a 4 year works program (See weakness 4).

**Threats**

1. A lack of funding priority from a State level may indicate the long term intent and tenure of the road itself.
2. Over time, unintended consequence will be passive disadvantage to the less densely populated councils, as more populated councils apply for funding (higher # state roads & AADT roads in more densely populated areas)
3. The allocation and subsidisation of state controlled assets ultimately draws funds away from the intended funding Target (LG LRRS).
4. For those councils providing RPC (Road Performance Contracts) for these areas, there may be a potential conflict of interest (i.e. profiting from TIDS funding).

3. **OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION**

1. The RRTG Works Program Development and Management Process remain as is.

2. The RRTG Works Program Development and Management Process be amended to include the opportunity for state controlled roads to be considered only as a result of operational savings made during Q1-Q3. Projects would be considered in the same manner and same weight as non-LRRS Roads, being subject to the maximum 20% allocation of total funding, as per TIDS policy.

   Any nominated project must first be assessed, prioritised and moderated as per the standard project process. Funds with then be allocated on a priority basis, as per the Works Program Development and Management Process.

3. The RRTG Works Program Development and Management Process be amended to include the opportunity for state controlled roads to be considered in the same manner and same weight as non-LRRS Roads, being subject to the maximum 20% allocation of total funding and matching funding, as per TIDS policy.

   Any nominated project must first be assessed, prioritised and moderated as per the standard project process. Funds with then be allocated on a priority basis, as per the Works Program Development and Management Process.

**Attachments**

Attachment A – Discussion Paper (Presented RRTGTC Meeting 51 – 8 August 2016)
Attachment B – Etheridge Shire Council submission to the RRTG (8/1/2018)
Attachment A

FNQ RRTG Discussion Topic: Expanding TIDS on State Road Network

Raised by: FNQ RRTG Technical Committee

Executive Officer’s recommendation to the Board for discussion:

Background:

Etheridge Shire Council currently have $686,600 allocated funding in the 2016/17 works program to upgrade to new 2 lane sealed standard for two sections of the Forsayth-Einasleigh Road (Ch. 27.767 – 30.067 and Ch 30.067 – 32.367) totalling 4.6km. Forsayth-Einasleigh Road is a LG LRRS. Under the current arrangements, Etheridge Shire Council is required to match this funding to undertake the works.

Etheridge Shire Council are requesting to re-assign the $686,000 to a new project on Georgetown-Forsayth Road to assist with upgrading of approximately 13.57kms (Ch 11.77 to 25.30) from the existing gravel pavement to a two lane bitumen road. Total project cost is $2,911,667. Etheridge intends to fund the project via:

$1,707,560 R2R 2016/17

$686,600 TIDS 2016/17

$517,507 R2R 2017/18

$2,911,667 TOTAL

Amendment at Cooktown Board meeting

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2R 2016/17</td>
<td>$1,707,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIDS 2016/17</td>
<td>$ 686,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheridge Shire Council Reserves</td>
<td>$ 343,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2R 2017/18/19</td>
<td>$1,035,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,771,574</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under normal circumstances, the existing projects would be removed from the program and funding reallocated to (in priority order):

1. Projects running over into the next financial year and are able to be matched by Council.
2. Highest ranking project (unfunded or able to be bought forward) and matched by Council.
   (note, the new Etheridge proposal would be considered under this)

The concern with Etheridge’s proposal is that the Georgetown-Forsayth Road is a State LRRS. The FNQ RRTG has traditionally not allocated funding to a State LRRS road as there is no requirement for this funding to be matched by the State, effectively less ‘tar’ on the regional network.
This request from Etheridge Shire Council requires the FNQ RRTG to make a policy decision regarding expenditure of TIDS on State Roads.

**Etheridge Shire Council Comments:**

1. The Georgetown-Forsayth Road is a State Controlled road and has been identified and classified as a “local Road of Regional Significance” (LRRS). The road is one of the main arterial roads within the Etheridge Shire that links the North with the South and vice versa.

2. Council is prepared to add $2,225,067 of R2R to this State LRRS.

3. The upgrade supports tourism and mining activities in the area.
4. Over the past 12-16 months the road has had an increase in traffic movements and especially in heavy haulage vehicles which has been associated with the mining activities of Central Gold/JKO Mining.

5. There have been abnormal movements of cattle trains along this road which has been due to the drought conditions within the shire, with cattle producers moving their stock either to other pastoral holdings or simply de-stocking and sending them off to Charters Towers for sale.

6. To compound the matter further, the shire has had approximately 16,000 visitors from April – September 2014 with 1 in every 5 visiting Cobbold Gorge traversing the Georgetown-Forsayth Road.

7. The 13kms of unsealed road deteriorates very quickly with heavy corrugation, rutting and loss of formation causing traffic issues as the road becomes unsafe to both the inexperienced traveller and experienced users of this road.

8. Also programmed within the 13km section is TMR plans to eliminate a dangerous corner called “Dairymaid Corner”.

9. The sealing of the 13kms will alleviate the safety issues and open the road all year round to make the journey more pleasurable.

10. Etheridge Shire understands that this is a State road which should be maintained/upgraded by the State however its importance to the shire and the desire to undertake the works is so high they are prepared to contribute over $2mil of their R2R funding to it.

11. Etheridge believes that if the road has such importance to a Council then it should be viewed tenure blind.

Comments from Technical Committee representatives

Roads Alliance Operational Guidelines

- There is provision within the Road and Transport Guidelines that “RRTGs can allocate RTA TIDS to works on the State-Controlled Road Network, including TMR LRRS, noting RTA TIDS funding allocated to these projects is not required to be matched.” (RTA Guidelines - 4.1.3 page 11).

Comments against allocation to State Roads

- Historically the practice of allocating TIDS to state LRRS has not been supported as it means less funding on roads (TIDS on State roads does not need to be matched by the State or LG)

- To date, the process of allocating TIDS on State roads has not been recommended as it may encourage devolution of responsibilities by the State.

- The last time the FNQ RRTG TC saw a 4 year program from TMR was in 2006 (at the time it was a 5 year program). The FNQ RRTG was then able to discuss and negotiate higher priority works on State controlled LRRS.

- As there is no requirement for Councils to match this funding of TIDS it could result in:
  - Less works on the road network (i.e. $1mil on State Roads verses $2mil on Local roads (50%LG, 50%TIDS)
  - Councils submitting a wish list of State controlled projects, which may influence project prioritisation within future programs.

- Projects on State roads in some local government areas would rank higher than projects on local roads in other local government areas.
Where is the line between Council being proactive and fixing a road which is a priority to the community, regardless of ownership and the State seeing this as an opportunity to devolve their responsibility or hand over the asset to Council?

Potentially less projects would be delivered on Council roads.

It could be argued that putting bitumen on roads increases councils assets thus making them unsustainable however, this has not always been assessed whole of life costs (i.e. long term maintenance costs of gravel roads).

State TIDS bucket allocation to RRTG’s is based on the following methodology:
- 20% based on number of councils in the RRTG
- 80% based on the kilometre of Local Government roads (this includes LRRS and Non LRRS) - State LRRS are not included.

Comments for allocation to State Roads
- If an individual community (Council) determines that a State LRRS upgrade is a higher priority than a LG LRRS then the RRTG should support this view.
- This could well be the only option a small council has in seeking to provide long term infrastructure sustainability. Putting bitumen on local roads to provide an ever increasing sealed road network is not sustainable in many cases.
- If TIDS funding was applied to state controlled roads, state roads would be improved. The rate payers don’t care if the road is managed by State or Council, they just want them fixed.
- The road network is seen as one asset and State roads generally have higher traffic volumes so are generally higher priority roads meaning higher priority issues would be actioned.
- It’s State money anyway, and Council revenue is not being spent on State assets.
- Funding of State roads does happen in other RRTG’s (although limited).
- Concern that the direction of TIDS funding to new assets on Council’s LRRS are making some Council’s less sustainable with increasing depreciation/renewal requirements which will not be funded by TIDS.
- Potential that if a Council develops a project on a State LRRS that is funded by TIDS and delivered through a Road Performance Contract (RPC) or similar that Council would then have an opportunity to receive a profit from TIDS funding.

Neutral comments to consider
- Regional TMR budget is not enough to maintain/upgrade State LRRS; should LG take on the responsibility? What precedence does this set?
- Over the last 6+ years TMR’s involvement in the FNQ RRTG TC has been relatively ‘administrative’.
- As there is no requirement for Councils to match this funding of TIDS it could result in Councils submitting projects on State LRRS to gain benefits in workforce sustainability with no ongoing responsibility for asset ownership.
- Question the development of the Statement of Intent (a requirement for TIDS funding) i.e. is it a LG SOI or TMR SOI – traditionally it is road owner responsibility. A thought is that it should be developed by the local government and approved by TMR.
- If we do decide to spend on State Roads we need to open the opportunity to all Councils to nominate works on State roads.
Concern over State not maintaining their road network (reference Infrastructure Australia audit – Pavement rehabilitation and programmed maintenance requirement on North Queensland roads of $700mil over the next 5 years, $318m of which represents a backlog)

Does the same design completion rule apply? I.e. detailed design is required to be completed in the year prior to the funding allocation.

LGAQ advise the State does not expect TIDS funding to be put to State roads. While there is a provision in the Roads Alliance Operational Guidelines to spend TIDS money on State roads, such spending is not compulsory and the failure to spend money on State roads will not affect funding allocations in the future.

LGAQ also advised that there is an expectation that the roads groups will consider the regional needs and plan accordingly. The groups should decide what is best for their region in terms of spending TIDS funding.

Under the TIDS ‘one bucket’ the funding can be spent on Aerodromes, jetties and Marina’s. The FNQ RRTG considered that there was not enough funding to include these for funding consideration. Does this need to be reviewed as well?

When TIDS went to ‘one bucket’ there was concern that the State would pass the onus onto Councils/RRTG’s. Is this what is happening here?

Break up of State LRRS Network across Council areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Unsealed Km</th>
<th>Sealed Km</th>
<th>Total Km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cairns Regional Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassowary Coast Regional Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69.237</td>
<td>69.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Shire Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Shire Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Shire Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheridge Shire Council</td>
<td>136.682</td>
<td>23.575</td>
<td>160.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mareeba Shire Council</td>
<td>57.145</td>
<td>5.195</td>
<td>62.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablelands Regional Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160.015</td>
<td>160.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wujal Wujal Aboriginal Shire Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrabah Aboriginal Shire Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential options for the Board to consider in developing their policy decision

The following are some potential ideas for the Board to consider in isolation or as a combination to form its policy direction.

1. When funding is above x level – funding could be allocated to state LRRS roads.

2. State controlled LRRS to be submitted for consideration where the percentage of State vs Council LRRS exceeds x% (to be determined). This may be a benefit to Councils with a smaller overall length of Council LRRS and therefore public expectation is likely to be focused on State LRRS.
3. Allocate TIDS to State controlled LRRS projects if percentage of funding is matched by TMR from other programs such as bulk maintenance/capex (or matched by Council).

4. Not allocate to State Roads but advocate for additional TMR budget to undertake required works.

5. Allow TIDS funding on State LRRS

Questions to consider as part of the motion:

i. Who develops (and approves) the SOI?

ii. Consider the direction of funding to State LRRS only after a prioritized works program is provided to the FNQ RRTG and reviewed by the TC for all projects Councils wish to put up on State LRRS.

iii. Consider the direction of funding to State LRRS only if the same requirements for projects on Council LRRS (SOI, project prioritisation by the PPT and moderated by the TC, detailed design completed in the financial year previous to funding allocation)

Note: if the Board does decide to allocate TIDS to State LRRS, all Councils need to have an opportunity to put forward projects to be considered. Under current arrangements the funding will be released from Etheridge (Forsayth-Einsliegh) project and go to next highest priority; which could be a project in another Council.

Council acknowledges that Local Government and the State (through TMR) have a legislative responsibility to manage their respective road and transport networks and collaborate to deliver a safe and reliable network for Queensland road users.

TMR and Etheridge Shire Council have successfully worked together, and presently collaborate through the Roads and Transport Alliance partnership and Far North Queensland Regional Road and Transport Group to address shared road and transport challenges.

Etheridge Shire Council has recently constructed a section of the Forsayth – Georgetown Road (state controlled) using its TIDs and R2R allocations, for the following reasons:

- To promote development of regional transport and delivery capability for residents, visitors and industry;
- To contribute to an integrated transport system that supports the safe, efficient and reliable movement of people and goods;
- To respond to community expectations with respect to the standard of road maintenance;
- To maintain the current level of employment of local government staff and local contractors; and
- The State Government is unable to invest sufficient funds in the state controlled road network within the Etheridge Shire to meet the community expectation.

The Etheridge Shire Council has demonstrated its good-faith in maintaining the Local Roads of Regional Significance, irrespective of ownership, for the benefit of road users (residents, visitors and industry) and seeks to continue to advocate for additional expenditure on the Gregory Developmental Road in 2019/2020 and beyond.

The roads within the Etheridge Shire that are currently classified as Local Roads of Regional Significance are:

- Forsayth – Georgetown Road (State Controlled);
- Gregory Developmental Road (State Controlled);
- Forsayth – Einasleigh Road (Shire Road);
- North Head Road (Shire Road);
- Agate Creek Road (Shire Road); and
- Cobbold Gorge Road (Shire Road);

The current FNQ RRTG funding priorities include the Forsayth – Einasleigh Road (Construction to a sealed 2 lane standard in 2018/2019 - $343,300 from chainage 32.37 to 34.37 and 2019/2020 - $686,000 from chainage 37 to 41.07), however the construction of the Genex Solar / Hydro Renewable Energy Hub at Kidston has elevated the concerns of safety on the State Controlled Gregory Developmental Road, especially during the construction phase. Stage One of the project is providing 50MW of solar power, Stage Two will produce 250MW of pumped hydro power and Stage
Three, an additional 270MW of solar power. In all, almost 3,000,000 solar panels will need to be transported to the site on road trains, competing with the triple cattle road trains and cars towing caravans during the tourist season.

Council has identified the need to upgrade two sections of the Gregory Developments Road to 2 lane bitumen seal standard to provide passing opportunities (at the Kidston Road turn-off and at the Mywyn Station Road intersection). This work is dependent on the TIDs allocation being amended by the FNQ RRTG. It is proposed to fund the road upgrade from a combination of TIDs, a developer contribution and TMR funding.

The Gregory Developmental Road is part of a major arterial road link within the Etheridge Shire (Georgetown – Forsayth – Einasleigh – The Lynd) which is an alternate link to the Gulf Developmental Road between Georgetown and the Kennedy Developmental Road.

The proposed projects involve the construction and sealing of two sections of road for following traffic to catch up and pass heavy vehicles. Information signage will also be installed prior to the bitumen sections to alert drivers to the impending passing opportunities. Council endorsed this proposal at its September 2017 meeting.
The current FNQRRTG Works Program, as it pertains to Etheridge Shire Council projects, and the allocation of TIDS funding is summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>226/LGSR/14</td>
<td>Georgetown - Forsayth Rd</td>
<td>11.77-25.3</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>$3,771,574</td>
<td>$1,093,476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000531-003</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>37.0-41.07</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>$1,372,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$686,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000531-002</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>27.77-30.07</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>$686,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$343,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000531-004</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>32.37-34.37</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>$686,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$343,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000531-005</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>34.37-36.27</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>$686,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$343,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000561-003</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>30.07-32.37</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>$686,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$343,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FNQROC recently invited Councils to review the works program and bring forward and add additional projects for consideration within the program. The recommended changes to the FNQRRTG ‘future’ works program and reallocation of TIDS funding is summarised below (noting the current Forsayth Road upgrade projects has been omitted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>GDR* (The Lynd – Quartz Blow)</td>
<td>21.0-23.0</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Georgetown – Forsayth Rd</td>
<td>23.3 – 25.3</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>GDR* (The Lynd – Quartz Blow)</td>
<td>51.9-53.9</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Georgetown – Forsayth Rd</td>
<td>11.8–13.8</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000531-004</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>32.37-34.37</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$686,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000561-003</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>37.0-41.07</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,372,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000531-002</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>27.77-30.07</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$686,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000531-005</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>34.37-36.27</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$686,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-000561-003</td>
<td>Forsayth – Einasleigh Rd</td>
<td>30.07-32.37</td>
<td>LRRS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$686,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*GDR – Gregory Development Road