

CAPRICORN MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

2025 MEETING 5 MINUTES

Venue: Teams
Date and Time: 28th August 2025 at 11am

Item																									
1	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Attendance:</p> <div><div>Richard Bywater (MCE) Todd Lisle (MCE) Nathan Garvey (BSC) Anthony Lipsys (BSC) Michael Stanton (IRC) Sarah Banda (CHRC)</div><div>Brendan Fuller (GRC) Grant Vaughan (RRC) Jamie McCaul (RRC) Janaka Mahendrapala (IRC) Jarvis Black (MRC) Jon Ashman (LSC) Bradley Dinsdale (LSC)</div></div>																								
2	<p>Apologies:</p> <p>Franz Krause (GRC) Scott McDonald (GRC) Mohit Paudyal (RRC)</p>																								
3	<p>True and correct record of minutes from previous meeting</p> <p>Refer Attachment A</p> <p>Meeting M2025.04 minutes have been uploaded following 2 week review period by committee and no comments.</p> <p>Noted confusion regarding Schedule 1 (Terms of Reference and Budget), particularly the breakdown of fees on a population census basis. Jamie confirmed no further issues and the updated breakdown is applicable.</p>																								
4	<p>CMDG Action Register</p> <p>The latest register is Attachment B</p> <p>CMDG Trial Register</p> <p>The latest register is Attachment C</p> <p>Schedule 1</p> <p>The latest schedule is Attachment D</p>																								
5	<p>Terms of reference and Budget</p> <p>Purchase orders not received from all LGA's for the new coordinator engagement. Richard will follow up with the relevant LGA's.</p> <p><u>Action By:</u> MCE</p>																								
6	<p>Outstanding items from the previous meeting</p> <p>This includes items which still require discussion or direction from the committee or items not considered previously due to time constraints.</p> <table><tr><th>Item number</th><th>Item</th><th>Proponent</th></tr><tr><td>M24.06.03</td><td>Erosion and Sediment Control Documents</td><td>RRC</td></tr><tr><td>M24.06.05</td><td>D10 Landscaping Design</td><td>RRC</td></tr><tr><td>M25.03.01</td><td>Drawing D-032 Additional Details</td><td>LSC</td></tr><tr><td>M25.03.02</td><td>Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist</td><td>MCE</td></tr><tr><td>M25.03.03</td><td>Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2</td><td>MCE</td></tr><tr><td>M25.03.04</td><td>Industrial Sewer Loading</td><td>MCE</td></tr><tr><td>M25.03.05</td><td>Manual for Guardrail</td><td>MCE</td></tr></table>	Item number	Item	Proponent	M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents	RRC	M24.06.05	D10 Landscaping Design	RRC	M25.03.01	Drawing D-032 Additional Details	LSC	M25.03.02	Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist	MCE	M25.03.03	Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2	MCE	M25.03.04	Industrial Sewer Loading	MCE	M25.03.05	Manual for Guardrail	MCE
Item number	Item	Proponent																							
M24.06.03	Erosion and Sediment Control Documents	RRC																							
M24.06.05	D10 Landscaping Design	RRC																							
M25.03.01	Drawing D-032 Additional Details	LSC																							
M25.03.02	Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist	MCE																							
M25.03.03	Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2	MCE																							
M25.03.04	Industrial Sewer Loading	MCE																							
M25.03.05	Manual for Guardrail	MCE																							

Item			
7	New Agenda Items		
	Item number	Item	Proponent
	M25.05.01	Erosion and Sediment Control – Standard Drawings	LSC
	M25.05.02	Awashaft Sewer Maintenance Holes	BSC
	M25.05.03	LGA feedback for Floodway Standard Drawings	MCE
	M25.05.04	CMDG-R-017 Revisions to Standard Drawing	MRC
	M25.05.05	C271 bar chairs performance specifications.	MCE
8	General Business		
9	Next Meeting Next meeting to be 9 th October via teams.		
10	Meeting closed at: 12:05PM		

Agenda Items Detail

Item No.	Item Details
M24.06.03	<p>Erosion and Sediment Control Documents In progress</p> <p><u>M2025.02 Discussion</u> Jamie McCaul provided an update on the progress of the documents. RRC has progressed the documentation and will provide a policy document to the ESC sub-committee before providing to the CMDG committee for information. It was advised that sites greater than 2500m² were being treated on a case-by-case basis in terms of the need for a HES basin and that low risk sites as determined by the RUSLE equation may not require a HES basin. The policy will also include a section for asset handover. For bio basins on sites smaller than 2ha that are not staged it is expected that the policy will require the developer to construct the under drainage, cap the filter media and pay contributions towards planting.</p> <p><u>M2025.03 Update</u> A draft has been provided by Jamie which has been reviewed by MCE and GRC. Proposed updates have been actioned and the draft D7 document has been attached as Attachment E for discussion.</p> <p><u>M2025.03 Discussion</u> Proposed that the two-week review period be started 08/05/2025. Richard advised that MCE will provide a summary of revisions email.</p> <p>Jamie questioned if the asset handover documentation has been incorporated into the main document. Confirmed it has been kept separate. Scott advised it would be best to keep LGA specific process outside of the main document however additional feedback on the matter would be provided at a later date.</p> <p>Jamie advised he had considered putting together a separate guideline regarding water quality that could cover asset handover however noted the complexity of this and that it may not be directly correlated with ESCP (construction). Jamie confirmed that he would begin compiling this document and provide to the committee for review at a later date.</p> <p>Richard put to the committee if there was any additional feedback on the matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GRC – confirmed to keep the ESCP doc separate to the asset handover doc in order to get the content into circulation. • MRC – requested summary of what precipitated the changes. • No other feedback provided. <p><u>M2025.03 Actions</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCE to send separate email with changes and include a summary of why the changes have happened. • Jamie to begin compiling separate document regarding operational and asset handover. <p><u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Discussed changes received by committee. Key feedback from MRC suggested that that a new introduction section is required to better clarify the application of the document. General agreement from the committee to include this. Agreed that a 5 working day review period for the revised document. Mohit suggested that this is too long and requested to send the document as is. Richard suggested that we incorporate the new section and send to industry for review concurrently with the committee review.</p> <p>Jarvis suggested that a flowchart would help direct the use of the document as part of the new section.</p> <p><u>M2025.04 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate new section. • Send to industry for review in tandem with committee review. <p><u>M2025.05 Discussion</u> Feedback from industry and committee received. Some actions arose from this, particularly the certification (CPESC) requirement and the forms which are to be actioned by MCE. Feedback has been provided to Jamie for review. Emails from industry consultation reviewed in meeting. Discussion on the need to provide a certification on all sites – Jamie advised for low-risk sites there was no need to provide CPESC certification and a basic RPEQ certification would be suitable. Medium and higher should be CPESC or equivalent. Bradley confirmed agreement with this approach. Discussion on the 'transition period', Jamie raised that there should be no transition period given the age/history of this update. Bradley and Michael confirmed agreement with this.</p> <p>Jamie suggested that as an interim (until the RPEQ gains CPESC certification), a reasonable level of evidence of training etc should be supplied. This should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The reasonableness of Annexure A certificate requiring CPESC <i>and</i> RPEQ qualifications was discussed. Jamie advised he didn't think this was reasonable and that two separate persons with either qualification could provide these two certifications. Todd raised that the temporary drainage aspect couldn't be covered by only a CPESC given it'd be categorised as engineering services under the Professional Engineers Act so therefore leaves a grey area of liability. Discussed that therefore RPEQ certification should still be required. Jamie advised he'd discuss with Topo (ESCP Consultant).</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RPEQ certification required for low-risk sites and CPESC or equivalent for medium and high-risk sites. - No transition period to be adopted. - Jamie to confirm with Topo regarding CPESC <i>and</i> RPEQ certification and advise to MCE for incorporation into D7. - MCE to update D7 accordingly and upload document. <p><u>Action By</u> MCE & Jamie McCaul</p>
M24.06.05	<p>D10 Landscaping Design In progress</p> <p><u>M2025.02 Update</u> Grant Vaughan advised that the review committee may be recommending changes to planting near intersections. Discussed that this item was being addressed separately as part of M24.09.02. Ongoing and no further resolution.</p> <p><u>M2025.03 Discussion</u></p>

	<p>Grant advised no additional updates. Progress is still underway however it is being slowed by interlinking with other policies etc.</p> <p><u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Grant advised that no updates are able to be provided. No further discussion.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Discussion</u> Grant advised that the town planners were reviewing the document and progress was being made. Standard drawings are being prepared by RRC. Grant advised these drawings would be on 'L' series.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> RRC</p>
M25.03.01	<p>Drawing D-032 Additional Details</p> <p>Additional details have been requested to be provided on CMDG Standard Drawing D-032:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Square opening on roof slab detail. • Cast-insitu chamber details (including reinforcement) up to and including 3000x3000. <p>An example of such details are provided by Bundaberg Regional Council standard drawings D2101, D2102, D2201, D2202, D2301 and D2302 – refer to Attachment E.</p> <p><u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Richard provided background on this item noting that a range of cases should have a custom design provided that doesn't typically happen. Noted that Attachment E provides an example of the proposed changes to cover more information (i.e. reinforcement, sizes, penetration details etc).</p> <p>Brendan advised that IPWEA withdrew their drawings for rectangular access covers.</p> <p>The risk of no design being provided was discussed and that providing drawings would assist to ensure this is mitigated.</p> <p>Grant advised that preference would be to not providing overarching certification with disclaimers as such, or alternatively, provide a specific certification by an RPEQ on the drawings. Scott suggested that the RPEQ certification could be covered by the existing CMDG form process.</p> <p>It was discussed whether or not this item should be a priority in reference to other drawing updates underway. Richard suggested MCE could request the drawing files from Bundaberg Regional Council to assist in expediting the updates.</p> <p>Consensus was that the information would be beneficial to the committee. Scott suggested that this could be applied as a job to maintain workload as necessary.</p> <p><u>M2025.04 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCE to request the drawing files from Bundaberg Regional Council. • MCE to provide a fee proposal to provide the design/s. <p><u>M2025.05 Discussion</u> MCE are in the process of discussing the request with BRC. It was noted that the drawings were provided via a third party service to BRC and certified by an RPEQ external to the Council as part of that process. MCE has contacted BRC to discuss and discussions are in progress. Once a resolution on this is reached MCE will provide a fee proposal for the design/s.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MCE to follow up. <p>Post-Meeting Update: BRC has confirmed willingness to provide the .dwg files as requested. MCE are in the process of coordinating their procurement.</p> <p><u>Action By:</u> MCE</p>

M25.03.02	<p>Sewer Pump Station Commissioning Checklist</p> <p>CMDG has recently included LSC's SPS Commissioning Checklist as a 'Council Specific' document.</p> <p>If any other LGA would like to use this document, it can be generalised and included in an overarching document (e.g. CP1).</p> <p><u>M2025.04 Discussion</u> Richard provided background info on this item noting that Brendan had noticed the pre-commissioning checklist has not been provided by LSC.</p> <p>Mohit advised RRC is in the process of making their own checklist.</p> <p>Bradley advised he'd follow up internally to try get access to the pre-commissioning checklist and provide to the committee.</p> <p><u>M2025.04 Resolution</u> No resolution. Further discussion to be had at the next meeting.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Discussion</u> Bradley and Mohit to provided the relevant documents. Noted that the LSC document provided was the <i>commissioning checklist</i> not the <i>pre-commissioning checklist</i>. Bradley advised that the commissioning checklist hasn't historically been used internally and was likely used by the capital works team.</p> <p>Jamie advised that the document provided by Mohit was a draft of a draft and shouldn't be implemented yet. Advised that Fitzroy River Water (FRW) were still yet to review and therefore should wait until this is done.</p> <p>Brendan advised WSAA has relevant documentation that could be relevant. Richard advised he'd forward information to the committee provided by Brendan on this.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Richard to forward the WSAA information to the committee for review. - Await FRW review for the RRC document. Jamie to provide to FRW for review. <p><u>Action By:</u> MCE and RRC</p>
M25.03.03	<p>Australian Rainfall & Runoff V4.2</p> <p>The procedure to quantify the effect of climate change on rainfall depths and other hydrologic processes has been updated with ARR V4.2. The results are a significant increase in magnitude as compared to the previous climate change factors – in Rockhampton for example this is a 3x increase, from 20pct to 60pct increase in rainfall depths (particularly for smaller catchments – e.g. local creek catchment flooding).</p> <p>Currently, the State and overarching authorities have not provided any guidance on the adoption of these new factors. MCE have noticed some movement in industry as various LGA's start to broach the adoption of these changes.</p> <p>It is suggested that a sub-committee be formed to investigate and provide recommendations to the Committee on how D5 should address these changes.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Discussion</u> Nathan advised that BSC are in the process of updating their modelling. Following a meeting with QRA advice to be provided to the committee on the outcome of this to guide implementation. Jamie advised the same.</p> <p>Agreed to gather information from each LGA as available to determine the best course of action for inclusion into D5.</p>

	<p><u>M2025.05 Resolution</u> Nathan and Jamie to provide updates to MCE for inclusion into the next agenda regarding the outcome of their respective flood updates and/or meetings with QRA.</p> <p>All LGA's to consider their internal approach to adoption.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> All</p>
M25.03.04	<p>Industrial Sewer Loading This item was not discussed at M2025.05</p> <p>It has been identified that the industrial sewer loading rate provided by D12 is illogical when compared with the water loading rate provided by D11 – i.e. D12 specifies 73.06 EP/ha compared to D11 which specifies 56 EP/ha.</p> <p>The source of this sewer loading rate is not immediately apparent and it is suggested that the suitability of this loading rate be discussed.</p> <p>There are some cases where the use of the default water/ sewer rates may not provide LGAs with the best outcome. E.g. oversized sewer pumpstation. Consider adding text noting that reduced water and sewer loading rates may be suitable for some developments with prior agreement from the LGA.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Suggested Resolution</u> Update D11 water rate to align with D12 sewer loading rate or vice versa.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>
M25.03.05	<p>Manual for Guardrail This item was not discussed at M2025.05</p> <p>TMR have moved to proprietary guardrail systems. Typically, MELT treatments are not specified for new installations. The currency of C264 has been queried as it offers conflicting and out of date information.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Suggested Resolution</u> C264 be reviewed and updated in line with the document 'TMR Accepted Road Safety Barrier Systems and Devices'. Alternatively, C264 could be removed and a clause added in D1 to reference the TMR Accepted Road Safety Barrier Systems and Devices document.</p> <p><u>Action by</u> MCE</p>
M25.05.01	<p>Standard drawings for ESC This item was not discussed at M2025.05</p> <p>There has been a query from LSC as to whether standard drawings will be added/ updated for Erosion</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Suggested Resolution</u> MCE to create standard/ example drawings for HES basin and typical arrangement of drainage controls etc.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>
M25.05.02	<p>Awashaft Sewer Maintenance Holes This item was not discussed at M2025.05</p> <p>CMDG has been approached by a supplier requesting a discussion regarding the use of polypropylene maintenance structures for gravity sewer applications. Please refer to the email below.</p> <p>This topic has been raised with CMDG on several occasions previously, but no resolution has been reached to date. For reference, please see the attached M2024.03 meeting minutes in regard to EZI pit.</p> <p>We are now seeking confirmation from all LGAs regarding their position on this matter. Specifically:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you supportive in the discussion of using polypropylene access chambers (e.g. Ezipit, AWASHAFT) as an alternative to traditional concrete chambers? <p>If your LGA is supportive, please advise so that this item can be added to the agenda for the next CMDG meeting.</p> <p>BSC has responded that they would be happy to use. GRC has responded that they are already using these and support the use.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Suggested Resolution</u> MCE to update D12 to allow use of polypropylene manholes/ maintenance structures. Table of difference to be added if required.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>
M25.05.03	<p>LGAs have provided feedback for the draft Floodway Standard Drawings. This item was not discussed at M2025.05</p> <p>Feedback from Scott has questioned the 20-year design life parameter on a Rigid pavement. Although CMDG D2 states the design life of rigid pavement to be for 20 years we suggest a 30-year rigid pavement life is more suitable in accordance with Austroads Guide to Pavement Technology Part 2.</p> <p>Design life of 30 years with 500AADT pushes the Ndt value outside the parameters of a lightly trafficked road and section 9 of Austroads Guide to Pavement Technology part 2 to now be used for AADT over 300 (15% heavy).</p> <p>CMDG-R-097 now updated to include AADT of 300 to 1500 which will satisfy the 30 year design life. Main changes of the 300 to 1500 design includes a lean mix subbase, slightly thicker concrete base and raised to 40MPa concrete strength.</p> <p>The other main comment received was the relating to the provision of two-way crossfall on bed level crossings. Grants feedback is that bed level crossings should have a one-way crossfall regardless of road width. Culvert crossings may have a crown or one-way crossfall (including superelevation against flow direction if required).</p> <p>For discussion and update of drawings as agreed.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Suggested Resolution</u> MCE to update drawings as agreed and upload to the website.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>
M25.05.04	<p>CMDG-R-017 Revisions to Standard Drawing This item was not discussed at M2025.05</p> <p>Feedback is not conclusive for the changes to CMDG-R-017.</p> <p>MRC has stated that the changes have implications on the recent updates to D1 Road Design Tables. MRC also wants discussion around the removal of 'seal width'.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Suggested Resolution</u> TBC</p> <p><u>Action By</u> TBC</p>

M25.05.05	<p>Revisions to C271 – Minor Concrete Specifications This item was not discussed at M2025.05</p> <p>A contractor has brought up that the current performance standards for concrete bar chairs in C271 is not in line and does not reference current Australian Standards. The reasoning behind current performance standards asked for in C271 is also unknown.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Suggested Resolution</u> MCE to update section C271.29.06 to be in line with AS 2425. MCE to also review and update the entire C271 specification. Last update appears to be 2018.</p> <p><u>Action By</u> MCE</p>
M25.05.06	<p>Communication from CMDG Mailbox</p> <p>Jarvis requested that email correspondence to be channelled through the cmdg@mcmengineers.com account only. Brendan agreed that this would be preferable.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All correspondence to be sent and received via the cmdg@mcmengineers.com account only. - No further actions required.
M25.05.07	<p>Compaction Around Sewer Manholes</p> <p>Brendan highlighted that CMDG D12 doesn't provide specific compaction requirements around sewer manholes and questioned if any other LGA's are experiencing issues with subsidence as a result.</p> <p>Richard suggested that additional wording could be added to D12 to cover this. Suggested that additional testing could be an outcome and queried whether or not this would be a preferable outcome. Advised that currently trench backfill only needs to be tested at road crossings or deep sewer and identified that at the manhole may not be consistent with this approach.</p> <p><u>M2025.05 Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MCE to prepare suggested updates to D12 to incorporate this. <p><u>Action By:</u> MCE</p>