

Local Government Name: Shire of Collie

Date received: 12/04/2017

DRAFT BRM PLAN SUBMISSION

Has a cover letter from the local government been attached to the submission?

- ✓ Cover letter attached

Has an electronic and hardcopy version of the submission been provided?

- ✓ Electronic (MS word or PDF)
- ✓ Hardcopy

Comments

- Softcopy of BRM Plan received on 07/04/17. Hardcopy plan with covering letter from CEO submitted 12/04/2017.

BRM PLAN PREPARATION – GENERAL (inc Section1, Section 2 and Appendices as attached)

Does the BRM Plan follow the format of the OBRM BRM Plan Template and have all sections been addressed?

- ✓ OBRM template has been used (*preferred*)
- ✓ All sections have been addressed
- ✓ Section numbering and order consistent with template

Have all required appendices been attached to the BRM Plan?

- ✓ Communication Strategy
- ✓ Planning Area Map
- ✗ Asset Risk Register (if applicable)
- ✓ Multi-agency local government-wide controls table
- ✗ Treatment Schedule (if applicable)

Have the roles and responsibilities of the various agencies/stakeholders been described?

- ✓ Roles and responsibilities section completed?

OBRM Comments

- The second paragraph should be removed from the 'Document Endorsements' section of the BRM Plan.
- The last dot point should be removed from the Local Government Roles and Responsibilities section.
- The last dot point should be removed from the DFES Roles and Responsibilities section.
- The last dot point should be removed from the OBRM Roles and Responsibilities section.

Officer Comments

- Retained as requested by Director of Development Services (DDS)
- Retained as requested by DDS
- Retained as requested by DDS
- Retained as requested by DDS

CONTEXT – DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY CONTEXT (Section 3.1)

Strategic and Corporate Framework (Section 3.1.1)

- ✗ Has a link to the corporate or strategic framework been established?
- ✗ Have relationships between bushfire risk management and existing local government strategic and corporate frameworks been explained?
- ✓ Has information been provided on how the BRM Plan will be embedded into current local government functions, including which areas of the local government will be responsible for each element of the BRM Plan?
- ✓ Has information been sourced from Local Government documents, Corporate Plans etc?
- ✗ Has relevant information been included in this section as per the template?
- ✗ Is the information provided relevant to this section of the context?
- ✗ Has the information provided been appropriately sourced and referenced?

Strategic and Corporate Framework (Section 3.1.1)	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relationship between bushfire risk management and existing local government strategic and corporate frameworks is not clear from the information provided. • Reference should be made to the template and the BRM Plan guidelines for the relevant information to be included in this section. • Referencing in this section should be reviewed and corrected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Development Services heading, BRM Plan implementation is outlined • See above • No modification

Location, Boundaries and Tenure (Section 3.1.2)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has a brief description of the local government location and boundaries been provided? ✓ Has a map been provided (optional)? ✓ Have a breakdown of land tenure (by percentage) been provided in tabular form? ✓ Have key land owner groups to be involved in the development and implementation of the BRM Plan been identified? ✓ Is the information provided relevant to this section of the context? ✗ Has the information provided been appropriately sourced and referenced? 	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information provided in this section has not been appropriately sourced and referenced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified

Population and Demographics (Section 3.1.3)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Has a brief description of the population and demographics been provided? (including where and how people live, the location of communities and <u>general trends with implications for bushfire risk management</u>) ✗ Have areas undergoing significant or rapid growth or that are planned for development been identified? ✗ Has the engagement of the community in preparedness, general perceptions of bushfire-related risk and the accuracy of these perceptions been addressed? ✓ Is the information provided relevant to this section of the context? ✓ Has the information provided been appropriately sourced and referenced? ✗ 	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population information provided in this section is very brief and relates to a whole-of-Shire level (Does not describe major population centres). • Whilst information has been included on expected population growth, it again only at a Shire level and does not relate to any specific areas. • No information has been provided in relation to community preparedness or perceptions of bushfire risk. • Figure 3 should be removed from this section as it has no relevance. • Refer to Section 3.1.3 of the BRM Plan template for information required in this section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified • There is no expected population growth within the Shire beyond the norm • No modification • Relocated as requested.

Economic Activities and Industry (Section 3.1.4)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has an overview of any significant economic and industrial activities based within the local government been provided? (Particular attention should be given to those activities with regional or state significance). □ If tourism is a significant industry, have the number of visitors and peak seasons of activity been detailed? ✗ Have any activities with specific bushfire risk management considerations (e.g. impact of smoke on agricultural production) been addressed? ✗ Names of private companies or employers have not been used? ✓ Is the information provided relevant to this section of the context? 	

Economic Activities and Industry (Section 3.1.4)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has the information provided been appropriately sourced and referenced? 	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information in this section is relevant in respect of the significant economic and industrial activities within the Shire of Collie. However, no consideration in relation to the impact of bushfire on these activities has been provided. • Names of private companies should be removed. (e.g. Figure 12) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified • Modified

CONTEXT – DESCRIPTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND BUSHFIRE CONTEXT (Section 3.2)

Topography and Landscape Features (Section 3.2.1)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Has an overview of the topography of the local government area been provided? ✗ Have any landscape features with the potential to significantly affect bushfire behaviour, increase bushfire-related risk or limit the capacity to implement effective treatments been addressed? ✓ Is the information provided relevant to this section of the context? ✗ Has the information provided been appropriately sourced and referenced? 	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The topographical information provided is relevant to this section but no consideration has been given to its effect on bushfire behaviour, whether it increases bushfire risk or how it might limit the capacity of landowners to undertake treatments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified

Climate and Bushfire Season (Section 3.2.2)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has an <u>overview</u> of the climate of the local government area been provided? ✓ Have seasonal conditions, including the length and period of all seasons, annual temperature and rainfall patterns, and prevailing conditions, Forest Fire Danger Index (FFDI) and Grassland Fire Danger Index (GFDIs) (extremes 95th percentile) been addressed? ✗ Has the annual bushfire season (including details of Gazetted Restricted Burning Times and Prohibited Burning Times) been detailed? ✓ Is the information provided relevant to this section of the context? ✓ Has the information provided been appropriately sourced and referenced? 	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information has been provided in relation to FFDI or GFDI. • Information has not been provided in relation to Gazetted Restricted Burning Times or Prohibited Burning Times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified • Modified

Vegetation (Section 3.2.3)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has a broad overview of the vegetation categories relevant to bushfire risk management been provided? ✗ Have vegetation types, arrangements and fuel loads that will affect potential fire behaviour been addressed? <input type="checkbox"/> Has a list of vegetation categories been provided in the appendices (optional) <input type="checkbox"/> Is the information provided consistent with the vegetation map developed by the Local Government (If provided)? ✓ Is the information provided relevant to this section of the context? ✓ Has the information provided been appropriately sourced and referenced? 	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited information has been provided in respect of how vegetation types, arrangements and fuel loads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified

Vegetation (Section 3.2.3)	
<p>may affect potential fire behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cleared agricultural land and plantations have not been included in Table 8. The Total vegetation adds up to 100 percent despite the omission of these vegetation categories. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified table heading

Bushfire Frequency and Causes of Ignition (Section 3.2.4)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has an overview of the frequency of bushfires in the local government area been provided? ✓ Has fire history and areas of frequent ignition, known ignition sources or activities, potential fire paths and the frequency of natural events been addressed? ✓ Is the information provided relevant to this section of the context? ✗ Has the information provided been appropriately sourced and referenced? 	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information has only been provided in respect of bushfires in DP&W managed land (reserves). • Limited information has been provided in relation to the cause of bushfires. • Reference should be made to section 3.2.4 of the template for information required in this section. • Information provided has not been appropriately referenced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P&W data is the only accurate data available • Limited information is available to the causes of bushfire and often unreliable • No modification • No modification

ASSET IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT (Section 4)

Planning Areas (Section 4.1)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has the Local Government been divided into Planning Areas? ✓ Have the Planning Areas been named and listed? ✗ Has a map showing the boundaries of the Planning areas been provided as an Appendix? 	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst a map has been provided as an appendix to the plan, 2 of the planning areas (Collie Town and Allanson Town) are not clearly shown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified

Method of Prioritisation for Asset Identification and Risk Assessment (Section 4.1.1)
<p>Which method of prioritisation has been used?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Planning Area Assessment Tool ✗ Alternative method for asset identification and assessment
<p>Comments</p>

Asset Identification and Risk Assessment (Section 4.2, Section 4.3 and Appendix if attached)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has the BRM Plan been 'locked' in BRMS? ✓ Have assets been identified in all planning areas? ✗ Have assets been correctly identified in all asset categories? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Human settlement assets identified ○ Economic assets identified ○ Environmental assets identified ○ Cultural assets identified ✓ Have assets been appropriately identified in the map (use of polygon, marker, line)? ✓ Have assets been grouped appropriately (where necessary)? ✓ Have assets been named appropriately (unique name assigned)? ✗ Have P&W assisted with the identification and assessment of environmental assets? (Evidence of P & W

Asset Identification and Risk Assessment (Section 4.2, Section 4.3 and Appendix if attached)	
consultation for asset identification in Communication Strategy)	
✓ Have risk assessments been completed and recorded for all assets identified (including cost information)?	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 14 'Local Government Asset Risk Summary' should add up to 100% rather than each row adding up to 100%. The BRM Plan was locked on 07/04/2017. Environmental assets have not been identified and recorded in BRMS. A clearer explanation for this needs to be provided in Section 4.2 of the BRM Plan. No evidence in Communication Strategy of consultation with DP&W re identification of environmental assets Further information and clarity is also needed in respect of the identification of cultural assets in Section 4.2 and the relevance of 'Bushfire Prone Mapping'. The link is not obvious. Schools should be recorded as Human Settlement – Special Risk and Critical Facilities not Economic – Critical Infrastructure. See asset COCLT086 Review required of assets recorded as Human Settlement – Temporary occupation. Tourist accommodation or assets where someone is living should be recorded as Human Settlement – Special Risk and Critical Facilities e.g motel accommodation, camp sites Dip sampling of assets shows that : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assets have been appropriately identified and named Assets have been appropriately grouped Risk assessments have been completed including provision of cost information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modified Modified Modified Modified Schools are noted as both due to them being the second largest employment sector in the Shire Modified where appropriate

RISK EVALUATION AND RISK TREATMENT (Section 5 and Section 6)

Risk Acceptability (Section 5.3)	
✓ Has the level of risk acceptability been documented in the BRM Plan?	
✗ Has the course of action table been completed appropriately?	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The last sentence of the second paragraph should be removed from this section. The last sentence in the recommended course of action table under Extreme Risks should be removed. Reporting of unresolved risks should be to DFES as HMA for Fire. Under High Risks, a definition of 'semi-annual' is required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retained as requested by DDS Modified Replaced with annual monitoring

Risk Treatment – Local Government Wide Controls (Section 6.1 and Appendix)	
✓ Has the Local Government –wide controls template been used and provided as an appendix to the BRM Plan?	
✓ Have additional local government-wide controls been identified and listed?	
✓ Have actions, timeframes and responsibilities been identified?	
OBRM Comments	Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information provided in the Appendix does not include timeframes. Reference should be made to the template for information required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No modification

Risk Treatment – Local Government Wide Controls (Section 6.1 and Appendix)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibited and Restricted Burning should be Times not periods. Only PBT/RBT are gazetted (s17 & s 18 of the BF Act 1954). 'Open' burning period cannot be gazetted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periods changed to Times |
|---|--|

Risk Treatment – Asset-specific Treatment Strategies (Section 6.2 and Appendix if attached)

- ✗ Has the Treatment Schedule been provided as an appendix at the time of submission of the BRM Plan?
- If so, have known treatments been listed?
- For the treatment strategies identified, are they appropriate to the level of risk identified?
- ✓ Where a treatment schedule has not been provided, is there evidence in the Communication Strategy to show that activities have been planned to engage land owners and treatment managers in the development of the Treatment Schedule?

OBRM Comments

- The last sentence of the first paragraph in section 6.3 should be removed from the BRM Plan.

Officer Comments

- Retained as requested by DDS

MONITORING & REVIEW (Section 7)**Monitoring & Review**

- ✓ Have appropriate process for monitoring and review of the BRM Plan been documented?
- ✓ Have the responsibilities for the monitoring and review processes been detailed?

OBRM Comments

- The wording 'for as long as funding is available; should be removed from the last sentence in section 7.3.

Officer Comments

- Retained as requested by DDS

COMMUNICATION STRATEGY**Communication Strategy**

- ✓ Does the BRM Plan follow the format of the OBRM Communication Strategy Template and have all sections been addressed?
- ✓ Have communication roles and responsibilities been identified?
- ✗ Have key stakeholders been identified, with consideration given to the impact of BRMP on them and the level or engagement required?
- ✓ Have communications been identified for all stages of development of the BRM Plan?
- ✗ Have risks to communication been identified along with a suitable strategy to manage these risks?
- ✗ Have monitoring and evaluation methods been identified for each communication?

OBRM Comments

- Level of engagement with key stakeholders has been removed from the table.
- The community as a whole and private landowners have not been included as key stakeholders.
- The Communications Plan is incomplete. Gaps in information should be addressed such as key messaging, identifying risks, strategy to manage risks and monitoring and evaluation method.
- Unnecessary information has been included in the

Officer Comments

- Modified
- Modified
- Modified
- Modified

Communication Strategy

Communications Plan e.g. 25/01/16 Begin asset mapping, 20/01/16 Local Government BRPC BRMS software training.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Referencing should be checked throughout the document for accuracy and relevance.
- Limited information has been provided in the context section of the BRM Plan. Reference should be made to the template and Guidelines for further information requirements in each section.

Checklist and comments completed by the Office of Bushfire Risk Management

Date : 28/04/2017