

WITHAM FOURTH DISTRICT INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

MINUTES

of the proceedings of the **Plant & Pumping Stations Committee** at a Meeting held at the Board's Offices, 47 Norfolk Street, Boston on Wednesday **22 November 2017**

Present:- J.E. Grant (Committee Chairman)

Messrs: T. Ashton P. Richardson
P. Bedford A. Saul
C. Brotherton P. Skinner
C. Crunkhorn J. Ward
R. F. Leggott R. Williams

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for non-attendance were received from:-

Messrs: A. Saul

2. **ENGINEERING MANAGER'S ESTIMATES 2018/2019**

2.1 **Plant Replacement Programme 2017/2018 – Current Year Update**

The Engineering Manager updated the Committee Members on progress in the current year:

Plant Item	Estimate	Cost	Comments
JCB JS 260 Excavator	£160,000	£148,500	To replace JCB JS220
Bomford 81-81 Flail	£38,000	£28,500	To replace Spearhead flail
Herder 5m weedbasket	£5,000	£8,300	Estimate was for a 3m basket
Weedmaster 5m weedbasket	£5,000	£7,975	Estimate was for a 3m basket
Alpego Off-set flail mower	£8,500	£5,200	
Weedmaster 4m weedbasket	-	£5,000	Additional item not in estimates – see note
Total	£216,500	£203,475	

The Engineering Manager confirmed that there had been an increase in costs as a result of buying 5m weed baskets instead of the 3m previously used. Given the increased output achieved with the 5m baskets, a 4m basket was purchased to fit to the Atlas 160 LC excavator which has also proved to be a success. The Chairman added that we had also purchased the larger 260 machine to replace the 220 to cope with the larger basket. The Engineering Manager added that the JS220 had a bespoke rig whereas the 260 had the standard rig which was the preferred option.

2.2 **Plant Replacement Programme 2018/2024**

The Engineering Manager confirmed that the expenditure for the next six years was shown and the account was in good shape.

The Engineering Manager confirmed that the next item to consider is the disposal of the 22RB. This is a crane purchased in 1973 which is no longer used. The crane has a number of issues and is insufficient space for undercover storage. There is no suitable location to put it on display without it being a hindrance to the day to day work in the Depot. The 60ft jib (previously condemned but we were lucky to find a second hand replacement jib section in good condition) will become a safety issue due to corrosion and can no longer be repaired

by the Board's workshop (the Board's insurers have previously stated that the jib must be repaired by a certified welder). A £4000 cash offer has been made for its purchase (note scrap value currently circa £2000). The Engineering Manager confirmed, in his opinion that the 22RB should be disposed of and asked the Committee for their recommendation.

The Chairman added that he felt that this was a very important part of the Board's history and should be retained. He believed it was sacrilege to dispose of it but he would listen to what other members had to say on the matter.

P. Skinner said that it was a lovely piece of history and it was a shame it was rotting and so he supposed it should be disposed of.

R. Leggott added there was no room for sentiment and it should be disposed of.

P. Bedford added it should be sold.

C. Crunkhorn agreed it should be disposed of.

B. Bowles said that he would prefer it to stay in the district and he knew of two people who might be willing to take it and keep it maintained but he did not know if they would be willing to pay £4,000 to do so.

T. Ashton said he agreed with the Chairman and he was very sentimental about the machine and would rather it be retained and preserved rather than sold to the highest bidder.

J. Ward added we were not a museum and it should be disposed of.

R. Williams agreed it should be disposed of.

N. Jones asked if the offer of £4,000 had come from outside the district.

C. Crunkhorn suggested that B. Bowles make further enquiries with the parties to keep it inside the district before the next Board meeting.

T. Ashton added that the machine should not be left to stand outside and perhaps investigations could be made with a local heritage group but he felt it was worth more than £4,000.

The Chairman suggested that a decision be deferred to the next Board meeting to enable B. Bowles to investigate the option referred to.

This option was proposed by P. Skinner and seconded by T. Ashton.

2.3 **Plant Replacement 2018/2019**

The Engineering Manager said that generally use of the bigger weed baskets had proved successful. The possibility of additional work for the EA had been discussed at the Works Committee and they had approved the undertaking of this work. Now that had been agreed it would be necessary to put forward a plant report to ensure that we could meet this commitment. The JS220 and the JS 145 were absolutely critical to us being able to meet the Board's existing programme and some of the EA work. It would mean an intense programme of work subject to having the right equipment to enable them to meet the task. The final specification can be decided upon when the Board has confirmed support of us doing the additional works. The Engineering Manager then confirmed the proposed programme of Plant Replacement as follows:-

- a. **JCB JS220**
Purchased 2009, 9174 hours.
Estimated Cost **£140,000**

- b. **JCB JS145**
Purchased 2008, 11093 hours.
Estimated Cost **£100,000**

- c. **Unimog**
Purchased 2002, 128,205km.
Estimated Cost **£135,000**

Recommend defer for 1 year due to condition.

- d. **Foreman's 4x4**
 Purchased 2015, 47848 miles.
 Estimated Cost **£23,000**

A Depot/Pumping Station 4x4 with 85,698 miles will be sold and the replaced by the existing Foreman's 4x4.

- e. **No 2.5m weed basket**
 Purchased 2013, weed baskets are replaced after 8 seasons' use.
 Estimated cost **£4,850**

2.4 **Additional Replacement Plant**

It is recommended that the following sums are included for the purchase of additional plant:

- a. **Small Plant Items**
 Sum to cover purchase of small powered hand tools and other small plant.
 Estimated Cost **£2,000**

- b. **Weed baskets**
- | | | |
|---------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 No 5m | £8000 | for item a. above |
| 1 No 4m | £5500 (3.75m) or £6500 (4.3m) | size tbc. |
| 1 No 2m | £4000 | for Herder Cavalier |

- c. **Weed Boats**
 Estimated cost (to EA specification):

1 No. boat – cutting £77,000 (inc. trailer to suit 4x4)
 1 No. boat – raking £66,000 (inc. trailer to suit 4x4)
 Add £5,500 each for tractor trailers.

Recommend retaining the Truxor for 1 more year. If not used consider selling in 2019.

- d. **Tree Snipper/Cutter**
 Due to the extended weed cutting season and closed season for tree and bushing works the window of opportunity for tree cutting operations has become very narrow with both Foreman requiring the same equipment at the same time. A second medium sized tree cutter would enable more tree control works to be completed and extend the life of the existing equipment.

Estimated cost: £15,000 - £20,000

The Assistant Engineer quantified the need for 2 weed boats as each boat would be required for approximately 770 hours each through the season. The Engineering Manager confirmed that if the EA work did not continue the older machines could be disposed of and there would be no need for replacement as we could use the machines already purchased. Therefore the liability to the Board is fairly low.

The Engineering Manager confirmed that the Tree Snippers cost approximately £15,000 to £20,000 but they are very long lasting. The current one was purchased in 2003 and was still going strong. There is a 6-8 week opportunity for tree cutting work to be completed and at the present time both Foreman need the tool at the same time.

The Vice-Chairman said that we were looking at an additional £90,000 work from the EA but the weed boat costs £56,000. The Assistant Engineer confirmed that the weed boat work will carry out the largest portion of the work clearing weeds. The Chief Executive added that the impact on the drainage rates would be minimal as the only effect would be the depreciation value and the running costs. Depreciation value over 8 years is 12% and monies will also be deducted from the plant fund.

C. Crunkhorn said that he was concerned that "most" of the cost would be covered and not all. The Engineering Manager said that this had been based on the initial estimate and having had an opportunity to review this further almost all of the cost would be covered. The Assistant Engineer added that work rates had been calculated and a conservative estimate was 130m of cutting an hour but on a good run it could be as much as 200m. Although this was a conservative estimate time had been built in for transportation, idle time etc.

T. Ashton asked how unreliable the machines had become. The Engineering Manager confirmed that they were not unreliable but that if we are undertaking additional volume of work for the EA that we had to ensure that we had good, reliable machines with which to do the work. We could not have a situation where the machines had broken down in the middle of the busy periods. The work programme was very intense and we had to ensure that we were as able as possible to deal with it. The Chairman added that the Board needed to be reliable to secure more work looking to the future.

T. Ashton was pleased to see the Board was retaining the Unimog.

N. Jones asked why we were considering disposal of the Deport 4x4 when the diesel engine had only done 85,000 miles. The Chairman said that he had asked the same question at the pre-meeting but vehicles depreciate rapidly once they have mileage over 90,000. Again, reliability was an issue for the staff that were using the vehicles as they were providing a service to the men working in the district, towing machinery etc and efficiency and reliability were a major factor.

After discussion it was

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND Purchase of
a) JCB JS220
b) JCB JS145
c) Defer replacement of Unimog for 1 year
d) Foreman's 4 x 4
e) 1 No 2.5m weed Basket

With regard to the purchase of additional plant, the Chairman questioned whether the purchase of 2 x weed boats was necessary and asked why our existing Truxor could not be used.

The Vice-Chairman asked what the life of a weed boat was. The Assistant Engineer said it depended on the yearly usage but roughly about 7-8 years.

P. Bedford asked what the delivery time was from the date of order. The Assistant Engineer confirmed that it was approximately 4 months so the boat would need to be ordered in January to be delivered in time to start the work programme.

P. Bedford stated that there was no point in ordering one after January then as we would miss the window for work. The Chairman added that there was no definite written commitment at this stage but the Assistant Engineer said that if we can commit to deliver we will get the work. The Engineering Manager added that the Truxor was a good machine which does a good job but it is a lightweight machine and it had broken down last summer – whilst it is damaged it cannot be used. The Assistant Engineer confirmed that this intensive programme leaves us 6 weeks to do our own work. Each boat will be used for 780 hours for the EA work and then be used for our work.

C. Crunkhorn asked if we had enough drivers and said that if we were not confident in the Truxor we should be looking at disposing of it. The Engineering Manager confirmed we did have sufficient drivers and that we needed to keep the Truxor.

T. Ashton felt we would be hard pressed to meet our obligation with one weed boat and one Truxor. The Assistant Engineer said that we need 2 weed boats.

The Chairman proposed that we purchase one weed boat and use the Truxor but if the Contract was confirmed in writing in the meantime that the Chairman and the Vice Chairman be given delegated powers to purchase the second weed boat.

R. Leggot said that he would suggest that the money for the purchase of the second weed boat be included in the budget and then proceed as per the Chairman's proposals. The Assistant Engineer said that following on from a recent meeting he did not believe that there would be an issue asking the EA to attend a further meeting and get them to confirm the finer details. The Engineering Manager added that the EA had been told to get IDBs to do the work.

T. Ashton said that he supported putting the money for the purchase of two weed boats into the budget to ensure that we could fulfil the Contract.

R. Leggot proposed this and the proposal as seconded by T. Ashton.

After discussion it was

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND Purchase of
 a) Small Plant Items
 b) Weed Baskets
 c) Weed Boats – subject to the above condition
 d) Tree Snipper/ Cutter

C. Crunkhorn added that we should make it more widely known why we do tree-cutting. The Chief Executive said that he would include it in the News Letter next year. The Chairman added we should also state that we only cut one side and leave the other for environmental reasons.

2.5 **Pumping Station Resilience Measures**

The Engineering Manager confirmed that new electricity contracts had been negotiated and there was nothing major to report. Resilience Measures were in place.

2.6 **Pumping Stations Operational Costs**

Based on average annual costs it is recommended that the following sums be allowed in the 2018/19 estimates:-

	2018/19 Estimate	2017/18 Estimate
Pumping Stations	£446,000	£436,000
Depreciation of existing assets	£13,233	£13,233
Total	£459,233	£449,233

After discussion it was

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND Approve estimate of £459,233 for 2018/2019

2.6 **Workshops and Depot**

The Engineering Manager confirmed no changes and based on average annual costs recommended that £42,000 be allowed in 2018/2019 estimates.

R. Leggott asked if £42,000 would be sufficient. The Engineering Manager confirmed that it was.

After discussion it was

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND Approve estimate of £42,000 for 2018/2019

3 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business and the meeting was closed.

Chairman