

## Howlong Pool Service Delivery Review 2024 Service Delivery Model Options

Name	1. "As Is" Service Delivery Model	2. Tiered Supervision Model	3. Unsupervised Model
<b>Service Provider</b>	Council	Council	Council
<b>Service Level Change</b>	No change to the current service level.	Patrons may experience reduced supervision at times when accessing the pool.	No direct supervision of patrons.
<b>Focus of Service Delivery</b>	This model involves retaining the service 'as is'.	This model involves tailoring lifeguard supervision based on patron numbers and risk. Same model Council has resolved to implement at Corowa Aquatic Centre.	This model includes controlled entry through issuing of fobs and other controls within the facility to enable the community to access the pool without lifeguard supervision.
<b>Brief Description of Service Delivery Model</b>	Summer seasons with access to all users during existing opening hours. Lifeguard supervision provided at all times when the centre is open to the public.	Implement a minimum lifeguard supervision mode during periods of low patronage utilising signs as remote supervision, i.e. "No Lifeguard on Duty", with supervision increased during periods of higher patronage. This model will require consultation with council's insurer, including undertaking a risk assessment and developing operational procedures. This model also includes revised staff resourcing - core base of permanent employees supplemented with casual pool of staff – in-line with the model for Corowa Aquatic Centre.	No lifeguard supervision and no staff at the pool watching over patrons. This model will require consultation with council's insurer, including undertaking a risk assessment and implementing controls to remotely supervise patrons. This model would involve a reduction in the casual workforce.  This model is suited to remote and small communities that have difficulty finding staff to man their facilities.
<b>Advantages</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council retains direct influence over the serviced delivered.</li> <li>• Council retains important relationships with stakeholders.</li> <li>• Council can ensure risk and liability are adequately managed.</li> <li>• Utilisation of internal Council services – Facilities, Human Resources, IT, Communications, Payroll, Finance etc.</li> <li>• Customers are familiar with this service delivery model.</li> <li>• Existing pool of trained and qualified staff available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same pool of staff resourcing used at Corowa and Howlong Pools.</li> <li>• Consistency with the model being implemented at Corowa Aquatic Centre.</li> <li>• Risk based supervision of patrons.</li> <li>• Opportunity to create efficiencies with staff rostering and resourcing.</li> <li>• Opportunity to reduce operating costs.</li> <li>• Reduced impact on Council's overall financial sustainability.</li> <li>• Retain existing trained pool staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facility remains open for the public to use.</li> <li>• Patrons not limited to access the facility only during opening hours.</li> <li>• Minimal staff resourcing required.</li> </ul>
<b>Disadvantages</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current model does not provide opportunity for efficiencies and cost savings.</li> <li>• Labour costs are higher under council Local Government Award than industry awards.</li> <li>• Attracting, recruiting, and retaining staff has been and will continue to be a challenge for Council.</li> <li>• Model does not align with the model being implemented at Corowa Aquatic Centre.</li> <li>• Risk of two different models being implemented at Corowa and Howlong Pools with the same staff resources – creating confusion and inconsistency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear procedures and processes will be required to maintain safety of patrons.</li> <li>• Clear communication with patrons to make them aware of supervision arrangements and their responsibilities.</li> <li>• Reduced casual employment opportunities at the facility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Model not suited to the population size of Howlong, the number of patrons visiting the pool or the type of patrons attending the centre.</li> <li>• Significant risk of injury and/or death.</li> <li>• Council will not meet duty of care requirements for patrons.</li> <li>• Unlikely to be approved by Council's insurer.</li> <li>• Kiosk cannot be supported with this model.</li> <li>• Income will be limited to the sale of fobs only.</li> <li>• Reduced casual employment opportunities at the facility.</li> </ul>
<b>Roles &amp; Responsibilities</b>	All aspects of the service provided by Council.	All aspects of the service provided by Council.	All aspects of the service provided by Council.
<b>Financial Sustainability</b>	This model does not propose to change the overall financial sustainability of Council.	This model will improve Council's financial position.	This model will improve Council's financial position.
<b>Forecast Budget</b>	Income \$21,851 Expenditure \$155,706 <b>Net Result -\$133,855</b>  <b>Budget change:</b> No change expected.	Income \$21,500 Expenditure \$123,000 <b>Net Result -\$101,500</b>  <b>Budget Change:</b> operating cost <u>reduction</u> of <b>\$34,200</b>	Income \$3,225 Expenditure \$82,825 <b>Net Result -\$79,600</b>  <b>Budget Change:</b> operating cost <u>reduction</u> of <b>\$74,375</b>
<b>Forecast Ratepayer vs. User Contribution to Operating Costs for the Centre</b>	<b>Ratepayer Contribution:</b> 86% <b>User Contribution:</b> \$14%	<b>Ratepayer Contribution:</b> 82.5% <b>User Contribution:</b> 17.5%	<b>Ratepayer Contribution:</b> 96% <b>User Contribution:</b> 4%
<b>Recommendation</b>	Not recommended	Recommended	Not Recommended