

**Committee of Management.**  
**Flood Relief Funding Proposal – March 2011.**

**By: Bob Mutton.**

Now that we have an estimate of the cost to repair the flood damage on the course, we need to develop a plan in order to maximise our opportunities for grant funding. This document sets out a possible approach to the issue.

**1. Funding opportunities available:**

[a] Rural Finance – Victorian Floods Assistance Grant: \$25,000.00 max, closes 31<sup>st</sup> August.

[b] Commonwealth Bank Community Group Flood Assistance Grants: \$20,000.00 max.

Closes March 11<sup>th</sup> and is restricted to equipment only.

[c] Victorian Government Community Recovery Fund: \$5000.00 max, closes 22<sup>nd</sup> March.

Set out below is a suggestion as to how we should structure an application to the groups a, b & c above. The unknown factor is what assistance, if any, Golf Victoria [VGA] is prepared to provide, so I'll deal with that issue first.

I think that the only thing we can do at this stage in relation to the VGA is to write to them and provide full details of the estimated cost to repair the damage as well as the steps we have taken to obtain funding from other sources.

**2. Funding applications:**

I think we need to link the damage we want to repair to the funding sources available. The following is a suggestion designed to meet that aim.

[i] Repairs to the pathway network.

Below is the cost estimate provided by the Course Curator to carry out the necessary path repair work.

*Reinstatement of established crusher dust pathways on 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> holes.*

*310 x 2 metres of pathway:*

• 60m <sup>3</sup> of crusher dust – 4loads @ \$600	2400
• Bobcat earthworks 16hrs @ \$70	<u>1120</u>
	<b><u>\$3520</u></b>

This aspect of the repair work should be linked to funding source [c] above.

There are two reasons for this:

- The funding limit for source [c] is \$5000.00, which fits nicely with this aspect of the repairs required.
- This funding source was identified as a result of an approach we made to the Mildura Rural City Council requesting permission to redirect one component of our 'Recreation Facilities Upgrade Grant' to path repairs. The MRCC indicated that they would consider our request if we were unsuccessful in an attempt to get funding from source [c].

However, I believe that we should increase the funding sought to \$4520.00, bringing it closer to the funding limit and giving us additional funding that could be used in other areas.

[ii] Repairs to the irrigation control system.

Below is the cost estimate provided by the Course Curator to carry out the necessary repair work to the irrigation control system.

*Replacement of irrigation control system components damaged due to prolonged submersion*

• 8 valve boxes	443.52
• 32 decoders	7742.70
• 16 lids	380.80
• 4 x 80 mm valves	1416.80
• 5 x 50 mm valves	820.75
• Decoder cable 4mm 2x 2 /1.5mm -2x 500 mtr	3561.00

• 200 joiners	448.00
• 4 cds surge arresters	336.00
• 8 copper rod ground kits	564.48
• 4 copper plates	<u>490.00</u>
	<b><u>\$16204</u></b>

This aspect of the repair work should be linked to funding source [b] above.

There are two reasons for this:

- The funding limit for source [b] is \$20,000.00, which fits nicely with this aspect of the repairs required.
- Funding source [b] is restricted to the cost of equipment ONLY, which is clearly what this damage is.

As with [i] above, I believe that we should increase the funding sought to \$18,204.00, bringing it closer to the funding limit and giving us additional funding that could be used in other areas or for additional irrigation system repairs not accounted for in the original cost estimate.

That leaves \$43,266.00 of the cost estimate uncovered by a potential relief grant and only one known funding source not aligned to a particular issue. The issue we haven't covered is the cost of repairing the turf farm. I believe that this is an essential element as it is a crucial component of the club's income.

There are a couple of approaches that we can take to address the \$43,266.00 and the cost of the turf farm repairs.

[i] Although funding source [a] above has a limit of \$25,000.00, we could include the \$43,266.00 that remains from the total cost estimate. It's not likely that such an application will be successful, but it might be worth a try.

[ii] We could make an application to funding source [a] for repairs to the turf farm. To do this we will need to develop an estimate of the funds required, but given that applications don't close until the 31<sup>st</sup> August, this shouldn't be a problem. From the comments in Andrew Wood's report on the recent meeting with Rural Finance – Victoria, a funding request to make repairs to the turf farm might be viewed favourably. The following comments in Andrew's report are relevant:

*We were advised that our application should include*

- *How the floods impact upon the continued viability of the club*
- *Information upon the number of club employees reliant on income from the club*
- *Spin off effect on local businesses/suppliers who deal with the club*
- *Significance of the turf farm in regard to the future of the club*

*She was impressed with the initiative shown in establishing the turf enterprise and the role of volunteers within the club structure.*

[iii] The unknown factor, as mentioned earlier, is what the VGA will do. If they were to 'come to the party' with funding assistance then it might be better to use them for golf course repair funding and Rural Finance – Victoria for turf farm funding. I believe that we have the time to do this, given the late closing date for funding assistance through Rural Finance – Victoria.

It's essential that we make a decision about how best to use funding sources [b] & [c] given that applications to both close very shortly.