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* Denotes Attachment
1. NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the General Management Committee was held on Thursday 23 September, 2010 in the Boardroom of the Association Offices, 34 Patrick Street, Hobart.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mayor Deirdre Flint
Lord Mayor Rob Valentine
Mayor Don Thwaites
Mayor Lynn Laycock
Mayor Albert van Zetten
Mayor Robert Legge
Mayor Jock Campbell

Vice President
Hobart City Council
West - North West Region
West - North West Region
Northern Region
Northern Region
Southern Region

APOLOGIES:

Mayor Barry Easther
Mayor Mike Downie
Mr Allan Garcia
Dr Katrena Stephenson
Ms Christine Agostinelli

President
West-North West Region
LGAT
LGAT
LGAT

OBSERVER:

Clr James Graham
1.1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES *

Mayor Don Thwaites/Mayor Robert Legge

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2010, as circulated, be confirmed.

Carried

Minutes of the meetings held on 29 July 2010 are at Attachment to Item 1.1.

1.2 BUSINESS ARISING *

That the Committee receive the report on business arising from the meeting held in July 2010.

Noted

Update of Policy items from the last meeting not covered in this Agenda are at Attachment to Item 1.2.

1.3 ACTING PRESIDENT’S REPORT

That the Acting President’s report be received.

Noted

The Acting President, Mayor Deirdre Flint, reported that she had:
- Attended a meeting with Christine Mucha, CEO of the Common Services Corporation
- Contributed to the LGAT Newsletter
- Written to all Mayors in relation to the formation of the Metropolitan Councils Group

1.4 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT *

That the Chief Executive Officer’s report be received.

Noted

The CEO was on leave from 2 August to 13 September 2010.

The Activity of the Association is reflected in the monthly reports provided to all Elected Members for July and August. Copies of the reports are at Attachment to Item 1.4.
2. POLICY

2.1 METROPOLITAN COUNCILS GROUP **

Mayor Lynn Laycock/Mayor Robert Legge

That the Committee note the actions taken in relation to progressing this issue.

Carried

Mayor Jock Campbell/Mayor Don Thwaites

That the Committee approve the motions and related terms of reference to go to the Special General Meeting on October 2010.

Carried

Background

Earlier this year Hobart City Council wrote to the Association seeking the establishment of a Metropolitan Councils Group. Hobart City Council considers that there are a number of matters that could be progressed by such a grouping if the opportunity was provided for regular meeting and dialogue. This was one of a number of issues raised by Hobart City Council for consideration as part of a review of their ongoing membership of the Association.

A paper was provided to the General Meeting held on 23 July 2010 and the following motion was carried:

That the Meeting support the formation of a Metropolitan Councils Group within the framework of the Local Government Association of Tasmania, subject to Terms Of Reference as agreed by the full Association Membership.

Subsequently, in consultation with the General Managers of Hobart City Council, Clarence Council and Kingborough Council, the Policy Director prepared draft Terms Of Reference (TOR) and draft Rule Changes for consideration by councils. A copy of the draft TOR and rule changes are at Attachment to Item 2.1A.

In preparing the draft Terms of Reference there was consideration of mechanisms used elsewhere (UK, South Australia) and issues raised at the General Meeting.

Some key points to note in relation to the Terms of Reference proposed are:

1. To be eligible, councils must be a city or have a population of greater than 30,000 and be a member of LGAT.
2. The Metropolitan Councils Group (MCG) will have the power to identify, implement and evaluate actions in relation to metropolitan issues. Each Member shall have one vote.
3. The MCG will meet quarterly, will develop an annual strategic plan, and will keep and distribute minutes (and agendas) to the broader LGAT membership. The MCG will also report to each General Meeting of the Association.
4. The President of LGAT will be an ex-officio member of the MCG. The Chair will be elected from the General Management Committee by members of the MCG. The Chair will not be the President in order to avoid any conflict of interest between the positions of the Metropolitan Councils Group and the broader LGAT membership.
5. Up to three observers (excluding the President) may, with the permission of the Chair, attend meetings of the MCG.

6. The Metropolitan Councils Group will be supported by the Local Government Association of Tasmania’s Policy and Administration staff. Protocols will be developed in relation to interaction with the Local Government Association of Tasmania and costs, with the understanding that costs beyond general hosting and administration will be borne by the member councils.

7. The Terms of Reference will be reviewed within two years operation of the Metropolitan Councils Group.

The draft Terms of Reference were provided to councils on 10 August 2010 requesting feedback by 10 September 2010.

It was suggested in that email that they would formally be considered at a Special General Meeting to be held in Launceston on 20 October 2010, unless there was widespread support/agreement on this current draft.

Unfortunately around only 1/3 of councils had responded by 9 September and one council (King Island) was strongly opposed. On that basis the Special General Meeting was confirmed as going ahead in correspondence to Mayors and copied to General Managers. From the Acting President, a copy of the correspondence is at Attachment to Item 2.1B for reference.

That correspondence also addressed an issue raised by the Mayor of King Island in relation to the wording of the motion at the July meeting which he had interpreted as meaning a unanimous vote by members rather than the normal voting process as outlined in the Rules of the Association. This interpretation was not supported by Mayor Armstrong and Mayor Burt who were involved in either moving the amendment or moving the amended motion.

However, to clearly address that issue, it is suggested that the following motion is made to the Special General Meeting.

1. That the Meeting agree to the formation of a Metropolitan Councils Group.
2. That the Meeting agree the Terms of Reference for the Metropolitan Councils Group as proposed.

In relation to specific comments on the draft Terms of Reference only the following have been raised to date (by Central Coast):

− The outcomes of the strategic planning meeting, including the annual work program should be made available to all members.
− As an element of good communication, the unconfirmed Minutes should be circulated to the broader Membership (ie not waiting for the minutes to be confirmed three months down the track).

It should also be noted, that while nothing had been received at the time of writing, it is understood that Glamorgan Spring Bay may be intending to put forward a motion relating to the establishment of a Rural Councils Group.

**Budget Implications**
Does not apply at this time.

**Current Policy**
As per the 23 July 2010 General Meeting.
2.2 LGAT ASSIST/GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL

Albert van Zetten/Mayor Robert Legge

That the Committee consider employees of the Glenorchy City Council eligible to access LGAT Assist.

That the Rules of the Association be amended at the next Annual General Meeting in relation to LGAT Assist, to make it clear that all Local Government employees and employees of Local Government owned entities are eligible to access LGAT Assist.

That the Committee has determined that communication and consultation arrangements with Councils are activities associated with Membership of the Association and should be provided on the basis of the present membership model.

Carried

Background

At the Meeting of the LGAT Assist Board on 11 August 2010, the Board unanimously resolved that a motion be put forward at the next GMC meeting that Employees of Glenorchy City Council (GCC) be considered eligible for LGAT Assist Loans even though the council is no longer part of the Association.

The Chief Executive Officer of LGAT was an apology at this meeting.

This motion came shortly after a meeting between the President, LGAT Policy Director, Mayor of Glenorchy and General Manager of Glenorchy at which it was suggested by Glenorchy City Council that

a. Under the Rules of the Association, Glenorchy City Council employees were eligible for LGAT Assist even though the Council was no longer a member of LGAT; and

b. To reopen eligibility would be well perceived as a gesture of good will in relation to future consideration of GCC membership of LGAT.

At the meeting with Glenorchy City Council and in correspondence it was also suggested that the Association had a legislative mandate to include Glenorchy in consultation and correspondence related to State Government Policy and legislation.

Subsequent to both those events the Policy Director sought legal advice on the two issues from Jackson Tremayne and Fay.

In brief, the advice is as follows:

In relation to LGAT Assist –

As Rule 52(a)(ii) refers to Local Government employees it could be interpreted in a court as relating to people who are employed by a council established under Section 18 of the Local Government Act. The rule does not necessarily limit use of funds to employees of member councils. The legal advice proposed that if it is intended by LGAT that any LGAT Assist Program be only for the benefit of employees of members of LGAT, then rule 52 should be appropriately amended.

While not specifically sought, there was a suggestion made in relation to the eligibility of water and sewerage authority employees with a view that there is doubt that said employees are in fact Local Government employees raising questions as to their eligibility. This may need clarification in the rules.
In relation to Section 328 of the Local Government Act (Functions and Powers of the Association)
The advice does not support Glenorchy City Council’s assertion that LGAT has an obligation to inform it of communication received from the State Government and of consultation that LGAT has with the State Government on state wide and broad policy matters.

How the Association might respond.
In considering the long-term future of the Association, the associated desire to re-engage Glenorchy City Council as a member and the legal advice received, the following actions are suggested:

1. Glenorchy City Council employees could be considered eligible for LGAT Assist.
2. Amend the Rules of the Association in relation to LGAT Assist to make it clear that all Local Government employees and employees of Local Government owned entities are eligible for LGAT Assist.
3. As a gesture of good will, include Glenorchy City Council in communication and consultation for a period not exceeding three months leading into their budget considerations for next year.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
The current position of the General Management Committee is that Glenorchy council staff are ineligible for LGAT Assist by virtue of Glenorchy City Council no longer being a member.

There is no formal position of the membership in relation to communication and consultation with Glenorchy City Council but at the 23 July 2010 General Meeting there was an informal indication that it should not be provided while they were not a Member of the Association.

2.3 Premier’s Reform Agenda

That the Committee note the following report.  

Noted

Background
At the PLGC meeting of 29 July 2010 it was agreed that the State Government and Local Government would work together to identify opportunities for reform. The Premier committed to funding the detailed work that would be required as well as in relation to implementation of outcomes.

Advice of this announcement was sent on behalf of the President to Elected Members.

The Local Government Division has prepared a draft paper broadly outlining scope and process for the PLGC Officials/PLGC meetings coming up.

The Association had opportunity to comment on the paper. The key issue raised by LGAT was that with a lack of project detail it was difficult to make a complete judgement and that there would be benefit in a draft Project Plan/ Communication and Consultation Plan being developed in parallel, to go to the PLGC Officials Meeting.
The timeframes have constrained that activity to an extent but the Local Government Division have take the comments on board and will work to address some key process issues. For example, governance, facilitation, budget and communication and consultation prior to PLGC Officials.

**Budget Implications**

Does not apply.

**Current Policy**

Does not apply.

---

2.4 **POPULATION ISSUES**

**Mayor Lynn Laycock/Mayor Don Thwaites**

The Committee noted the report and requested that a copy of the information provided at the recent Property Council session addressing population and ageing issues be forwarded for their reference.

Carried

**Background**

At the 21 June 2010 General Management Committee meeting Mayor Thwaites raised the issue of population growth and the potential impacts on councils by way of service and infrastructure provision. Following the presentation of some demographic information in July, it was agreed the research needed to be expanded to look in some detail at what work that has been done that is relevant to Tasmania. As a consequence a paper has been prepared and is at Attachment to Item 2.4.

The paper shows that Tasmania is undergoing a process of demographic change, having an ageing population that is slowly growing. At a regional or local level this process of change can be summarized as:

1. Population centres which are slowly growing, for example Hobart and Launceston, due to inward migration of youth from within the state and inward migration of middle age and older residents from overseas or interstate;
2. Population growth in non-metropolitan forestry, colonial, fishing/holiday and hydro-electric areas; and
3. A decline in population in the mining settlements of the West Coast.

This change process has a range of implications for Tasmanian councils. Among these are -

- The financial viability of some rural councils, due to a loss of rate revenue brought about by the declining population;
- New ways of delivering some services, which could include resource sharing in smaller municipalities; and
- The location and mix of current housing stock, given there will be increasingly smaller family units with different housing needs.
The paper expands on these issues and includes some strategies for managing the changes outlined. It should also be noted that Senior Policy Officer Ivan Zwart will continue to gather information about Tasmania’s changing demographics by attending a presentation by leading demographer Bernard Salt, in late September.

**Budget Implications**
Does not apply.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.

### 2.5 CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor Robert Legge/Mayor Albert van Zetten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Committee agree the issue of specific funding provisions for a public relations campaign be taken to a General Meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carried**

**Background**
The Policy Director participated in an ALGA workshop (for senior officers) on Constitutional Recognition at the end of August.

It is clear that there are three phases of work to be undertaken:

1. Associations and Councils need to work to build support for and satisfaction with Local Government and build acceptance of the need for Constitutional reform.
2. ALGA needs to work to gain agreement for a Referendum.
3. ALGA need to develop the ‘yes’ campaign with support from each jurisdiction.

Following that workshop and announcements made during the Federal Election campaign and subsequent to the election the ALGA wrote to the President highlighting the following:

- The ALGA Board agreed in March 2010 to pursue financial recognition in the Constitution for Local Government. This would involve a change to Section 96 of the Constitution by adding the words (in italics):
  
  The parliament may grant financial assistance to any State or Local Government Body on such terms and conditions as Parliament thinks fit.

- The ALGA Board also agreed that it would support the inclusion of Local Government in a revised preamble if the opportunity were to arise.
- $250,000 has been provided to ALGA to develop the case for Constitutional Recognition further.
- A detailed work program is to be presented to the Board at the October 2010 meeting.
- ALGA is encouraging Associations to consider making a specific provision for funding a public relations campaign in 2011-12.

At the ALGA workshop it became apparent the jurisdictions were at varying levels of readiness in relation to a public relations campaign and in relation to improving the satisfaction with Local Government generally.
Work done by ALGA and our own community satisfaction surveys show that there is a relatively high level of satisfaction with Local Government in Tasmania. However, this needs to be lifted to even higher levels and it also needs to be translated into a desire to see Local Government recognised in the Constitution.

Further, it was not clear that councils universally understood the decision by the Board to focus only on financial recognition. That is, it will not prevent councils from being dismissed or amalgamated.

The Australia Local Government Association's (ALGA) President, Cr Geoff Lake states –

“the inclusion of Local Government in the Constitution is all about stable government. It is about removing the current uncertainty stemming from last year’s High Court decision in Pape which has cast serious doubt on the power of the Commonwealth to continue to provide funds directly to Local Government”.

Constitutional Recognition does not change Local Government’s accountability or status but it can secure its ability to cater to the needs of local communities in line with the intent, in 1840, when councils were first established.

There has been opportunity to leverage off the uncertain outcome of the Federal Election. For example, the Agreement between Federal Labor and the Greens included a commitment to a referendum being held in this parliamentary term to include Local Government in the Australian Constitution. Engaging with Andrew Wilkie will be important in the Tasmanian context. There is also much work to be done in convincing State Parliamentarians to support a ‘yes’ campaign.

**Budget Implications**
May require additional budget request of councils

**Current Policy**
 Constitutional Recognition for Local Government is supported by the Membership.

---

### 2.6 PLANNING DIRECTIVE NUMBER ONE

**That the Committee note the report.**

Noted

**Background**
Through the Association, member councils were provided opportunity to comment on the proposed Common Key Elements Planning Scheme Template which is a fundamental tool in the implementation of the regional planning initiatives.

The Association consulted with members and also participated in a workshop in the South prior to developing a whole of sector response.

It is worth noting that this was an extremely difficult submission to formulate because of fundamental differences in opinion across the regions but particularly between the North/North West and the South.

A number of councils in the North and North West felt that because issues raised in previous consultation rounds had been disregarded that they would rather make substantive comment during the public hearing phase.
The level of detail was significant and councils were also encouraged to make individual submissions.

The key points of the LGAT submission as outlined in the summary are as follows:
- There is support for the need to undertake sensible reform of the Common Key Elements Template (CKET).
- It is considered that the template offers the best way forward to achieve consistent and contemporary planning instruments and to underpin the regional planning initiatives.
- However some components of change are substantial and perhaps outside the terms of reference for the review.
- In general Councils do not consider the CKET 2010 ready for the Planning Directive process and would like more discussion.
- It has been extremely difficult to evaluate the workability of CKET 2010 and understand points of difference without some detailed examples and in the absence of the codes (aka schedules) and a detailed guide.
- Regardless, it is strongly perceived that the CKET 2010 will not deliver the reform objectives desired.
- More robust and inclusive consultation between Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC), CCRPI and all councils is required. Directions and detail to date have been poorly communicated outside officer level (and sometimes even at officer level).
- There is a need to further engage with elected members on the outcomes the CKET 2010 will produce.
- There are some key areas of difference across regions which need to be analysed and worked through with all parties.
- The Association requests the TPC to compare and contrast the alternative draft templates through testing and develop a final position which is the TPC’s preferred approach.
- In doing so we understand this needs to be done in a timely fashion. We note with some concern that councils in the North West are being encouraged to undertake work modifying planning schemes in accordance with the Cradle Coast Regional Template and regardless of time imperatives, strongly discourage this approach regardless of the lack of an agreed template.
- There are particular concerns with regard to proposed changes to permitted/discretionary development provisions together with shift in the planning requirements from the Performance Criteria/Acceptable Solutions approach.

The submission is available on the LGAT website and has been circulated to all councils.

Of note, that regardless of the Associations key message that councils did not consider the CKET 2010 ready for the Planning Directive process, the Planning Commission have advised there will be no further consultation with councils outside the formal public process (which has commenced). The Association has been advised that a number of changes have been made based on the feedback by the Association and councils.

**Budget Implications**
Does not apply.

**Current Policy**
All councils are participating in the Regional Planning Initiative.
2.7 RATING AND VALUATIONS

That the Committee note the following report.

Background
Further to the report made at the 23 July 2010 General Meeting, the Local Government Valuation and Rating Review has progressed as follows -

A discussion paper was prepared by Access Economics. This was provided to participants attending two workshops (North and South) as well as posted on the Local Government Division Website. The workshops were attended by 24 councils and were targeted primarily at those with a technical understanding of rating and valuation.

Access Economics advised that the workshops were extremely useful. They have used the inputs gained through the workshops as well as modelling using data from four councils (Latrobe, Northern Midlands, Hobart and Kingborough) to inform their report to the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee has reviewed the Interim Draft Report and it is anticipated that the Final Draft will be received around the time of the GMC meeting.

The reports have been of a very high quality, particularly impressive given the tight timeframes.

It is proposed that the Final Report will be a publically available document circulated in tandem with a Communications and Consultation Strategy (which is under development).

Likely recommendations include:

- A move away from AAV to using Land Value or Capital Value and a more frequent valuation cycle.
- Removal of 4% minimum rule.
- Greater use of fixed charges (up to 50%).
- Better use of differentials.
- Introduction of change caps.
- Amendment to the legislation to improve clarity.
- Transition management including using rating tools to minimise impacts, strong support to councils and broader stakeholder education.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
The Association is represented on the Steering Committee.
2.8 **SMOKING LEGISLATION/REVIEW**

That the Committee note the following report.

Noted

**Background**
At the 12 May 2010 General Meeting a motion was tabled requesting the State Government to introduce no smoking legislation for alfresco dining areas, including consideration of entire designated public areas. The motion was lost, primarily on technical/drafting grounds. Nevertheless, results of an independent business and community survey showed there was majority support for the introduction of smoke free public places.

Since then, the Department of Health and Human Services has released a discussion paper for comment outlining a variety of potential changes to tobacco laws. There are twelve proposals. The first seven aim to protect people from tobacco smoke, and include banning smoking:
- In all outdoor areas
- In all pedestrian malls, bus malls and covered bus shelters
- Within enclosed children’s playgrounds and outdoor sporting stadiums

The remaining proposals place further restrictions on the availability and display of tobacco products. They include banning tobacco product vending machines and confiscating tobacco products possessed by children.

The discussion paper has been forwarded to Councils for their consideration, with feedback required to the DHHS by 1 October 2010.

A further report, reflecting councils comments/concerns will be made to the November General Meeting.

**Budget Implications**
Does not apply.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.

2.9 **BANNING OF PLASTIC BAGS**

That the Committee note the report and endorse the progression of this issue to the November General Meeting.

Noted

**Background**
The Association has no formal position in relation to the banning of plastic bags. There has been increasing interest in this issue of late and the Association was in the process of canvassing councils on the matter prior to the recent media attention.

The Association has noted that there is general agreement that the number of plastic bags in circulation must be reduced. Traditionally the focus has been on reducing plastic bag litter and this has had some success (see data below), but it may be time to consider the supply of plastic bags at the point of sale, particularly plastic bags used as a one-off carry bag.
HDPE bag consumption in Australia 2002–2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (billions of bags)</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not clear how the reduction at point of sale might be achieved. An Australian Government report in April 2008 stated that “regulatory options for a phase-out had economic costs which significantly outweighed the environmental benefits” the Environmental Protection and Heritage Council (Oct 2008) resolved to not endorse uniform regulatory action at this time to ban or place a charge on plastic bags, ie business as usual.

There are varied approaches being taken by Governments. For example, the Association notes that in South Australia there is a state-wide ban on plastic bags and in Ireland the Government has introduced a bag levy.

The Association would like to formally progress the issue with Members in the following manner:

− Consultations at officer level with councils and State Government.
− Environmental Scan – what is being done elsewhere? What issues have arisen?
− Development of a discussion paper for the November General Meeting.
− Presentation by John Dee (Clean Up Australia) at the November General Meeting.

It should be noted that there are number of other waste matters that we would like to take to the November General Meeting as well including the re-emerging issue of a State Waste Levy.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
There is currently no formal policy on plastic bags.

| 2.10 AUSTRALIAN PACKAGING COVENANT |

Mayor Jock Campbell/Mayor Albert van Zetten

That the Committee endorse LGAT as a Covenant signatory.

Noted

Background
The Australian Packaging Covenant is a commitment by industry and governments to the sustainable design, use and recovery of packaging. The first National Packaging Covenant (NPC) was introduced in 1999 and amended in 2005. The new Packaging Covenant—renamed the Australian Packaging Covenant—commenced on 1 July 2010.

The objective of the Packaging Covenant is to minimise the overall environmental impacts of packaging by pursuing the following performance goals:

1. **Design**: packaging optimised to achieve resource efficiency and reduced environmental impact without compromising product quality and safety.
2. **Recycling**: the efficient collection and recycling of packaging.
3. **Product Stewardship**: a demonstrated commitment to product stewardship by organisations in the supply chain and other signatories.
Packaging Covenant Signatory Obligations:

- Submit an action plan that sets out what the organisation will do to support the Packaging Covenant’s objective and goals.
- Submit an annual report each year that outlines performance against the action plan commitments.
- Publish the organisation’s action plan and annual reports on your web site in a prominent and readily identifiable way.
- Implement design and procurement processes that drive sustainable design of packaging, consistent with the Sustainable Packaging Guidelines (SPG).
- Implement policies or procedures to buy products made from recycled materials.
- Establish collection and recycling programs for used packaging materials generated on-site.
- Take action, where appropriate, to reduce litter.
- Assist the Packaging Covenant Council to respond to complaints from the public about the design and use of packaging materials.

On 17 August 2010 the LGAT declared an intention to become a signatory, and are required to prepare a 5 year action plan. As a consequence of LGAT being a signatory, regional waste management groups are able to secure grants for projects such as litter reduction (SWSA $20000), kerbside recycling and education (CCA $120,000).

**Budget Implications**

Does not apply.

**Current Policy**

The Association has been a signatory for the past 5 years.

---

### 2.11 GENERAL POLICY DISCUSSION

That Committee members note the intent of this session and contemplate any matters they consider worth raising.

Noted

**Background**

This is a standing agenda item intended to allow members the opportunity to raise any matters of strategic policy not addressed elsewhere in the agenda.
3. PROJECTS & SERVICES

3.1 SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS AND OBJECTIVES PROJECT

That the Committee note the following report.

Background
Further to the last report on this project (capturing the review of Key Performance Indicators) the consultation paper has been released and can be found at www.dpac.tas.gov.au/lgd. Input is being sought on the key strategic priorities to be measured, the desired outcomes under each priority and indicators and targets that can measure the key strategic priorities and outcomes.

Written submissions are being accepted until 1 October 2010 and regional workshops are being held 23 September, 30 September and 1 October in the South, North West and North respectively.

Members of the Steering Committee will be supporting the forums. The LGAT Policy Director will be acting as co-host in the North.

The Association has had some concerns about the nature and timing of workforce development data and so the Careers Development Officer has been working with the Local Government Division to ensure the best outcomes for all parties.

Data collection will change in a phased manner with some revisions this year and some additions for 2011. The new consolidated data set will be distributed to councils in October.

Expert working groups will be formed to develop initial indicators and targets. LGAT will participate in a number of these.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

3.2 STANDARDS PANEL ISSUES

That the Committee note the following report.

Regulation Review
The Local Government Division of the Department of Premier and Cabinet has agreed to a review of the Code of Conduct provisions (and related provisions) in the Local Government (General) Regulations 2005.

In June 2010 LGAT circulated an issues paper to councils to seek feedback on the existing regulations with suggested changes for consideration. LGAT has received good representations from councils on the paper.
LGAT is currently collating the feedback from councils with a view to providing advice to the Local Government Division on necessary changes to the regulations in the next month. It is likely that the suggested way forward will include a two phased approach to the review. The first requesting urgent changes to the regulations where there is full support from councils for the changes and where the current regulations are proving to be inadequate. The second phase will include a more detailed review of some suggestions, such as the need for a regional pool of councillors available to sit on Code of Conduct Panels.

New cases
The Standards Panel has recently been inundated with new cases. Some of this influx may be due to the large volume of media attention that some cases have received in regional papers. This media attention has been concerning as it has occurred prior to the hearings and has included inaccuracies. The additional cases are also having implications on LGAT resourcing. These issues will also be considered in the review.

Budget Implications
There are no budget implications at this stage.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

3.3 EDA UPDATE

That the Committee note the following report.

Noted

Background
The Electronic Development Assessment (eDA) Project was due to conclude in June this year. However, a number of issues impacted on full completion of the project including:

- Delays in the development of, and access to, the national test harness;
- Technical issues related to data security at Hobart City Council which has required new solutions to be developed including external hosting and data migration and delayed the capacity of that council to go live
- Issues with the new version of the Infomaster software which has required some rethinking by the vendors
- No real data for the evaluation and cost benefit analysis limiting the ability to draw any substantial conclusions.

The full $500,000 was also not fully expended or committed. The Commonwealth have agreed a variation to the project allowing funds to be carried forward to the end of 2010 to allow the following:

1. Development of a business case for expansion of eDA beyond the two pilot councils.
2. Further independent evaluation once the projects are further progressed.
3. Implementation of communication strategies.
4. Support for improved data collection.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.
3.4 MOVE WELL EAT WELL PROJECT

That the Committee note the following report.

Noted

Background
For a second year the LGAT received funding and support from the Department of Health and Human services to run a grants program for Move Well Eat Well Projects. $3000 was available to allocate in each region to promote active play, recreational cycling or walking for primary age children and their families within their communities.

The funding round closed on 20 August with applications assessed shortly thereafter. The successful applicants were:

- Burnie City Council: Kommunity Kids Cycleway – further development and promotion.
- Launceston City Council: Invermay Bicycle Lending program and signage development to promote the track to children and families.

All successful applicants are required to provide a brief report on the outcomes of the projects and these are promoted in the LGAT News Magazine.

It is envisioned there will be another round of funding next year. Consideration is being given to moving away from a specific regional allocation to just the three best applications state-wide.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

3.5 CLIMATE CHANGE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

That the Committee note the following report.

Noted

Partnership Agreement
Discussions are well underway with the State Government in regards to a new schedule on adaptation in the Partnership Agreement with Local Government on Climate Change. The revised draft partnership agreement will be presented to LGAT’s General Meeting on 17 November 2010 for approval. The final partnership agreement will be considered by the PLGC Official's meeting on 25 November and signed at the PLGC meeting on 16 December 2010.
An evaluation of the existing partnership agreement has been drafted. The majority of deliverables under the existing partnership agreement have been achieved and LGAT has delivered on the agreed outcomes against the 2009-10 MOU with the State Government. These include:

- delivery of greenhouse mitigation action plans to all 28 councils participating in the planet footprint program;
- delivery of state-wide greenhouse gas data for all Tasmanian councils;
- delivery of regional forums to councils participating in the Planet Footprint Program;
- delivery of climate change adaptation forums to council officers and elected members; and
- delivery of quarterly climate change e-newsletters to council officers and elected members.

Council Climate Change Case Studies
LGAT has contracted Impress Clear Communications to draft ten local council climate change case studies. The purpose of the case studies is to share knowledge and learning's on climate change projects and to motivate action on climate change. It is intended that the first ten case studies will have a standard format that can be replicated easily and self populated by councils in the future.

Impress has made contact with those council officers who have agreed to contribute a case study on behalf of their councils. The case studies should be completed by the end of October and will be available to councils for promotional purposes as well as being available on the LGAT website.

Street Lighting
LGAT is working with the State Government to examine the cost saving opportunities and greenhouse gas abatement opportunities associated with converting mercury vapour street lighting globes to more energy efficient globes. LGAT met with the Office of Climate Change, DIER, Aurora Energy and Clarence City Council to examine a proposal to fund the development of a whole of Local Government business case for energy efficient street lighting. This proposal was submitted by Clarence City Council.

The Department of Infrastructure showed interest in the proposal being broadened to include all street lighting in Tasmania rather than being Local Government specific. The working group is now looking to broaden the request for quotation to include a number of potential providers.

LGAT is also working with ALGA and other state associations to further progress opportunities to lobby the Federal Government to fund, or partially fund, the capital upgrade of street lighting to more energy efficient globes.

Planet Footprint
The LGAT contract with Planet Footprint finished at the end of June. Planet Footprint has now provided LGAT and Councils with final greenhouse gas reports and energy reports for the 2009/10 year.

After reviewing the data, LGAT had discussions with Planet Footprint regarding the effect of the removal of sewerage and water assets from council’s greenhouse gas emissions. Planet Footprint has identified that Aurora Energy may have been charging councils for the energy costs associated with water and sewerage assets post the June 2009 hand over. If this issue was identified by Planet Footprint they have provided this information to councils in their anomaly reports and councils are encouraged to follow this up with Aurora Energy. Councils such as Huon Valley and Glenorchy have now been reimbursed for these costs.

Budget Impact
Does not apply.
3.6 **FLU CLINIC REVIEW**

That the Committee note the following report.

**Background:**
During the first half of 2010 the Department of Health and Human Services’ (DHHS) undertook a review of the Tasmanian Flu Clinic Model in order to improve future DHHS operational and strategic pandemic preparedness concerning the Community Response Strategy.

Four workshops were held with stakeholders to inform the review. LGAT participated in the four workshops and provided feedback on the major issues faced by councils during the 2009 pandemic. A draft report "Ways Forward- Planning and Implementing Responsive Clinical Services to Address Pandemic Influenza in Tasmania" has been circulated to the stakeholders involved in the workshop and LGAT has sought input from all member councils prior to formulating a sectoral response.

Overall the draft document identified that flu services in Tasmania should include:
- A more localised model, responding to local needs through the devolution of planning to DHHS Area Health Services.
- A shift in the role of Local Government and the local State Emergency Services from being a provider of non-clinical services, to a locally negotiated role in logistical support for flu services.
- Enhanced engagement of primary health care organisations (GP’s) in providing a central role in flu service response.
- Broad oversight and policy setting by DHHS.
- Appropriate communications and information to ensure connectedness between flu services and stakeholders.

The LGAT response to the draft paper provided in principle support for the suggested reorientation of Tasmanian Flu Services identified in the draft. However, there were some matters for clarification and consistency issues around Local Government which needed to be rectified prior to public release of the document.

DHHS will provide a response to stakeholder comments on the draft once they have received comments from all stakeholders.

**Budget Implications**
Does not apply

**Current Policy**
LGAT will provide members with an update when this response is received.

3.7 **LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES** *

**Mayor Albert van Zetten/Mayor Robert Legge**

That the Representative for the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee be Clr David Moser, Tasman Council.

Carried
4. FINANCES

4.1 PROFIT AND LOSS REPORT *

That the Profit and Loss report to 14 September, 2010 be received.

Background
At Attachment to Item 4.1, is a print out of the Profit and Loss Report to 14 September 2010.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

4.2 CASH FLOW STATEMENTS *

That the Committee receive the report for the month of July 2010.

Background
It is considered appropriate that the Committee should have access to information relating to the cash position of the Association detailing cash on hand, reserves, amounts held for projects and expenditures and revenues pending.

Detailed cash flow statements are prepared for the information of the Committee and are at Attachment to Item 4.2

Budget Impact
As above.

Current Policy
The Association has a responsibility to manage the assets of the organisation in a responsible and transparent manner.
4.3 AUDIT FOR THE 2009/2010 FINANCIAL YEAR

That the Committee confirm the endorsement of the 2009/2010 Financial Statements by the Acting President, Mayor Deirdre Flint.

Noted

Background
The Financial Statements for the 2009/2010 financial year have been signed by the Acting President and forwarded to the Tasmanian Audit Office as per the requirements of the Local Government Act.

Final audit testing is to be carried out mid September with the Audit to be completed by mid October.

A copy of the signed, unaudited Financial Statements are at Attachment to Item 4.3.
5. ADMINISTRATION

Administration Items for Discussion & Decision.

5.1 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Decision Sought

The next GMC meeting is scheduled for 16 December 2010 in conjunction with the PLGC meeting, date to be confirmed.

That an additional meeting may be required pending outcomes of the Special General Meeting on 20 October 2010.

A list of meeting dates for 2010 is detailed below-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 September</td>
<td>PLGC Meeting</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 October</td>
<td>PLGC Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 October</td>
<td>Special General Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 November</td>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayors Workshop</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 December</td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLGC Meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Posthumous

5.2 OTHER BUSINESS & CLOSE

There being no further business, the Acting President declared the meeting closed at 1.10pm.