General Management Committee

Minutes

Thursday 7 December 2006
A meeting of the General Management Committee was held in the Board Room at the Association's Offices, 34 Patrick Street, Hobart, on Thursday 7 December 2006 commencing at 12.13pm.

PRESENT:
Mayor Mike Gaffney President
Lord Mayor Rob Valentine Hobart City Council
Mayor Kevin Hyland West - North West Region
Mayor Mike Downie West - North West Region
Mayor Barry Easther Northern Region
Clr Robert Legge Northern Region
Mayor Deirdre Flint Southern Region
Mayor Jock Campbell Southern Region

IN ATTENDANCE:
Mr Allan Garcia LGAT
Ms Christine Agostinelli LGAT
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* Denotes Attachment
1.1 SUBJECT: CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES *

Mayor Mike Downie/Mayor Deirdre Flint

That the Minutes of the meeting held 11 October 2006, as circulated, be confirmed.

Carried

1.2 SUBJECT: BUSINESS ARISING *

Mayor Robert Legge/Mayor Barry Easther

That the Committee receive the report on business arising from the previous meeting.

Carried

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

1.3 SUBJECT: PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Mayor Deirdre Flint/Mayor Barry Easther

That the President’s report be received.

Carried

The President’s activities since the GMC meeting in October were as follows -

- Newsletter and Magazine articles
- Waratah/Wynyard Council Annual General Meeting
- Media Interviews – ABC Radio, Examiner, Hart FM, 7AO/LA Radio, Elaine Harris, Advocate
- CWA Book Launch – Richmond
- Arts at Work Meeting
- Meeting with Minister Aird
- General Meeting
- Mayor’s Dinner & Workshop
- Rural GP Workforce Forum
- National General Assembly of Local Government
- Central Coast Council presentation
1.4 **SUBJECT:** CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT OCTOBER - DECEMBER 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Committee note the Chief Executive Officer’s report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CEO provided a verbal report on Local Government Sustainability, the 2007 LGAT Annual Conference and the proposed Tasmanian Road Summit.

Mayor Mike Downie left the room at 12.25pm during this Item and returned at 12.34pm.
2. POLICY

Policy Items for Discussion & Decision.

2.1 SUBJECT: WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mayor Robert Legge/Mayor Mike Downie

That the Committee note the following report and endorse the proposed arrangements for dealing with waste management policy issues of relevance to State and Local Government.

Carried

It was highlighted that regional waste management strategies and processes need to be in place to ensure a State Government based process/levy is not enforced.

Background
A High Level Oversight Group on Waste was formed in early 2005, under the broad umbrella of the Premier’s Local Government Council (PLGC), to examine and advance waste management issues of common interest to Local and State Government. Chaired by the Director of Environmental Management, it comprised the CEO of LGAT and a senior representative from each of the three regions. The HLOG has met six times.

At its last meeting, held on 30 October 2006, the role of the HLOG was reviewed. While it was acknowledged that it provided a useful forum through which significant progress had been made on a number of important waste management issues, there was some concern expressed by Local Government representatives about the governance structure of the group. Specifically, Local Government representatives considered that they did not feel they had the authority to make decisions through the HLOG that were potentially binding for other Councils within their region and that a more appropriate structure needed to be devised.

In light of these concerns it was agreed that HLOG would be disbanded, although it was acknowledged that there was value in continuing with some sort of forum that would allow regular high-level liaison on common waste management issues between State and Local Government.

To this end, it is proposed that LGAT will convene a Waste Management Reference Group, comprising similar Local Government representation to that on HLOG: Specifically, the CEO and Policy Officer of LGAT and senior representatives from each of the three regions. It is envisaged that the Reference Group would meet three to four times a year to discuss high-level waste management policy issues, such as regional waste strategies, household hazardous waste collection, waste data collection and other matters that might arise from time to time. It is likely that the Director of Environmental Management would be invited to attend some meetings to discuss matters that the Group considers appropriate. This structure will allow important waste management policy issues to be considered by the Reference Group and any proposals requiring Local Government agreement to be taken to a General Meeting of the Association for deliberation.

It was also agreed that the Association would report back to the Director of Environmental Management by March 2007 on how regional waste strategies will be delivered given there is an expectation that the framework for these will be in place by 1 July 2007.
In relation to the development of a state waste management strategy, it was agreed that a strategic planning process to formulate this was desirable and that it should be developed in consultation with Local Government. To further this objective the Department of Tourism, Arts and Environment will provide funding to engage a consultant to facilitate the planning and consultative process and to develop a draft strategy by mid 2007. Local Government will be represented on the selection panel for the consultant.

While there have been some difficulties associated with the governance structure of HLOG it should be acknowledged that significant progress has been made on a number of critical waste management policy issues of relevance to both State and Local Government. It is anticipated that these can be further progressed through the new structure.

**Budget Implications**

Does not apply.

**Current Policy**

There are a number of priority waste issues, including implementing regional approaches to waste management, that remain outstanding from the November 2003 report to the Premier’s Local Government Council.

---

### 2.2 SUBJECT: STATE POLICY ON THE PROTECTION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND (PAL) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor Barry Easther/Mayor Robert Legge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Committee note the response to the Review of the above policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

A number of councils provided direct inputs to the above review, several of which reflected specific issues that had impacted on their municipality as a result of the application of the policy via their planning schemes. The Association did not attempt to cover these matters in its submission to the review but focussed on some key matters that had been raised by councils during the review process.

While the PAL policy is a relatively simple document, it is this very simplicity that has created difficulties in interpretation and application. There is also a general lack of awareness among the community as to its existence and the impact it has in terms of issues such as dwelling construction and modification.

The recent decision pertaining to tree farming on King Island also raises the issue of the need for clarity as to the status of this activity in relation to the PAL policy. While one council has indicated its preference for this activity not to be allowed in categories 1-4, others have sought clarification in a more general sense.

Another significant matter arising is the capacity to allow activities on land covered by the PAL policy that while not strictly agricultural would not detrimentally impact or ‘fetter’ agricultural activity. Councils categorically support the retention of prime agricultural land and the endeavours to protect it but are concerned that instances arise where it is not feasible, practical or possible to utilise or adhere certain properties for agricultural use but they remain 'locked' without capacity for development.

The Association’s response covers all these matters as well as the need for a revised policy to have improved guidance for councils in terms of its interpretation and application. A copy of the response is at [Attachment to Item 2.2](#).
Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

2.3 SUBJECT: LEGISLATION COMMITTEE REPORT *

Mayor Deirdre Flint/Mayor Robert Legge

That the Committee note the following report.

Carried

Background
The Legislation Committee has the following members:
  Mayor Michael Gaffney, Chair
  Lord Mayor Robert Valentine
  Mayor Jock Campbell
  Mayor Robert Legge
  Mr Nick Heath, Hobart City Council
  Mr David Jones, Devonport City Council
  Mr Matthew Grimsey, Huon Valley Council

The Legislation Committee continues to meet on a regular basis. As well as meetings, a number of matters are dealt with outside session by email.

The officer members also provide invaluable assistance to LGAT staff on a wide range of day-to-day issues that arise in relation to legislative issues.

There have been three meetings in 2006. Unfortunately, the meeting to be held on 9 November was cancelled due to the unavailability of a number of members and the difficulty of establishing another date at this time of year.

Instead, a Report has been prepared to update members on the current status of a number of items of legislation.

A copy of that report is at Attachment to Item 2.3 for the information of GMC members.

LGAT Comment
Appreciation is extended to members for their commitment to the Committee.

Budget Implications
Administrative support to the Legislation Committee is included within the Policy Development function of the Association.

Current Policy
The Legislation Committee is recognised in the Communication and Consultation partnership Agreement.
2.4 SUBJECT: LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUSTAINABILITY

Mayor Barry Easther/Mayor Robert Legge

That the following report be noted.

Carried

The Committee discussed the implementation of a communication strategy to raise public awareness of the sustainability report, the findings and the options for moving forward.

Background
A brief has been prepared and forwarded to Access Economics. In discussions with Access it was agreed that it would be preferable to utilise 2005/06 financial data and councils have indicated that they have this information in an electronic format. The reports are presently being coordinated and will be forwarded to the consultants once all have been received. The Asset Renewal Funding Gap has also been provided to Access on an individual council basis and there is likely to be a need to survey councils for some additional information in relation to rating structures. It is not anticipated that this will be an onerous task for councils.

It is expected that Access will be in a position to provide a final report early in the new year although negotiations are continuing in relation to timing and the cost of the work.

It is expected that a verbal report will be able to be provided to GMC on the day of the meeting as to progress on these matters.

Budget Implications
The cost of the study has not been factored into the budget and will be met from Association reserves.

Current Policy
The proposal to conduct the study has been endorsed by GMC and a General Meeting of the Association.

2.5 SUBJECT: CLIMATE CHANGE UPDATE DECEMBER 2006

Lord Mayor Rob Valentine/Mayor Robert Legge

That the Committee note the following report.

Carried

Background
The issue of climate change and sea level rise is well documented and has been the subject of much research in recent years. The results of this research have contributed to growing acknowledgement and understanding of the issue but there remains a lack of information relating to on-ground solutions that can be readily implemented by land use planners and managers such as Councils.

In response to the need for greater direction and assistance on climate change issues at the Local Government level, the Local Government Association of Tasmania is establishing a Climate Change Reference Group.
Each Council has been asked to nominate a staff representative to a Climate Change Reference Group. The reference group will aim to include representatives from various Councils and with respect to a range of Council functions (e.g., planning, asset management and engineering).

The primary focus of the reference group will be to:

- Identify the needs of Councils for an improved capacity to address potential climate change and sea level rise impacts at the local scale;
- Identify and share current activities undertaken by Council in relation to planning for climate change and sea level rise impacts;
- Identify existing research, projects and activities relating to climate change that are of interest to Councils, and providing input for future direction;
- Provide a Council perspective to climate change initiatives, particularly those undertaken at other levels of government;
- Inform a Local Government policy position on climate change and sea level rise.

The reference group will meet on an as-needs basis, and will also provide a network for the sharing of ideas and information in relation to climate change activities.

The initial meeting of the Reference Group is to be held in Campbell Town on Tuesday 5 December 2006.

**Budget Implications**

Does not apply.

**Current Policy**

Does not apply.
3. PROJECTS & SERVICES

Projects & Services Items for Comment and Decision.

3.1 SUBJECT: LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT – CODES OF CONDUCT

This Item was dealt with in a closed session and the Minute will be provided to Committee members only.

3.2 SUBJECT: REVIEW OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD

Mayor Mike Downie/Mayor Robert Legge

That the Committee note the following report.

Carried

Background

In February 2006, the Minister Assisting the Premier on Local Government released the Terms of Reference for a review of the operations and functions of the Local Government Board.

A Steering Committee to oversee the review was established with Liz Gillam and Andrew Paul as the LGAT members. The first meeting of the Steering Committee was held on 11 May 2006.

In early June, the Chair of the Steering Committee wrote to all Councils and a number of other stakeholders inviting them to identify key issues which they felt should be raised in a proposed issues paper. Submissions closed on 30 June.

In the meantime, the former President established a Working Group to develop an LGAT position in relation to the future of the Local Government Board. This group circulated a discussion paper on the review process and sought comments from Councils.

The LGAT paper questioned the desirability of an ongoing role for the Local Government Board in undertaking general reviews of councils and proposed some potential alternatives for consideration. It formed the basis of LGAT’s submission to the development of the Issues Paper.

After considerable delay, the Issues Paper was released in mid-November for broad public consultation, with submissions to be received by 9 February.

The original LGAT Working Group is to meet on 18 December 2006 to consider a draft LGAT submission to the Issues Paper. This response will be circulated to Councils for comment. Depending on the responses, it may be necessary to recirculate the submission for endorsement by Councils.

It is hoped that a strong, consolidated position can go forward from Local Government. However, the timing of the release of the Issues paper and closing date for submissions makes this somewhat problematic.
Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
The role, functions and membership of the Local Government Board was raised as an issue by Local Government during the review of the Local Government Act. The State Government proposal that the Board be reviewed after completion of a full round of General Reviews of Councils was agreed to.

3.3 SUBJECT: NATIONAL APPROACHES TO SKILLS SHORTAGES AND TRAINING

Mayor Mike Downie/Lord Mayor Rob Valentine

That the Committee note the following report.

Carried

Background
At the national level, the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) and Local Government Managers Australia (LGMA) are working with other industry bodies and the State Associations to identify and implement sector-wide approaches to address skills shortages and training matters.

1. National Skills Shortage Strategy
Work is currently underway, under the auspices of LGMA, to develop a National Skills Shortage Strategy. Entitled ‘Working Together – Working Smarter’ the Strategy’s mission is to promote collaborations within Local Government between councillors, council officers and communities as well as between Local Government and professional peak bodies. The Strategy aims to help Local Government respond to the challenge of delivering efficient and effective services when faced with current and looming skills shortages. It is intended that the Strategy be a platform from which councils can develop and build their own responses to skills shortage. LGMA is currently seeking contributions from the sector exemplifying smarter ways of working.

2. National Training Agenda
The Association recently hosted a 2-day forum in Hobart involving representatives from the training units of all the State Local Government Associations, ALGA and Government Skills Australia (GSA), one of the Federal Government’s new national Industry Skills Councils. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss developments related to training and skills of national significance and to share information on activities currently occurring across the country.

GSA is one of the ten National Industry Skills Councils supported by the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) to replace National Industry Advisory Boards. The Australian Local Government Training Board was one of these bodies that is no longer recognised. Formed in July 2005, GSA is the industry council for government and community safety, which includes five industry areas, each of which were previously covered by their own individual Industry Advisory Boards. These are Local Government, Public Sector, Public Safety, Correctional Services and Water, each of which is now represented through an Industry Advisory Committee (IAC).

At the Hobart meeting it was agreed that better coordination between GSA’s Local Government IAC and the State Associations would be beneficial in ensuring national developments and initiatives in the areas of training and skills are relevant to the Local Government sector as a whole. To this end it is planned to hold a further meeting in January 2007 to consider a range of matters, including improvements to the Local Government Training Package.

Budget Implications
LGAT’s participation in these activities is funded through the Association’s budget.
3.4 SUBJECT: NRM UPDATE

Mayor Mike Downie/Mayor Robert Legge

That the committee note the following

Carried

Policy Statements
The NRM Policy Statements, endorsed at the last LGAT General Meeting, were subsequently put forward as a motion to the ALGA National General Assembly at the end of November.

Each of the State and Territory Local Government Associations had endorsed the Policy Statements, which were then proposed as a motion at the ALGA National General Assembly by LGAQ.

These Policy Statements will now provide a national policy context for Local Government involvement in NRM.

Future of NRM
The Australian Government has announced that it will continue to support the regional NRM framework in Australia beyond June 2008 when the current funding arrangements expire.

The Government will support new programmes, based on good science, that build on the success of the $3 billion National Heritage Trust and $1.4 billion National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality.

Although funding for the regional delivery model has been extended, the nature and form of future NRM programmes is still being assessed. The Australian Government is consulting with the State/Territories, the Regional NRM Bodies and other NRM stakeholders to inform the future of regional NRM delivery. A number of reviews of the NRM framework, undertaken during the past 18 months, will also feed into this process.

The Keogh Ministerial Review, undertaken to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current regional NRM framework, was released in October. The review overwhelmingly supports regional NRM in Australia, whilst identifying priority areas for improvement in future programmes. Among the recommendations made in the Report was for better engagement with Local Government in the regional NRM process.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.
3.5 Subject: RURAL GP WORKFORCE FORUMS

Mayor Mike Downie/Mayor Deirdre Flint

That the Committee note the following report

Carried

Background
The Association recently partnered with GP Workforce Tasmania, a unit of the Tasmanian General Practice Divisions, and the Area Consultative Committee Tasmania to conduct a series of regional consultation forums with Councils to explore the impact that health workforce shortages might have on the health services in rural and regional communities.

The forums provided a useful opportunity for Councils and other stakeholders to learn about the emerging workforce trends and share information on what they are doing in their own regions to address health workforce shortages. Insights from these sessions will be considered at a GP Workforce summit scheduled for early 2007.

The core objectives of the forums were to:
- Provide a picture of the GP Workforce for Local Government;
- Raise awareness about the need for change in our health systems as a result of workforce shortages; and
- Explore the impact of GP shortages on regional communities.

The GP Workforce presentation outlined some of the reasons for health workforce shortages and emphasised the need to think creatively as communities about how we are going to deal with the challenges these pose. GP Workforce was also keen to understand how such shortages will impact on local communities and a number of council representatives shared their experiences in this regard.

The basic problem is that the demand for health services is outstripping supply. The GP workforce is ageing (over 40% will be over 60 within 10 years); it is being feminised and this may accelerate the reduction in working hours and there is a general trend towards part-time work as practitioners strive for a better work/life balance. Concurrently, demand for services is burgeoning as the general population ages. Tasmania already has the oldest population in Australia and thus the problem is likely to be exacerbated here, with diminishing levels of access to health services that might affect regional economies and the general public, particularly those living with chronic illness and mobility difficulties. Already, the State is becoming heavily reliant on overseas trained doctors.

It was noted that the Australian Government is working to increase the supply of doctors and to reduce the demand for services and that the Tasmanian Government is currently reviewing rural health services in light of workforce shortages as part of a State-wide Primary Health Services Plan. It was suggested that councils could be proactive in addressing the issue by establishing local health working groups within their communities to work with local health providers to map existing services and identify local strengths and areas of risk with a view to developing realistic plans and if necessary seek additional resources to implement them. In this context, it was pointed out that councils are eligible to apply for financial assistance towards relevant projects through the Regional Medical Infrastructure Fund, which is part of the Regional Partnerships Program run through the Australian Government’s Department of Transport and Regional Services.

It is proposed to write to councils apprising them of this information.
**Budget Implications**
The forums have been fully funded through the Tasmanian General Practice Divisions.

**Current Policy**
Under the *Local Government Act 1993* Councils have the responsibility to provide for the health, safety and welfare of their communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.6 SUBJECT: ELECTED MEMBER CENSUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mayor Mike Downie/Mayor Kevin Hyland**

That the committee note the following  

*Carried*

**Background**
During October, the Association ran the second census of Tasmanian Local Government elected members. Of the 281 elected members, 181 responded (65%).

Following is a summary of the main findings from the census, with comparative results from the 2004 census:

- The majority, 77%, of respondents are male (2004: 72%)
- The most common age range of respondents is 56-65, 43% (2004: 56-65, 34%)
- The majority of respondents are married or live in a de facto relationship, 88% (2004: 86%)
- The majority of respondents do not have caring responsibilities, 59% (2004: 64%)
- The majority of respondents were born in Australia, 81% (2004: 85%)
- Only 0.55% of respondents identify as an aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (2004: 1%)
- English is the first language of 97% of respondents (2004: 99%)
- 9% of respondents have a disability (2004: 7%), of those, 82% believe that Council adequately accommodates any disability related support needs (2004: 100%)
- The highest level of education received by the majority of respondents is secondary education, 31% (2004: 38%)
- The majority of respondents are self-employed, 40% (2004: paid employment was 74%), a further 24% are retired (2004: 20%)
- 21% of respondents are primary producers (2004: 23%)
- The majority of respondents are employed in the private sector, 68% (2004: 71%)
- 13% of respondents earn within range of $46,000-$55,999 (2004: $16,000-$25,000 15%)
- 85% of respondents belong to an organisation other than Council. Of those who belong to an organisation, 40% belong to a service club
- 25% of respondents have served for a period of 4-6 years
- 31% of respondents have, on average, contact with 11-20 individual members of the public on Council matters per month
- 32% of respondents spend over 15 hours on Council activities per week.
- The majority of respondents believe that the main concerns of the public are planning and development, 77%, roads, 64%, rates, 54%, and infrastructure, 50%
From a range of options respondents nominated financial sustainability, planning and development and infrastructure as being important issues to Local Government, with dog/cat control seen as the least important.

A full report is available on the LGAT website.

**Budget Implications**
Does not apply.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.

### 3.7 SUBJECT: LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

**Resolved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Elected Member/Officer</th>
<th>Coordinating Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Review Committee</td>
<td>Mr Jay Wilson</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>DPIW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Social Research Reference Group</td>
<td>Cllr Mary Duniam</td>
<td>Elected Member</td>
<td>DPIW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. FINANCES

Financial Items for Discussion & Decision.

4.1 SUBJECT: PROFIT AND LOSS REPORT *

Mayor Deirdre Flint/Mayor Kevin Hyland
That the profit and loss report to 27 November 2006 be received.
Carried

Background
At Attachment to Item 4.1, is a print out of the Profit And Loss Report to 27 November 2006.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

4.2 SUBJECT: CASH FLOW STATEMENTS *

Mayor Mike Downie/Mayor Deirdre Flint
That the Committee receive the reports for the months of September and October 2006.
Carried

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 have been 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 SUBJECT: FINANCIAL REPORT FOR YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2006 *

Mayor Barry Easther/Mayor Kevin Hyland

That the Committee confirm the endorsement of the 2005/2006 Financial Reports.

Carried

Background
The Association’s Auditors, The Tasmanian Audit Office, have advised that the Auditor General has reviewed the 30 June 2006 Financial Report and given notice of his approval.

On signing of the statements by the President, the report was forwarded to the Auditor General for certification and a Certificate of Audit will be issued.

A copy of the Financial Report is at Attachment to Item 4.3 and will be distributed to Committee Members only.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.
4.4 SUBJECT: ASSOCIATION SUBSCRIPTIONS

Mayor Robert Legge/Mayor Kevin Hyland

That the revised structure of the current subscription categories be put to the next General Meeting of the Association for consideration.

Carried

Mayor Deirdre Flint/Lord Mayor Rob Valentine

That Glamorgan Spring Bay Council be provided with the option to pay the excess, of their current years subscriptions, over a four year period.

Carried

Mayor Downie requested that his objection to this motion be noted.

Background
A proposal for the consideration of a new arrangement for payment of subscriptions was presented at the last General Meeting. The major difference upon the existing arrangement was recognition of the fact that land valuations had increased considerably and that councils undergoing revaluations were being impacted significantly by the category structure.

The present arrangements for subscriptions are based on a net AAV which is intended to represent a council’s rating capability. As councils base their rating upon this platform, it has been viewed as the most equitable basis upon which to assign proportionate costs across councils for the operations of the Association. It is acknowledged that the simple fact that the value of land in a particular municipality increases dramatically does not immediately translate to an increase in rating income. However, the adjusted AAV is measured against those of other municipalities and are presumed to be a reasonable measure of relativity across councils.

Since the debate on subscriptions at the last AGM, a number of proposals have been forthcoming ranging from setting subscriptions on the basis of the population of each council through to levying subscriptions on the basis of the relative general rates of councils, net of user charges.

Population Basis
The difficulty confronting the Association is that with a system presently in place, a shift to any new platform will result in winners and losers. This is not to suggest that this is reason enough not to contemplate change but rather an acknowledgement of the fact that agreeable change is challenging.

There have also been criticisms about the fact that the system for subscriptions and voting are not aligned.
At present, the Association’s voting arrangements are based on population. This recognises the concept of representation rather than a propensity to pay. The voting range (1-4) acknowledges the population of the councils across four categories and provides councils with a vote on Association proceedings in line with the number of people they represent in their municipality. While a 4 level structure could be considered relatively narrow and inadequate, its origins reflect the fact that a one vote/one council system was not acceptable to the majority of the membership. This matter has been revisited on a number of occasions but the present system has been agreed by the membership as one which provides a reasonable, if not perfect, level of equity.

There is no reason why the Association couldn’t move to a population basis for its subscriptions. Population provides a higher level of stability, is largely relative to capacity to pay considerations and would not be impacted by the fluctuations in property values. The major issue against this as a subscription platform is the relatively wide variance in populations across municipalities and how it would then configure against the voting regime.

It has been suggested by one council that on the basis of the single vote it gets (out of a total of 56), it should only be required to contribute 1/56th of the total charge for subscriptions. The application of this arrangement would have the following effect when lined up against the current voting regime:

- 1 vote $14,910
- 2 votes $29,820
- 3 votes $44,730
- 4 votes $59,640

In general terms, this would result in significant decreases for councils presently in categories 1-3, small upward adjustments for some and decreases for others in categories 4 and 5 and substantial increases for the larger councils in categories 6 and 7. However, it is not unreasonable that this proposal be put to the membership as an option.

**General Rate Basis**

Another proposal put forward was that the Association could levy its subscriptions on the basis of the general rate charged by each council. This reflects the actual amounts that councils raise net of user and service charges. While not totally comparative across councils (due to the different treatment of charges for various services), it does more appropriately reflect the amount collected by councils and their capacity to pay. Although the AAV is the basis for the general rate, councils have control over the rate in the dollar they charge ratepayers and this varies across councils. Again, this is an option that could be put to the membership.

**Revision of Current Arrangements**

An issue arising in relation to the proposal placed before the General Meeting was that the only council presently in the proposed category 1, Flinders Council, as a result of its upcoming revaluation, would move into category 2. A similar fate was likely for King Island and Tasman in terms of moving extremely close to the category 3 margin following revaluation.

This suggests that some adjustment would be required at the bottom end of the proposed subscription structure to ensure that it could actually have some short to mid-term relevance. Discussions have taken place with the Valuer-General in relation to the impact of revaluations on Flinders and King Islands and Tasman as they have recently completed revaluations.

An adjusted category grouping and contributory percentages has been detailed below. The net effect is that there are shifts up and down but even with the adjustments, Tasman and King Island would move up a category. The Tasman AAV shifted from $11.6 million to $23.4 million as a result of revaluation. King Island shifted from $10.6 million to $19.3 million while Flinders shifted from $4.2 million to 11.3 million.
The shift to indexed valuations will prevent significant shifts in the future. It is unlikely that we will see shifts in property values in a one year period as we have over the traditional seven year valuation cycle. This will see incremental rises in AAV and while councils could arguably move up a category, the impact will be less severe in any given year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Adjusted aav category $</th>
<th>No of Councils in Each category</th>
<th>Average payable by each category %</th>
<th>Votes in each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 up to 15m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15m up to 35m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35m up to 60m</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4x1, 5x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60m up to 100m</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3x2, 2x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100m up to 180m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 180m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4x4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grp Now</th>
<th>Grp Prop</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>05/06 Amount</th>
<th>06/07 Amount</th>
<th>% Subs</th>
<th>New Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flinders Island</td>
<td>11244</td>
<td>11445</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>13367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>King Island</td>
<td>16788</td>
<td>16792</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tasman</td>
<td>16788</td>
<td>16792</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Central Highlands</td>
<td>22568</td>
<td>23141</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>22568</td>
<td>23141</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>22568</td>
<td>23141</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>George Town</td>
<td>22568</td>
<td>23141</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southern Midlands</td>
<td>22568</td>
<td>23141</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Break O'Day</td>
<td>22568</td>
<td>23141</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Circular Head</td>
<td>26132</td>
<td>26817</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>26734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>26132</td>
<td>26817</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>26734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>26132</td>
<td>26817</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>26734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Huon Valley</td>
<td>26132</td>
<td>26817</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>26734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Derwent Valley</td>
<td>26132</td>
<td>26817</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>21721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northern Midlands</td>
<td>26132</td>
<td>26817</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>26734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glam-Spring Bay</td>
<td>22568</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>26734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Waratah- Wynyard</td>
<td>26132</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>31746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meander Valley</td>
<td>32071</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>31746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sorell</td>
<td>32071</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>26734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Tamar</td>
<td>32071</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>31746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Burnie</td>
<td>32071</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>31746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>32071</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>31746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Devonport</td>
<td>32071</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>37594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kingborough</td>
<td>32071</td>
<td>33083</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>37594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>38881</td>
<td>40062</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>43442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
<td>38881</td>
<td>40062</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>43442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>38881</td>
<td>40062</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>43442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>38881</td>
<td>40062</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>43442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Subscriptions | 791872 | 835424 | 100.00 | 835424 |
Glamorgan-Spring Bay Issue
GMC was previously provided with a number of options to consider in relation to the concerns expressed by the Glamorgan Spring Bay (GSB) Council in relation to its significant subscription increase. These included

- providing a full rebate to the council thus leaving it at effectively the same rate as the previous year
- providing a partial rebate to the extent that the council only moved up a single category rather than the two it is subjected to now
- providing an indirect rebate in the form of not charging for conference attendance and the provision of elected member development on a no charge basis.

These proposals were rejected by GMC with the preference being to acknowledge the situation of GSB Council and adopting a subscription system that had an amended structure that would benefit GSB Council into the future as well as any other council undergoing revaluation.

At the recent General Meeting, GSB Council proposed that consideration be given by GMC to increasing its subscription by only 10% on top of that which it paid last year. This would equate to an amount of $24,825, significantly less than the $33,083 subscription proposed for this year and marginally more than the level that GSB Council would have paid had its AAV not changed so drastically ($23,141). In the event that GMC supports this proposal, the budget impact for the Association this year would be approximately $8000.

Budget Implications
A potential budget shortfall this financial year depending on the decision.

Current Policy
As per the Rules of the Association.
### 5. ADMINISTRATION

**Administration Items for Discussion & Decision.**

#### 5.1 SUBJECT:  DATE OF NEXT MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor Deirdre Flint/Mayor Barry Easther</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Committee meet in Launceston on 7 March 2007 and note that the 8 March be set as a possible date for a Mayor's workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:**

#### 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 March, Wednesday</td>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March, Thursday</td>
<td>Mayors' Workshop</td>
<td>Date and venue to be confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 April, Wednesday</td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May, Wednesday</td>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May – 1 June</td>
<td>LGAT Conference</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August, Wednesday</td>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October, Wednesday</td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 December, Thursday</td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLGC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Premier's Dinner</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 SUBJECT:  OTHER BUSINESS & CLOSE