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GENERAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

9 March 2011

1. NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the General Management Committee was held on Wednesday, 9 March 2011 in the Boardroom of the Association Offices, 34 Patrick Street, Hobart.

The meeting commenced at 11.25am.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mayor Barry Easther                  President
Lord Mayor Rob Valentine             Hobart City Council
Mayor Don Thwaites                   West - North West Region
Mayor Lynn Laycock                   West - North West Region
Mayor Albert van Zetten              Northern Region
Mayor Robert Legge                   Northern Region
Mayor Deirdre Flint                  Southern Region
Mayor Graeme Bury                    Southern Region

APOLOGIES:

Mayor Jock Campbell                  Southern Region

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr Allan Garcia                      LGAT
Dr Katrena Stephenson                LGAT
Ms Christine Agostinelli             LGAT
1.1 **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES** *

Mayor Robert Legge/Mayor Albert van Zetten

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2010, as circulated, be confirmed.

Carried

Minutes of the meetings held on 16 December 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 December 2010.

Noted

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

1.3 **PRESIDENT’S REPORT**

That the President’s report be received.

Noted

Since the last meeting, the President has represented the Association at -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>ALGA Strategic Planning Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inaugural Metropolitan Councils Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miles Hampton, Chair Water &amp; Sewerage Corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor Adrianna Taylor, Glenorchy City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forums</th>
<th>Southern Water Metering Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LocalBuy Seminars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Premier’s Australia Day Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Premier’s State of the State Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALGWA 60th Anniversary Celebrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media - Radio/TV</th>
<th>LGAT Newsletters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGAT Magazine article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT

That the Chief Executive Officer’s report be received.

Interface with external bodies
- Quadrant Board Meeting
- CMP Board Meeting
- National Broadband Network

Local Government Forums
- LocalBuy
- ALGA Strategic Planning Session
- Southern Water Metering Update
- Metropolitan Councils Group
- Women Can Meeting

State Government Meetings
- Key Performance Indicators/Sustainability
- Valuation & Rating Review
- Tasmanian Road Safety Advisory Council
- Water & Sewerage Select Committee
- Crane Reference Group
- Valuer General re data exchange processes
- Minister David O’Byrne re Local Government
2. POLICY

2.1 LG DIVISION – PRIORITY ITEMS

That the Committee note that an interim Director of Local Government has been appointed for a period of six months and the priorities identified by the interim Director.

Resolved

Background
The CEO recently held a meeting with the new Acting Director of Local Government, Mat Healey. In addition to undertaking the Director of Local Government role, Mat retains his former responsibilities associated with emergency management within the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

With the Premier’s decision not to proceed with broad Local Government reform, the focus of the Division has tightened to some key priority areas of endeavour. In particular the Code of Conduct regulations have been elevated in importance following the constant lobbying by the Association and the freeing up of resources that may otherwise have been devoted to the Local Government reform program. The regulations are presently in the process of preparation with the expectation that they would pass through the Parliament in the April sitting.

Another matter that will be hastened is the interim rating tools under the Local Government Act to assist councils better manage rate increases, particularly in light of revaluations. The interim measures are intended to address some long standing difficulties faced by councils and include matters such as capping increases in any given year. The interim arrangements are not intended as a substitute for the broader outcomes expected from the wider review into rating and valuation.

Sustainability Indicators remain high on the agenda. Much work has been undertaken by specialist working groups to define, cull, explore and agree on the measures by which council effort should be gauged. The financial and asset management indicators are largely complete and agreed but qualitative measures around governance, leadership and management etc remain under consideration.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
The areas identified for priority attention are largely in keeping with the LGAT policy agenda at this time.
That the Committee note the following report.

**Background**
The Association was invited to make a submission to this Inquiry and took the opportunity to again highlight to the Parliament some truths about council charging and approval regimes. The LGAT submission is at Attachment to Item 2.2 for reference.

The CEO and Policy Director attended the hearing and tendered evidence in support of the submission. The focus was on ensuring that national “hearsay” and “truths” generated by the head offices of peak bodies of the likes of the HIA and Property Council, in particular, were not taken as having direct applicability to the Tasmanian environment.

Propositions such as land scarcity, council approval times, deliberately stopping the clock to allow better work flows and the referral process to State Government agencies were all discussed with the Association presenting strong cases in favour of member councils. It was highlighted to the Committee that many of the delays were as a result of incomplete or non-conforming applications from developers and the process involved in getting them to a place where approval was more likely. The emphasis on development charges was debunked on the basis of their almost non-application in Tasmania by councils, even when they had the ability to apply them. That response was tempered with the acknowledgement that the water and sewerage legislation now mandates that developer charges apply.

It was highlighted to the Select Committee that councils were responsible for the implementation elements of the planning system. That the planning system was the responsibility of the Parliament and the legislation determines how it needs work. If there are problems with the system, then Parliament had the opportunity to rectify it – councils did not.

The planning skills shortage was also highlighted together with the benefits that consistent planning schemes are likely to bring to those administering planning schemes and those subject to them for development purposes. The merits and otherwise of the Tasmanian Planning Commission was touched upon together with propositions of the merits or otherwise of amalgamation and resource sharing.

In summary, the Local Government submission was put forcibly and strongly but with discretion and courtesy.
2.3 WATER METERS

That the Committee note the present activity and dialogue on this matter.

Resolved

Background
The issue of water meters remains a very topical public debate. All sections of the community appear to have a view on the matter. The water and sewerage reform process called for cost reflective user charging and this has been written into legislation. While meters are likely the only way to achieve this goal, debate continues on the merits of funding the meter roll out in terms of its cost benefit and the impact on significant users of water, particularly when coupled with forecast higher water prices.

Most in the debate do not deny the benefit for conservation of natural resources but an argument is presented that paying a premium for the conservation of a resource in plentiful supply likely defeats the purpose of the exercise. The counter argument is that regardless of the availability of water, everybody should pay for what they use, in much the same way as people pay for electricity usage. Using this analogy, whether there is excess or scarce supply of energy, the use is generally dictated by price and necessity with conservation of energy being a by-product of frugality.

From an Association position it has been difficult to engage in the debate on the basis of the differing and passionate positions of members. Meetings have taken place with the Chairman of the Water Corporations and Association personnel have attended the stakeholder briefings regarding the meter rollout. An undertaking was given to the Chairman to pursue with the Premier a continuation of the present 5% concession arrangements for water users but on the basis of transitioning to the user pay system. This would seek to alleviate the double decker price shock. At the time of writing that meeting had not been held.

Budget Implications
There is no direct budget impact on the Association but there will be implications for councils in the future based on the revenue derived from adjusted water usage that may result from meters.

Current Policy
User pays pricing was part of the reform package agreed by the Association and members as part of the broader water and sewerage reform and legislation.

2.4 WATER AND SEWERAGE SELECT COMMITTEE *

That the Committee note the Association’s submission and the fact that the Select Committee has commenced hearings.

Resolved

Background
The Association made a detailed submission to the Select Committee focusing on the history of the water reform process, the negotiations that took place, the trade-offs and the matters that Local Government particularly objected to in the final reform package. It was considered important to place on the record this historical account as key members in the State Government side and, indeed, within Local Government have subsequently moved on. A copy of the submission is at Attachment to Item 2.4 for reference.
The submission also raised a number of matters that have been raised by member councils since the inception of the reform. This was a relatively general overview as individual councils also made separate submissions and were far more critical of particular aspects based on their individual circumstance.

The Association had not appeared before the Committee at the time of writing.

**Budget Implications**

Does not apply.

**Current Policy**

The submission was in keeping with the LGAT policy positions previously taken on this matter.

---

## 2.5 Code Of Conduct

**Resolved**

### Legislative Review

The review of the Code of Conduct regulations is now a priority project for the Local Government Division.

Following discussion with LGAT and consideration of issues raised by councils, drafting instructions have been prepared for the Office of the Parliamentary Council.

At this stage the focus is on the Regulations, not any amendments to the Act.

At the time of writing this report, a paper was being prepared for councils by LGAT, to provide some detail ahead of a draft Bill.

### Workshop

LGAT is holding a forum about Council Code of Conduct and the Standards Panel to be attended by Code of Conduct Chairs and members of the Standards Panel. The forum will be held on the 13 April, 2011 in Campbelltown.

The purpose of the forum is to improve the understanding of participants about a range of processes involved in Code of Conduct hearings and the Standards Panel. Among the topics to be discussed are:

- Complaints handling
- Natural justice and equity
- Rules of evidence, determination of breaches
- Appeals of decisions

The forum will also hear from the newly formed Integrity Commission about its role and discuss the creation of a model Code of Conduct for Councils.

### Budget Impact

There may be a small cost to the Association to cover payment for speakers and catering.

### Current Policy

The forum supports current policy in relation to Code of Conduct and the Standards Panel.
2.6 ROADS, CRANES & SPEED ZONES OUTSIDE CHILD CARE CENTRES

That the Committee note the following report.

Resolved

Background
It has been a busy start to the year in relation to roads and following are updates relating to key areas of activity.

COAG Road Reform Plan Feasibility Study – Consultation process
In December an LGAT representative attended a consultation workshop at the ALGA Offices in Canberra regarding the COAG Road Reform Plan (CRRP) Project Team’s feasibility study into options for road reform and potential implications for Local Government. The CRRP project team is keen to gain insight into the various challenges and opportunities heavy vehicle pricing reform could bring to local governments across the nation. Input was sought in order to better understand the key issues and to identify information gaps as a final recommendations paper is formulated for release in the middle of 2011.

LGAT submitted a representative response to the Feasibility Study Discussion Paper, indicating support for a framework that ensures regions are achieving maximum benefit from expenditure on roads, based on locally identified priorities and their links with the regional and national priorities. The submission highlighted the fact that the current road charging regime for heavy vehicles remains a contentious issue for Tasmanian councils both in terms of the share of the heavy vehicle licence fees presently paid to Local Government within the state (15% of the base 1996 registration pool) as well as the current “averaging” arrangement that draws criticism from a number of councils who would prefer to see a more equitable distribution based on actual heavy vehicle use.

At the December meeting, the CRRP Project Team committed to meeting and consulting with managers and practitioners from within Local Government in each state. The Tasmanian consultation session will take place on 21 March and will be attended by General Managers and Road Asset Managers from around the state. This meeting will provide officers with an opportunity to discuss some of the issues raised within the final Local Government Consultation Paper (released after initial submissions were considered) as well as allowing the CRRP Project Team to further gauge the extent of specific Tasmanian issues and perspectives.

Crane Industry Reference Group (CIRG)
In a recent meeting with DIER, LGAT was asked to participate in a reference group comprised of experienced crane industry representatives and State Government.

Whilst the CIRG was initially established to predominantly facilitate exchange of information between State Government and industry representatives, it became apparent at the first meeting of the group in November 2010 that the issue of management of structures and roads across the Local, State and Federal levels of government has been creating problems and frustrations for operators. It was deemed appropriate to seek representation on behalf of Local Government, and as a consequence an LGAT representative attended the February 2011 meeting in Campbell Town.
In the past, management of road network access was principally in the hands of the former Department of Main Roads with one system of approvals and operations. Now, liaison with several tiers of government is often required in order to gain the requisite permissions to access both State and local roads, even to undertake journeys of a short distance. There is an acknowledgement that not all councils have a similar capacity to manage or oversee operations; as a result time delays in granting access permissions to local roads along with other administrative differences are points of concern for the industry. It is envisaged that liaison between Local and State Governments and the industry may lend to the streamlining of some processes, making more information available to operators to assist decision making in terms of appropriate routes, and ultimately to decrease some of the repetition associated with multiple permit applications for commonly accessed travel routes.

DIER intends to devise an electronically available network route map for the various classes of cranes which indicates clearly where each class may travel while also highlighting any weak links within the network such as bridge structures. It is envisaged that this will be a tool that assists operators when planning travel routes. In addition it is anticipated that annual permits could be extended to longer periods such as five years in order to decrease unnecessary and repetitive administrative practices within DIER.

It has been suggested that the provision of similar information about the local road network would be beneficial, both to operators and to Local and State Government. DIER currently has no information as to the capacity of the local road network, and crane operators have to apply to individual councils, which often have different methods of processing, varying time frames and permit conditions. Initially, LGAT will be looking to councils for feedback in relation to how current council practices could be streamlined, in order to make processes more straightforward for crane operators. It has been suggested that as a pilot one or a small number of councils could be involved in the route classification work that is currently underway in relation to the state network and ‘append’ appropriate routes on the local road network to the state route map in order to provide clear information to operators about where they can and can’t go with specific crane classes.

Meetings of the CIRG will be convened by DIER and will be held every three months over an approximate twelve month period. In summary DIER hopes to achieve the following outcomes over that period:

- A confirmed and categorised crane network by September 2011;
- Agreed access for cranes on certain networks;
- Avoidance of anti-competitive scenarios for operators; and
- As far as practicable, the allowance of extended time-frames for permits.

**Speed Zones outside Childcare Centres**

Pursuant to a motion put forward by Launceston City and Burnie City Councils that was carried at the October 2010 General Meeting, LGAT undertook to lobby the State Government to reduce speed limits around all Tasmanian child care facilities to mirror the same speed limits around schools (that being 40km). This proposal would be applicable to child care facilities such as registered child care centres, but not family day care placements in private houses.

The Association wrote to the Minister for Infrastructure in November, outlining the need for a reduction in speed limits outside Tasmanian child care centres and submitting that whilst it is acknowledged that DIER will consider reduced speed arrangements around individual centres upon request, a method of ad hoc reduction is insufficient to ensure the safety of all Tasmanian children who attend child care centres.

Subsequent to the abovementioned correspondence, representatives from LGAT met with DIER at the beginning of February to discuss next steps.
It has been agreed that it is appropriate to convene a working group to address this issue. The working group will be hosted by LGAT and comprise officer level representatives from Local Government and DIER. It is envisaged that initially the group will identify the largest ‘at risk’ centres around the state, based upon volume of enrolment and proximity to high traffic thoroughfares, and work together to determine appropriate sites for speed limit reductions, along with associated matters such as appropriate warning signage. The first meeting will be held in late April.

**Rural Road Speed Limits within Tasmania**

The Tasmanian Road Safety Advisory Council (RSAC) recently undertook a consultation process on a proposal to lower the default rural speed limit in Tasmania from 100km/h to 90km/h on sealed roads, and from 100km/h to 80km/h on unsealed roads.

The objective of the proposed amendment is to reduce the number of people seriously injured or killed on rural roads in Tasmania. A Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) was prepared to support the public consultation on the proposed changes. Following consultation with councils, LGAT submitted a letter to RSAC in response to the RIS, highlighting a number of issues raised by councils around the state which warrant consideration and potentially, further discussion. It is noted that a number of councils also made direct submissions to RSAC.

It was noted by some councils that the RIS did not present direct evidence to show the causal relationship between speed limit reduction trials and the reduction in accidents/crashes. There was no evidence presented from areas outside the trial on what happened to their crash rates over the same trial period. It was thus submitted that the claimed reduction in accidents due to reduced speed limits may have been the result of broader external factors not related to speed, or it may be due to the speed reduction; but there was no evidence to show that this was the case. In addition, it was noted that the RIS had not considered other options for reducing the road toll ie the interventions set out in the Draft National Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020, such as improved compliance, training and education. Some members indicated a desire for a broad approach to improved safety on the road, which would include more than just one solution to the issue.

Other issues identified included:

- A reduction in the default speed limit may simply result in communities placing additional pressure on councils to upgrade rural roads so they can be posted at 100km/h. If so this will impose additional pressures on Local Government in terms of funding and resources;
- The imposition of numerous different speed zones could result in the speed zones laws being even more complicated than previously. It has been submitted that consideration could be given to whether both sealed and unsealed should be 90 km/hr to avoid driver confusion and deliver consistency;
- There is real possibility of additional confusion about the correct speed limit in a given area, taking into account the number of possible ‘likely’ speeds. There is potential for more public complaints about the “end of limit” signs adopted by DIER, and a call for the posting of actual speed limit signage to achieve clarity.

In relation to the perceived advantages of a reduction in rural default speed limits and aside from the primary potential benefit, being a reduction in the loss of life and injury, a number of other potential benefits were identified, including the following:

- The proposal could save Local Government financially, with less wear and tear on gravel surfaces, seals, shoulders and pavements and therefore reduced maintenance, repair and upgrading costs.
- The movement of road traffic to higher standard roads with higher speed limits will provide a positive impact for road safety and amenity with resulting reductions in through traffic in rural residential areas.
It was acknowledged that success for any proposed amendments to the default speed limit in rural areas would depend on community support and as such, an opportunity to review public submissions in order to gauge support from the community prior to a final position from Local Government would be welcomed.

**Budget Implications**
There are no budget implications at this stage.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.

### 2.7 GENERAL POLICY DISCUSSION

**Decision Sought**

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

- The distribution of the Household Hazardous Waste brochures, in particular the cost associated with distribution in areas that were not holding a collection day was queried, however, the reduction in cost when limiting the delivery areas is in fact minimal and the wider distribution of brochures allows people who are prepared to travel to the nearest collection point to make use of the service.

- Under the Local Government Act there are clear guidelines as to the requirements for the placement of Council notices in the print media. With the introduction of electronic media there is reason to revisit this legislation and determine if a change could be implemented, a report will be provided for the next meeting.

- Members were advised that a common template for planning is to be issued with perhaps the capacity to allow for regional differences based on regional strategies.
3. PROJECTS & SERVICES

3.1 REGIONAL PROCUREMENT LOCAL BUY

That the Committee note the successful conduct of the recent series of regional procurement workshops.

Resolved

Background
A series of regional workshops were recently held to outline the arrangements put in place to allow access for councils to a national contract for trucks. LGAT entered into this arrangement in collaboration with LocalBuy, the procurement arm of LGAQ. The contract provides councils with the opportunity for significant savings on the purchase of trucks with the benefit of being able to purchase locally and without financial detriment to the local dealer.

Attendance at the workshops was a little disappointing however reports from those that did participate were very encouraging. The intention of the two part program was to assure Elected Members and General Managers that the tender process that had been conducted was appropriate and the second phase focused on the technical aspects of purchasing and was aimed at the procurement officers in councils.

Representatives from MAV procurement were also in attendance. LGAT has entered into an arrangement with MAV to purchase off its stationery and tyre contracts and has indicated a willingness to look at further collaborations in the future. The advantage of utilizing other organizations is that LGAT does not have to build a resource in the procurement area and member councils achieve the benefits of broader aggregated purchasing arrangements.

The direct benefit to the Association is a 50% share of the procurement commission on each sale with the other 50% flowing to the host procurement body (ie MAV and LocalBuy)

Budget Implications
With the strong reliance of the Association on member subscriptions for revenue, there is potential in pursuing the merits of aggregated purchasing where it can provide savings to member councils and generate commission income for the Association.

3.2 FINANCIAL AND ASSET MANAGEMENT PROJECT

That the Committee note the following report.

Resolved

Background
After considerable delays, the first funding payment for the Commonwealth's Local Government Reform Project on Long Term Financial and Strategic Asset Management Planning was received by the Association in late January 2011, shortly after the first Steering Committee meeting for the project.
Following two rounds of advertising and a reconsideration of project hours, a project Manager, Sue Grau, has been appointed and commenced work on the 21st February, 2011. We were not able to attract someone suitably qualified from within the Local Government sector. Sue has experience in a range of positions requiring the development, implementation and evaluation of major community and technical projects. Her last position prior to moving to Tasmania was Manager, Water Recovery, the Living Murray initiative.

The Local Government Division has also appointed a new officer, Sarah Patterson, who will be assisting on this project, for example drafting the State Asset Management Policy as required by the Commonwealth.

Under the terms with the Commonwealth, the Steering Committee is to be jointly chaired by the Director of the Local Government Division (Matt Healey is acting) and the CEO of LGAT. In addition the Policy Director, Katrena Stephenson and the Assistant Director of the Local Government Division Greg Brown will participate. Nominations were sought from councils to fill three additional places on the Steering Committee. The agreed representatives are to be:

- Ron Sanderson, General Manager Brighton Council;
- Harry Galea, Director Infrastructure Services Launceston City Council; and
- Matthew Greskie, Executive Manager Engineering Services Circular Head and Waratah Wynyard Councils.

The first meeting of the Steering Committee was held in late January and agreed the terms of reference, reviewed the project plan and considered the results of the survey of councils (regarding asset and financial management practices).

The next meeting of the Steering Committee is schedule for 4 March, 2011.

**Budget Implications**
Councils and LGAT are required to contribute co funding of $58,000 cash ($2000 per council) and $137,000 in-kind (human resources, meeting spaces etc).

**Current Policy**
This is a priority project for the Association.

### 3.3 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS FORUMS**

**That the Committee note the following report.**

**Resolved**

**Background**
LGAT is holding a Community Development Forum in Launceston on the 24 March 2011. The purpose of the forum is to:

- Update Councils on the status of a number of Local Government community development initiatives, programs and strategies;
- Provide an overview of community development initiatives at the State Government level; and
- Showcase an innovative approach to engage with the community used by Newcastle City Council.

The forum will also be used to inform and consult with Local Government about current initiatives regarding Alcohol, Tobacco and other Drugs.
Among the speakers are Nick Evans from the DPAC Community Development Division, Penny Saile, Hobart City Council and Roger Jaensch from the Cradle Coast Authority.

The forum is targeted to officers working in the field of community development, including social planners, youth workers and community development officers. Elected members are also encouraged to attend.

**Budget Impact**
Participants will be charged to attend and it is anticipated that all costs associated with the workshop will be recovered.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.

### 3.4 METRO COUNCILS GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Background**
The inaugural meeting of the Metropolitan Councils Group (MCG) was held on 28 January 2011.

With all eligible councils in attendance the meeting was held in good spirits with affable exchanges among members and a solid list of issues identified for future attention. There was one observer, the Mayor of Southern Midlands, Tony Bisdee.

The Mayor of Clarence, Jock Campbell, was elected Chair. It was determined that in the absence of the Chair from a meeting for any reason, an acting Chair would be appointed from around the table to conduct a meeting.

It was agreed that formal administrative protocols were unnecessary at this time and a watching brief would be maintained to ascertain what level of formality may be required in the future in relation to administrative arrangements or financial support.

It was further agreed that the MCG needed to take a strategic approach to issues and would seek meetings with and presentations from appropriate parties and organizations to develop working relationships and gain a better understanding of matters impacting on the city environments.

By way of example, the MCG will meet with Norm McIlfattrick next meeting to discuss the current rail situation prior to pursuing a discussion with TasRail about more detailed elements of the operation. A representative from TasGas will also be in attendance to discuss the impediments, challenges and costings associated with a more extensive roll out of gas in urban areas.

The MCG will revolve its meetings around the state linking where possible to General Meetings, GMC Meetings or PLGC Meetings.

The next meeting is to be held on the afternoon of 19 April 2011 following the PLGC meeting in Hobart.
3.5 KEY PERFORMANCE AND SUSTAINABLE OBJECTIVES INDICATORS

That the Committee note the following report.

Resolved

Background
Following the release of the consultation paper by State Government and with input from councils in writing and through regional workshops an expert working group was formed with a view to developing initial indicators and targets (with indicators the initial focus). Because of a number of staff changes at the Local Government Division, the Policy Director has assisted through facilitating the expert working group meetings.

While a number of possible indicators have been identified, the exercise has been far from easy with a number of broader issues identified which need consideration by the Steering Committee before progressing further. These included:

A) Imperatives:
   − There is a need to re-visit the reasons and drivers for the project. Do they all remain valid?
   − In considering the project drivers, are all strategic priority areas identified of equal importance/relevance?
   − Who and what are the indicators for?

B) Resourcing:
   − How will data collection, validation and analysis and reporting be resourced ongoing?
   − Community satisfaction surveys are considered by the expert working group to provide much of the required SOI data. Currently this is a biannual survey resourced by LGAT members.
   − How would satisfaction data be collected for councils are not members of LGAT?

C) The expert working group does not support the setting and use of targets. This was a component of the original work plan that needs further consideration by the Steering Committee.

D) The nature of indicators needs consideration for example -
   − Illustrative versus comprehensive indicators versus rolled up indicators.
   − Are indicators for financial and asset management, community satisfaction and compliance sufficient?
   − If reducing the number/nature of indicators, the assessment work undertaken by the expert working group may be useful in developing guidelines or other tools for councils’ use.

The Steering Committee is due to convene on the 3 March prior to the expert working group meeting again on the 8 March, 2011.

Budget Impact
Within current budget.

Current Policy
Does not apply.
Mayor Albert van Zetten/Mayor Lynn Laycock

That the Committee notes and endorses the offer of Life Members to establish a meritorious service award and that it be included as part of the Annual Conference.

Carried

**Background**

At the 2010 Conference Dinner the LGAT Life members approached the CEO with a view to establishing an award that could be included as part of the conference each year. Their proposal was to award outstanding or exceptional service by an elected member. The award is not intended to replace or replicate the present LGAT awards but more to acknowledge outstanding achievement by an individual. This may be as a result of a single event or a series of activities but would be confined to a period of say the last four years.

The Life Members were requested to develop a proposal and have done so, outlining eligibility criteria and some process around the award nomination and judging. The proposal is at [Attachment to Item 3.6](#) for reference.

While there are some details to be worked out in relation to process and timing, it is considered that this is a very significant award and it is pleasing that Life Members value their positions and are seeking to give something back through this award. The award will be one of recognition with a perpetual plaque the likely physical element of the award. This will need further discussions with the Life Members. While part of the Annual Conference, it is considered that this award should stand alone from the Awards for Excellence and have some distinguished positioning during the proceedings. Given that Life Members normally only attend the dinner, it is likely that this is the appropriate venue/circumstance in which to present the award.

It is requested that the Committee endorse the establishment of this award and agree to include it as part of the Annual Conference.

**Budget Implications**

There will be minor involvement of LGAT staff in the processing and judging of the award.

**Current Policy**

It is not intended that the award conflict or replicate present service awards of LGAT.
3.7 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES *

Lord Mayor Rob Valentine/Mayor Robert Legge

That the Committee support the nomination of Clr Fiona Buchan to the Adult Literacy Reference Group.

That the Committee note there have been no Local Government Representative appointments.

Carried

Background
The State Government is forming an Adult Literacy Reference Group to assist with implementation of the Tasmanian Adult Literacy Plan.

The Adult Literacy Reference Group will come together to:
- Provide input and expertise to the Literacy project implementation group;
- Test ideas;
- Provide feedback on how actions contained within the Adult Literacy Plan are being implemented; and
- Evaluate progress and outputs.

The group will meet on an infrequent basis for a specific purpose. Skills Tasmania and LINC Tasmania will host the group and provide secretarial support.

Other organisations invited to participate in the reference group include TasCOSS, Unions Tasmania, Tasmanian Community Fund, TCCI, The Tasmanian Council for Adult Literacy, Mission Australia, Tasmanian Skills Institute, Tasmanian Polytechnic and the Social Inclusion Unit.

Nominations from Local Government were called for, with a nomination received from Clr Fiona Buchan from Kingborough.

It is recommended that Cr Buchan be supported in her nomination given she has relevant experience and a strong interest in the role.

Budget Implications
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.
4. FINANCES

4.1 PROFIT AND LOSS REPORT *

Mayor Albert van Zetten/Mayor Don Thwaites

That the Profit and Loss report to 25 February, 2011 be received.

That the Committee noted the expected variances in the final outcome for the 2010/2011 financial year and requested adjusted budgetary figures be provided going forward.

Carried

Background
At Attachment to Item 4.1, is a print out of the Profit and Loss Report to 25 February, 2011.

Two occurrences have had a direct impact on the revenue of the Association for the 2010/11 Financial Year. The Annual Conference was moved to a later date, taking the event out of this financial year period and, Glenorchy City Council chose to resign their membership of the Association.

Preparation of the budget for 2010/11 is approved by GMC some weeks prior to the AGM with the result that at the time of preparation of the budget for the 2010/11 Financial Year the Association had not been formally advised of the Glenorchy City Councils resignation of membership.

Changing the date of the conference required altering the Rules of the Association at the AGM and, while it was anticipated that there would be no objection by Members to the change of date, it could not be presumed and income and expenditure for the conference were included in the budget.

4.2 CASH FLOW STATEMENTS *

Mayor Robert Legge/Lord Mayor Rob Valentine

That the Committee receive the report for the month of November, December 2010 and January 2011.

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 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 SITTING FEES & ALLOWANCES *

Lord Mayor Rob Valentine/Mayor Lynn Laycock

That the Committee endorse the LGAT Policy for payment of Sitting Fees and Allowances to those representing the Association on boards and panels.

Carried

Background
This matter was initially raised at the December 2010 GMC Meeting and advice has now been received from Wise Lord Ferguson, the Association’s Accountants in relation to the payment of Sitting Fees and Allowances to representatives of the Association, in particular the payment of sitting fees to Standards Panel Members and the requirement to submit superannuation when that remuneration exceeds the $450.00 per month threshold.

Based on this advice an LGAT policy has been formulated. A copy of the policy is at Attachment to Item 4.3.
Specifically the policy refers to the requirement for Standard Panel Members to be treated as casual employees with an obligation to provide superannuation payments when the superannuation thresholds are exceeded. The policy is retrospective to 1 July 2010 which will entail the late payment of some superannuation funds and associated fees to those Panel Members who did exceed the thresholds during the July to December 2010 period. The total outstanding superannuation is not a large amount, approximately $1000.00 and it is not anticipated that the additional charges for late payment will be onerous, however, these payments were for past complaints and will need to be met from the Association’s budget for Standards Panel expenses. Future superannuation payments will be recovered from the relevant council as is the case for all costs associated with the Standards Panel.

The advice also confirms that payment of Allowances to Association Members ie the General Management Committee, are not subject to PAYG withholding or to the Superannuation Guarantee Levy. However, it is the policy of the Association to deduct PAYG withholding from allowances paid to the President and Vice President if they opt for these deductions to be withheld.

Policy Implications
The Association seeks to meet its remuneration requirements in accordance with all prevailing legislation.

Budget Implications
The cost of the Standards Panel is generally borne by those councils utilizing its services. There will be a small sum that will not easily be attributed to past complaint processes and will need to be met from the Association’s budget.
4.4 LGAT MEMBERSHIP

That the Committee note the positive response from Hobart City Council to membership via the rescission of its decision to withdraw and the intended process with regard to engaging Glenorchy City Council.

Noted

Background
It was indeed pleasing to receive correspondence from the Lord Mayor indicating Hobart City Council’s unanimous agreement to withdraw its intention to resign from the Local Government Association of Tasmania. The correspondence indicated that the Council will review its decision in 12 months’ time but seeks to continue to foster a close working relationship between the Council and LGAT.

It is anticipated that the formation of the Metropolitan Councils Group and the agenda and scope that was discussed at the first meeting will be of particular interest to Hobart City Council and will be an important plank in forging that stronger working relationship.

The President has also held informal discussions with the Mayor of Glenorchy and the Association CEO is in the process of developing a proposal for Council to consider. It will seek to invite Council and highlight some of the initiatives that have been put into place that may be of benefit to Glenorchy. It will also outline some of the concessions that LGAT has given (e.g. access for employees to LGAT Assist) to demonstrate the LGAT’s bonafides.

Budget Implications
Memberships need to be considered in the context of establishing the 2011/2012 budget.
5. ADMINISTRATION

Administration Items for Discussion & Decision.

5.1 QUADRANT SUPERANNUATION PROCESS FOR APPOINTMENT OF EMPLOYER DIRECTORS

Mayor Robert Legge/Mayor Lynn Laycock

That the Committee note the proposed process in relation to the appointment of employer directors to Quadrant Superannuation and endorse the appointment of the President of the Association to the Nominations Committee.

Carried

Background
The Committee has previously been advised of the proposed arrangements for filling vacancies on the Quadrant Superannuation Board. The number of Board members was previously 10, comprising 4 employer directors, 4 employee directors and 2 trustee directors. Following an independent review of the structure, the Board endorsed moving to a 7 members – 3 employer, 3 employee and 1 trustee director.

As part of that reduction process, GMC was involved in the appointment of the present employer directors, Lynn Mason, Brent Armstrong and Allan Garcia for a period of 2 years. The 2 year period was aimed at staggering the Board appointments to ensure continuity. Member directors were appointed for a 4 year term. The 2 year term for the present employer directors expires on 29 February 2012.

Previous advice to GMC indicated the intention to establish a Nominations Committee to assist in the process of appointments to the Board. The Nominations Committee would be responsible for calling for nominations, making an assessment of nominees in respect of eligibility requirements and making recommendations to GMC for appointment as employer directors. GMC could accept or reject nominations put forward and could request the Nominations Committee to consider further nominations if required.

It is proposed that the Nominations Committee comprise a member director of Quadrant Superannuation, the CEO of Quadrant Superannuation and the President of LGAT. The proposed commencement for the process is outlined in Attachment to Item 5.1 but proposed commencement is July 2011 with a final decision by GMC to be made in the period November 2011 – February 2012. The eligibility criteria for employer members has also been included in the attachment.

At this time, GMC is being requested to note the process for appointment as outlined in the attachment and endorse the appointment of the President to the Nominations Committee.
5.2 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Decision Sought

The next GMC meeting will be held on Wednesday 11 May, 2011.

A list of meeting dates for 2011 is detailed below-

2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 March</td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 April</td>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston Country Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 April</td>
<td>PLGC Meeting</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCG Meeting</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>AGM/General Meeting</td>
<td>Wrest Point, Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 22 July</td>
<td>LGAT Annual Conference</td>
<td>Wrest Point, Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 August</td>
<td>MCG Meeting</td>
<td>Devonport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 September</td>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>Brighton Civic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GMC Meeting</td>
<td>Brighton Civic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November</td>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston Country Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November</td>
<td>MCG Meeting</td>
<td>Launceston Country Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 December</td>
<td>GMC/PLGC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 OTHER BUSINESS & CLOSE

There being no further business the President declared the meeting closed at 1.30pm.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD

Dated this day of  20

.................................................................

PRESIDENT