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PROCEDURAL MATTERS.
RULES REGARDING CONDUCT OF MEETINGS

13. WHO MAY ATTEND A MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION
(a) Each Member shall be entitled to send a voting delegate to any Meeting of the Association, such voting delegate exercising the number of votes determined according to Rule 16(a).
(b) After each ordinary Council election, the Chief Executive Officer shall request each Member to advise the name of its voting delegate and the proxy for the voting delegate for Meetings of the Association until the next ordinary Council elections.
(c) Members may change their voting delegate or proxy at any time by advising the Chief Executive Officer in writing over the hand of the voting delegate or the General Manager prior to that delegate taking his or her position at a Meeting.
(d) A list of voting delegates will be made available at the commencement of any Meeting of the Association.
(e) Members may send other elected members or Council officers as observers to any Meeting of the Association.

14. PROXIES AT MEETINGS
(a) Up to 1 hour prior to any Meeting of the Association, a Member may appoint another Member as its proxy.
(b) The form of the proxy is to be provided by the Chief Executive Officer and is to be signed by either the Mayor or General Manager of the Council appointing the proxy.
(c) The Chair of the meeting is not entitled to inquire as to whether the proxy has cast any vote in accordance with the wishes of the Member appointing the proxy.
(d) Proxies count for the purposes of voting and quorum at any meeting.

15. QUORUM AT MEETINGS
At any Meeting of the Association, a majority of the Member Councils shall constitute a quorum.

16. VOTING AT MEETINGS
(a) Voting at any Meeting of the Association shall be upon the basis of each voting delegate being provided with, immediately prior to the meeting, a placard which is to be used for the purpose of voting at the meeting. The placard will be coloured according to the number of votes to which the Member is entitled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of the Council Area</th>
<th>Number of votes entitled to be exercised by the voting delegate</th>
<th>Colour placard to be raised by the voting delegate when voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 – 19,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 – 39,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 and above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) The Chairman of the meeting shall be entitled to rely upon the raising of a coloured placard as the recording of the vote for the Member and as evidence of the number of votes being cast.
(c) Except as provided in sub-rule (d), each question, matter or resolution shall be decided by a majority of the votes capable of being cast by Members present at the Meeting. If there is an equal number of votes upon any question, it shall be declared not carried.
(d) (i) When a vote is being taken to amend a Policy of the Association, the resolution must be carried by a majority of the votes capable of being cast by Members, whether present at the Meeting or not.
(ii) When a vote is being taken for the Association to sign a protocol, memorandum of understanding or partnership agreement, the resolution must be carried by a majority of votes capable of being cast by Members and by a majority of Members, whether present at the Meeting or not.
(iii) When a vote is being taken to amend the Rules of the Association, the resolution must be carried by at least two-thirds of the votes capable of being cast by Members, whether present at the Meeting or not.
GENERAL MEETING AGENDA

10.00 am  Coffee on arrival
10.30 am  Meeting commences

11.00  Wendy Clarkson
       Workplace Safe Standards Tasmania

12.00  Stuart Heggie
       State Manager, Environmental Health
       Department of Health and Human Services
       Local Government Annual Report Template

12.30 pm  Approximately, lunch will be provided
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minutes of General Meeting Held On 17 November 2010</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business Arising</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Confirmation of Agenda</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Follow Up Of Motions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monthly Report To Councils</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Council Round-Ups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rating And Valuation Review</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metropolitan Councils Group</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Funding Waste Management In Tasmania</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Financial And Asset Management Project, Staffing Update</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Constitutional Recognition</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sustainability Objectives And Indicators</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Community Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Disability Care And Support Report By The Productivity Commission*</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Household Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Roads Report, Cranes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Climate Change Update</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Conference Update</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Motion: LGAT Conference</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>议题</td>
<td>页码</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Community Development Forum</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Motion: Blueprint For An Active Australia</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Environmental Health Annual Report</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Environmental Dispute Mediation Service</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The President welcomed Members and declared the meeting open at 10.30am.

**Apologies were received from**

Mayor Darryl Gerrity  
Mayor Charles Arnold  
Mr Des Jennings  
Mayor Darryl Gerrity  
Mr Peter Harder  
Mr Mark Goode  
Mayor Albert van Zetten  
Mayor Mark Shelton  
Mayor Tony Bisdee  
Mayor Lynn Laycock  
Mr Ian McCallum  
Mr Tim Kirkwood  
Mr Bill Costin  
Mayor Michael Gaffney  
Mr David Metcalf  
Mr Stephen Mackey  
West Coast Council  
King Island Council  
Break O'Day Council  
West Coast Council  
West Coast Council  
King Island Council  
Launceston City Council  
Meander Valley Council  
Southern Midlands Council  
Devonport City Council  
Devonport City Council  
Southern Midlands Council  
Sorell Council  
Latrobe Council  
Glamorgan Spring Bay Council  
Derwent Valley Council

1 **ITEM:** MINUTES OF GENERAL MEETING HELD ON 17 NOVEMBER 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hobart City Council/Burnie City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2010, as circulated, be confirmed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carried**

**Background:**
To confirm the Minutes of the General Meeting held on 17 November, 2010.
2 ITEM: BUSINESS ARISING *

That members note the information

Noted

Background:
At Attachment to Item 2 is a schedule of business considered at the previous meeting and its status.

3 ITEM: CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

That consideration be given to the Agenda items and the order of business.

Noted

Background:
Delegates will be invited to confirm the agenda for the meeting and the order of business.

4 ITEM: FOLLOW UP OF MOTIONS *

Contact Officer – Katrena Stephenson

That Members note the following report.

Noted

Background:
A table detailing action taken to date in relation to motions passed at previous meetings is at Attachment to Item 4.

5 ITEM: MONTHLY REPORT TO COUNCILS*

That Members note the following reports.

Noted

Background comment:
Monthly reports to Councils that briefly outlines Association activities and outcomes for the previous months are at Attachment to Item 5.

6 ITEM: COUNCIL ROUND-UPS
That Members note the presentation from Derwent Valley Council.

Noted

Background comment:
The session also allows time for questions and provides an opportunity to briefly share and highlight problems or opportunities facing councils.

7 ITEM: RATING AND VALUATION REVIEW
Contact Officer – Allan Garcia

That Members note the progress of this project.

Noted

Background comment:
The public consultation for the review resulted in over 100 submissions being made with 18 councils responding and almost 70 individual ratepayers. Of the councils that made submissions there was widespread support for increasing the rating tools available under the legislation and providing greater guidance and clarity. There was significant support for increasing the flexibility of options for councils, including increasing the fixed charge component and permitting differential minimums and tiered rates.

There was less consistency from councils regarding the valuation base. There remains a good level of support for the continuation of Assessed Annual Value (AAV) but so long as the four percent rule is removed where practical or modified in some way. Councils that are more supportive of a change in the valuation system are unsure as to the precise impacts of a change to either land or capital value will have, but there is a tendency to prefer capital value as land value is seen as potentially having a more dramatic impact. The overwhelming view is that more modelling and resources are required to be clear on the possible impacts of a change in the valuation base.

The difficulties with modelling all possibilities are the differing assumptions that individual councils are able to make in setting their rating resolutions. Dramatically increasing the fixed charge will have differing consequences and the capacity to utilize an enhanced differential rating regime could have further distortions. The single biggest concern for councils is the extent of the shift from one system to another. AAV’s limitations around the four percent rule have placed ratepayers in two broad categories with those under the threshold being rated in the more traditional way and those above effectively being rated on the basis of capital. This latter category is as high as 80 percent for some residential categories in councils.

To overcome this modelling shortcoming, consideration is presently being given to having a body of work undertaken to evaluate the impacts of councils moving from one system to another on the basis of attempting to maintain relative status quo in relation to present rating incidence. This would not provide a comprehensive analysis but would aim to demonstrate how a new system with an enhanced set of tools could be utilized to minimize the broad shift in rating impacts. While this may prolong the project further it is considered paramount that councils have a good, if not precise, understanding of the impacts of any changes to the valuation base.

“Flat rating” is still favoured by those councils presently using this arrangement and the State Government is considering the issue in the context of its broad validity within the legislation.
It would appear that there is some appetite for removing doubts about the practice. The public consultation process generated a significant show of support for this system from ratepayers where the system is in place with few respondents from those municipal areas expressing concerns about the practice.

In light of this broad acceptance there is likely to be some pressure on the State Government to validate rather than remove the capacity to rate in this way. Being able to rate on the basis of location is under serious consideration. This would mean that a fixed amount could be charged for a particular suburb. The challenge for councils would be to demonstrate how the charge was derived and to be able to justify differences with other areas. It is not certain as to whether councils hold or have access to data to be able to make such judgments.

Concerns have been expressed by a number of councils about the ability to mirror these arrangements in areas where there is a lack of homogeneity across property types and being able to deliver an outcome that communities may desire but which may not be deliver the expectations being sought.

A suite of rating tools is presently being developed in terms of legislative amendment. An expert working group comprising key rates managers and practitioners has reviewed the proposals and the legislative drafting is progressing. The Association has been forceful in its advocacy on this matter and has acknowledged that while the period available for consultation will be short of the 5 weeks required under the Communication and Consultation Partnership Agreement, it is important for councils to have these capabilities for the upcoming rate setting year. This will require passage of the legislation in April.

Early outlines and drafts shall be provided to councils as soon as they become available and a series of regional workshops will be conducted in the near future to ensure that practitioners have a full understanding and can commence their modeling and considerations at the earliest possible stage.

The types of tools include:

- raising the allowable fixed charge in a general rate from 20 to 50 percent calculated as a percentage of a council’s general rate revenue in that year;
- that the ability to utilise change caps be introduced providing the ability to limit by a percentage, the amount that rates could increase for a property owner in a single year;
- variable service charges be introduced as an option for councils should they wish to use them; and
- that vacant land be recognized as a use under Section 107 of the Local Government Act.

Policy implications
The review is in accordance with LGAT resolutions to conduct an independent analysis of rating and valuation.

Budget Impact
There is no budget impact on LGAT specifically beyond staff time to participate in the review.

8 ITEM: METROPOLITAN COUNCILS GROUP
Contact Officer – Allan Garcia

That the Meeting note the progress of this group and its intended scope of activities
Background comment:
The inaugural meeting of the Metropolitan Councils Group (MCG) was conducted on 28 January 2011. Attended by all eligible councils, the meeting was constructive, informative and conducted with much goodwill. One council outside the membership attended in observer status and Mayor Jock Campbell of Clarence City Council was elected Chair of the Group.

Much of the initial meeting was procedural in the context of agreeing the terms of reference previously endorsed by the General Meeting, electing the chair and establishing protocols and arrangements for meeting agendas and progressing issues.

Meetings of the MCG are to be conducted four times a year and, to the extent possible, held in conjunction with GMC, General or PLGC meetings to minimize travel and maximize participation.

The meeting schedule for the remainder of the year is as follows:

- 19 April 2011 Hobart (in conjunction with PLGC Meeting)
- 5 August 2011 Devonport
- 16 November 2011 Launceston (tbc) (in conjunction with General Meeting)

It was agreed that a strategic plan for the MCG would be developed at its August Meeting.

Among the matters that the MCG will consider progressing are the following:

- State economic development strategy from a metropolitan council perspective.
- Bus services and public transport – presentations from Metro on future directions and issues such as inter-city transport.
- Planning for urban growth.
- Matters associated with ports and developing a closer relationship with Tasports and engendering a strategic approach to port decisions and activities in consultation with councils.
- Strategic responses to infrastructure gaps.
- Anti social behaviour and the sharing or working collaboratively on solutions to issues such as graffiti.
- Street openings for utility purposes – protocols, standards, approval regimes, etc.
- Club and pub issues – the relationship between planning and licensing.
- Capital City metropolitan plan, and its broader implications on other metro areas in the state – ensuring that rigour and resource is allocated to the project.
- Stronger interaction with Regional Development Australia – assess additional Local Government representation on the Board, particularly from Metro councils perspective.
- Airports – impacts of regulatory changes on planning and development.
- Economic development – job creation plans of State Government and interface with Local Government.
- Natural gas extension – long term roll out plan – costs and issues associated with roll out in urban areas, strategies to improve present limited roll out.
• Tasmania Together – does the MCG need to have a closer look at goals and make observations from a metro council perspective, is the program still a priority of Government?
• Local health networks.
• Rail – futures and plans.

Priorities for the next meeting include presentations from the State Government on the rail network and TasGas regarding the opportunities to enhance the gas rollout to a greater number of residences in the state. Regional Development Australia will also be considered in the context of the push by the federal Minister, Simon Crean, to utilize these bodies to set priorities and distribute funding for infrastructure projects.

Budget Impact
It was agreed at previous General Meetings that reports on MCG activities be provided to General Meetings.

Current Policy
Consideration of workload and resources to support the MCG will dictate whether additional funding may be required for its operations.

9 ITEM: PROCUREMENT
Contact Officer – Allan Garcia

That the Meeting note the activities of the Association in this area.

Noted

Background comment:
The Association has been progressing a number of procurement opportunities in conjunction with State Associations in other jurisdictions. Perhaps the most significant of these has been a truck contract which has been offered on a national basis. The aggregated purchasing power of Local Government across Australia has meant being able to access trucks at much reduced prices than otherwise would have been available. Importantly in negotiating the contract, much emphasis was placed on the need for the savings to be realized at the manufacturer’s end of the supply chain rather than the local service agent. This has been achieved with councils able to buy locally in the knowledge that the local agent is not being pressured to forego commissions. The contract was advertised in all states and met all the advertising requirements of all the jurisdictions to ensure both access and confidence that the tendering requirements were being met.
Contracts for stationery and vehicle tyres can also be accessed via the Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) but the same rigour was not applied to the advertising arrangements. Effectively, this tender was conducted in Victoria with most national chains responding. Those same respondents operate in Tasmania but some councils have determined that it does not meet their tendering policy requirements. LGAT’s position is that if councils choose to access the contract, it is available. It has been agreed with MAV that all future “joint” procurement arrangements will involve tendering/advertising in Tasmania to ensure that local suppliers have the opportunity to participate and council procurement requirements can be met. It should be noted that the contracts under consideration generally focus on national companies rather than small providers.

The Association has long been involved in aggregated contracts for the supply of uniforms for council staff and the provision of fidelity insurance for member councils.

LGAT is presently considering another “procurement” arrangement that has been taken up by both Western Australia and South Australia. A firm of tax consultants has recently reviewed diesel excise in both these jurisdictions and has discovered several millions of dollars of overpayment by councils. The company effectively audits councils tax payments and if there is any taxation to be refunded, it returns 75% to councils and keeps 25%. If there is no refund, there is no cost to council. LGAT is presently in the process of drawing up documents to provide this service to councils if they seek to take it up.

**Budget Impact**
Small commissions are payable to the Association from transactions associated with aggregated procurement activities, however the savings from purchasing through these arrangements can be significant for councils.

**Current Policy**
Enhanced procurement opportunities support the LGAT policy position of seeking to secure long term financial sustainability in the sector.

### 10 ITEM: FUNDING WASTE MANAGEMENT IN TASMANIA

**Contact Officer – Allan Garcia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern Midlands Council/Hobart City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Members authorise LGAT to undertake discussions with the State Government and the three Regional Waste Bodies on the collaborative establishment of a Local Government structure to manage the proceeds of a State Legislated Waste Levy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carried**

**Votes Against**  
Central Highlands Council  
Clarence City Council  
Devonport City Council  
West Tamar Council

**Abstained from Voting**  
Burnie City Council  
Glamorgan Spring Bay Council  
Flinders Council

**Background comment:**
The State Government and the Local Government Association of Tasmania have, for over a
decade, been debating the introduction of a waste levy to fund waste management in
Tasmania.

The Association has generally vigorously opposed the introduction of a levy on the basis that
it is an unacceptable impost on Councils and communities.

In the 1990’s a Legislative Council Select Committee recommended a waste levy be
introduced. This was the catalyst for the introduction of a $2/tonne levy by the Northern and
North West Councils. The Southern Councils had previously introduced a voluntary $2/tonne
levy on landfill waste.

In 2009 the Tasmanian Waste and Resource Management Strategy (TWRMS) was approved
by the State Government after considerable consultation and input by Local Government.
The Strategy supported the establishment of a Waste Advisory Committee (WAC) to ensure
the successful implementation of the Strategy and to oversee the collaborative efforts in
waste and resource management.

The Waste Advisory Committee was established to formalise links between State
Government, Local Government, regional authorities, industry and the community. Local
Government is represented on the WAC by a nominee from each of the three regions (David
Sales – Southern Region; Harry Galea – Northern Region; Gerald Monson – North West
Region).

The TWRMS (2009) identifies that one of the WAC’s priorities is to advise on funding
mechanisms to deliver the strategy.

The State Environment Protection Authority (EPA) have identified that their preference to
raise funds is the model used in South Australia. This model applies a waste levy on all
waste to landfill, with funds collected distributed 50:50 to the state Environment Protection
Authority and Zero Waste South Australia. Zero Waste South Australia delivers all of South
Australia’s waste reduction / minimisation programs.

All states excluding Tasmania now have a waste levy with varying proportions hypothecated
back into waste reduction programs.

The Table below shows the value of levies across Australia and hypothecation amounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2010 General Levy $/t</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Hypothecation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>SMA $70.80</td>
<td>ERA $65.30</td>
<td>RRA $20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MSW $64.15</td>
<td>C+I $113.85</td>
<td>Imbedded in gate fee;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>$25.20</td>
<td>Metro; Non metro $12.90</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>MSW $30</td>
<td>C+I $30</td>
<td>Rural MSW $15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>$35 from July 2011</td>
<td>Only applies C+I and C+D streams</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>MSW $28</td>
<td>Inert $12m3</td>
<td>metro only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Association’s representatives on the WAC believe that a waste levy is considered
inevitable for Tasmania and supports Local Government being proactive to obtain a funding
model that retains funds raised to support waste programs and not diverted into the State Government’s consolidated revenue.

Typically the cost of recycling is greater than the cost to dispose to landfill. The main principle behind levies is twofold:

1. It increases the cost of landfill disposal to make recycling more competitive;
2. If funds collected from the levy are used to fund waste recycling programs, it reduces the cost of recycling.

What’s the Problem?
The National Waste Policy 2010 based on historical trend, show waste to landfill will grow by 7% p.a. This means, based on 2006 waste figures, that waste to landfill will more than double by 2020.

Landfill data in Tasmania is of limited quality. However, two of the larger landfills in Tasmania, Launceston Waste Centre and Dulverton Landfill, over the past 3 years waste has been increasing at 9% and 7% respectively. In the case of Dulverton Landfill this figure ignores that an additional 30% of waste that would have gone to landfill now gets composted. This compares to Tasmania’s population growth of 0.9% for 2010.

There are four main reasons why increasing waste to landfill is a concern:

1. Landfills are Local Government’s largest source of greenhouse gases.
2. Limited resources, such as paper, glass, steel etc. are lost to landfills.
3. The existing landfills should be managed to ensure maximum life possible as it will be extremely difficult to find new sites in the future.
4. Organic matter should be diverted from landfills for other value added purposes such as compost.

How are the trends reduced?
Although education, container deposit legislation and banning plastic bags are worthy programs they will do little to reduce waste to landfill. To divert significant waste from landfill investment in infrastructure is required. For example, nearly 50% of the waste stream comprises organics, food waste, garden waste and timber for which there are robust technology solutions for today; however seed funding and increasing landfill fees are required to encourage investment in these alternative treatments.

Priorities identified by the three local government waste groups are:

- Kerbside recycling (commingled and organic)
- Improved collection for rural residents
- Commercial and industry materials recovery facilities to improve recycling
- Construction and demolition sorting facilities
- A controlled waste disposal facility
- Waste education

Funding Mechanisms
A levy on all waste disposed to landfill is used by all other states and is considered appropriate for Tasmania.

It is recognised that recycling and processing for most materials costs more than disposal to landfill. A waste levy is a market mechanism that closes the gap between recycling and disposal costs, with the funds raised used to subsidise recycling markets/processes.
Municipal Solid Waste, waste generated by kerbside collection and waste transfer stations, comprise approximately a third of the waste stream, with commercial and industry and construction and demolition comprising of a further third each. If local government were to imposed a waste levy, for every $1 that local government contributed $3 is returned.

Cost to the Community
On average a household produces around 1 tonne of waste a year. If a $10/tonne levy was imposed then additional charges through rates would be $10/tonne. Recent waste studies on behalf of North and North West Councils indicate that $20/tonne is a more appropriate level but there are concerns as to whether an increase of 1000% is tolerable or could be sold to the community.

Benefits and Disbenefits of a Levy
The main benefits of a levy is reducing the increased trend of waste to landfill and as such reducing greenhouse gas emissions and greater recovery of resources. Other benefits of greater resource recovery are:

- Greater employment. For every 2,200 tonnes of waste recycled 1 direct and 1.8 indirect jobs are created. Assuming waste to landfill remains stable in Tasmania at around 500,000 tonnes per year, then 500,000 tonnes a year would be recycled by 2020 creating around 230 direct and 400 indirect jobs. That's 630 ongoing jobs across Tasmania.
- Organic waste would be diverted from landfill to be composted. Application of organic material back in Tasmania's agricultural soils, gives Tasmania a comparable advantage over other agricultural regions.
- Waste activities in Tasmania would be better aligned with Brand Tasmania.

The negatives of a levy are:
- Some funds collected would be lost through administrative requirements.
- Cost to the community and businesses.
- Provides an opportunity for the state to collect additional taxes.

Issues for Consideration
The Local Government Association of Tasmania’s current policy on levies is “no state imposed levy”, and while this still may be desirable it must be recognised that a waste levy will likely be imposed with or without Local Government’s support.

It is recommended that the Association review its position on waste levies and commence negotiations with the State. Issues to be considered in this review are:

- The existing $2/tonne is insufficient to facilitate change. A more realistic levy would be $10/tonne generating around $5m per year
- The existing voluntary system is not suitable as preliminary legal advice is that Councils cannot impose a levy on private landfills. It is therefore likely that as the levy increases from $2/tonne to $10/tonne waste will be diverted to private operators. Therefore the state will need to introduce enabling legislation to facilitate the ability to raise levies from private landfills.
- The State’s EPA preferred position is the South Australian model where 50% of the funds collected are used to fund the Environment Protection Authority. Consideration needs to be given to potential governance structures which allow State and Local Government representation and minimises the funds used by the State for funding their activities.
- It should be noted that in terms of various initiatives identified within the Waste Strategy, there are no costings nor is there any understanding of the expectation of the State Government in relation to the level of funding it may be seeking beyond the proposition of receiving 50% of whatever is collected.
• The preferred position discussed by the Northern Tasmanian Waste Management Group and Cradle Coast Waste Management Group is a levy of $10/t applying to all waste types with the proceeds managed either centrally or regionally. If controlled centrally, then by an organisation primarily managed by a skills based Local Government Committee/Board.

Budget Impact
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

11 ITEM: FINANCIAL AND ASSET MANAGEMENT PROJECT, STAFFING UPDATE
Contact Officer – Katrena Stephenson

That Members note the report.  

Noted

Background comment:
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. Sarah has come from the Department of Treasury and Finance, where she supervised staff in the collection of state taxes for the Revenue Branch and managed stakeholder relations for duty related matters. Prior to that, Sarah worked at Hydro Consulting, managing staff and projects. She has previously worked in investigations with the Ombudsman and was executive officer for two reviews with the Local Government Board.

Under the terms with the Commonwealth, the Steering Committee is to be jointly chaired by the Director of the Local Government Division (Mat 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 2011 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).

A second meeting of the Steering Committee was held on 4 March and the draft Communications Plan and outline for the State Policy on Asset Management was considered.

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

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

### 12 ITEM: CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION
Contact Officer – Katrena Stephenson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derwent Valley Council/Southern Midlands Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Councils contribute $75,000 annually, through subscriptions, into a Constitutional Recognition ‘fighting fund’, with such a fund to be quarantined for a campaign, or refunded if a referendum does not eventuate, to be topped up with LGAT reserves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background comment:**
At the General Meeting in October 2010 the following motion was carried:

“That the meeting agree to a pre-budget paper being brought to the March 2011 General Meeting regarding the Constitutional Recognition campaign.”

The purpose of this paper is to alert councils to the scale of the campaign and seek in-principle support to the development a ‘fighting fund’.

**Context**
Since October 2010, ALGA has written again to all Mayors with a progress update and inviting councils to become directly engaged in the campaign for constitutional recognition.

The campaign for constitutional recognition will focus on financial recognition.
The former ALGA President, Cr Geoff Lake stated –

“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.

It is likely there will be a dual referendum on constitutional recognition of Local Government and Indigenous Australians in 2013. There is much effort still required to maintain the commitment to that referendum and to work with all political parties and communities to ensure the ‘yes’ vote receives a majority in a majority of states.

ALGA has asked that all councils endorse the position they have put forward through formal resolutions in council chambers and lobby their local Federal members of Parliament.

The Campaign

When developing the campaign for Constitutional Recognition, ALGA identified 4 key communications strategies as being essential. These are:

1. Communications to attain agreement within the Local Government sector on the type of recognition.
2. Communications to achieve Government support for a referendum.
3. Communications to raise the profile and standing of Local Government.
4. Communications to campaign up to and during the referendum.

The first two strategies have been achieved as illustrated in the context above. The latter two strategies now need to be resourced and implemented.

In relation to raising the profile and standing of Local Government, a number of Associations, including LGAT have undertaken work to promote councils as employers of choice and it was agreed that Associations would continue to progress this strategy. Our Careers Project, which includes the Think Big, Work Local campaign, is funded only until July 2012.

The campaign up to and during the referendum requires a coordinated public engagement campaign and a ‘yes’/referendum campaign.

Association Policy Directors and Communications/Marketing Managers are meeting in March to develop a detailed plan to support the Constitutional Recognition Campaign which will provide support to each State/Territory campaign and coordinate input to the development of key messages and materials.

The Cost

While traditionally there has been Commonwealth funding of the ‘yes’ campaign, this is not guaranteed and ALGA have decided to take precautionary measures. From late last year ALGA began encouraging Associations to consider making a specific provision for funding a public relations campaign in 2011-12.

ALGA has identified that a significant budget is required for the campaign year – in the order of millions - to be funded by Associations in line with the allocation of subscriptions. This is
in addition to the ongoing state/territory work in building the profile and standing of Local Government.

Options open to LGAT in this case are

1) To fund the Constitutional Recognition Campaign from LGAT reserves.
2) To fund the Constitutional Recognition Campaign through a direct and total invoice to councils – aligned with the subscription formula, once a referendum is certain.
3) To seek part funds annually (eg $75,000 per annum) through the subscription process, to be quarantined for a campaign, or refunded if a referendum does not eventuate, to be topped up using LGAT reserves.

Option 3 is recommended.

**Budget Impact**
Significant, as detailed above

**Current Policy**
Constitutional Recognition for Local Government has been formally supported by the Membership.

13 **ITEM:** **SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES AND INDICATORS**
Contact Officer – Katrena Stephenson

**That the Members note the report.**

**Noted**

**Background comment:**
Following the release of the consultation paper by State Government and 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 and 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 who 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 vs comprehensive indicators vs 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 convened on the 3rd March, prior to the expert working group meeting on the 8th March.

Budget Impact
Within available budget.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

14 ITEM: COMMUNITY SATISFACTION SURVEY
Contact Officer – Katrena Stephenson

That the Members note the report.

Background comment:
This year, LGAT is due to undertake the Community Satisfaction Survey again.

At the August 2009 General Meeting the following motion was carried unanimously:

That the meeting agree to fund future surveys (to be undertaken biannually) through increased subscriptions from councils.

This was in recognition of the potential from positive survey results, particularly when currently the media is focussed on the deficits of councils and amalgamation. All surveys have shown the community are generally very positive about the role of, and services provided by councils.
The Association has commenced an expression of interest process to engage an organization to conduct the survey. The format of the survey will largely mirror previous years so that trend analysis can continue, however questions related to water and sewerage will be removed and some questions to support the constitutional recognition campaign will be added.

The expert working group for the Sustainability Objectives and Indicators Project has identified the satisfaction survey as a primary data source for non-financial strategic priorities. Some additional questions may be considered to boost the survey's utility in that regard.

A copy of the last report, as well as the regional supplement, can be found on the LGAT website. www.lgat.tas.gov.au.

The Association has canvassed councils on the following:

a) is your council likely to want to ‘add on’ to the survey (that is additional questions (2-3) and additional numbers surveyed in your municipality); and

b) does your council feel there are any new whole of sector issues that should be canvassed.

Not additional issues have been identified to date. A few councils are considering an ‘add on’.

It is intended to present the report at the July 2011 General Meeting/Conference.

**Budget Impact**
As outlined above, will be funded through increased subscriptions.

**Current Policy**
As above, to be conducted biannually.

15 **ITEM:** DISABILITY CARE AND SUPPORT REPORT BY THE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION*

Contact Officer – Katrena Stephenson

That the Members note the following report.

That the Members note the following report.

**Noted**

**Background comment:**
On Monday 28th February 2011, the Productivity Commission released its Disability Care and Support Report. This report contains a discussion on a National Injury Insurance Scheme (NIIS), separate from the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

The Productivity Commission are suggesting the Federal Government adopt a two pronged approach. The biggest scheme would be the National Disability Insurance Scheme. Like Medicare it would provide every Australian with access to long-term care if they become significantly disabled. A second much smaller no-fault national injury insurance scheme would be formed by bringing together the various state and territory schemes already in operation and it would provide lifetime support for people with catastrophic injuries. The basis for the Productivity Commission review is that:
“Care and support and related services in Australia for people with disabilities are currently provided predominantly by a combination of an insurance system which provides fully-funded lifetime care benefits for eligible claimants, and a social welfare system comprising a wide range of Commonwealth and State/Territory-based programs. Both systems are in urgent need of reform.

In the case of the insurance system, which predominantly covers a range of injuries, the most significant of which are traumatic spinal cord injury and brain injury, there are wide differences in coverage and entitlement across jurisdictions and across cause of injury. Moreover, because much of this insurance is paid in lump sum form, beneficiaries typically double dip into the wider disability welfare system when their available reserves are extinguished”.

The report includes a proposal that the NIIS should be funding by an impost on rates, refer to Attachment to Item 15.

The Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) have sought a briefing from the Productivity Commission on this report but in the meantime have, through the ALGA President, released this initial response:

"The Disability Care and Support Report by the Productivity Commission is a very important report. ALGA will be considering the issue at its next meeting and will be providing feedback to the Productivity Commission on the report. The National Injury Insurance Scheme (NIIS) proposal is an interesting but complicated proposal. The report does not include detail about how the scheme would work or how it could be practical. As a matter of principle Local Government does not support rates being used to raise general taxation revenue. A number of states have tried in the past to load up the rate system with additional charges and levies and Local Governments have opposed this. Rates provide revenue to fund local services and infrastructure and should not be used for welfare payments or income redistribution. Rates are an efficient tax given that they are levied on non-transportable property but rates are only paid by property owners and yet the benefits of such an insurance scheme would be across the whole community. This is generally a good reason to suggest that such a scheme should be funded through general revenue.”


Such a proposal is clearly at odds with the views of LGAT members as expressed in debates on the fire services levy and proposed ambulance service levy for example. LGAT will join with ALGA and other Associations to vigorously oppose this proposal.

**Budget Impact**

None at this stage.

**Current Policy**

There were Motions against collection of a Fire Service Levy in 2006 and 2007, the Issue was taken up again in 2010.

There was a Motion against an Ambulance Levy in 2008.
That members note the report.

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.

LGAT has prepared a paper for councils circulated to General Managers and Mayors to provide some detail of proposed amendments, ahead of receiving a draft Bill for formal consultation. If councils feel there are issues which remain unaddressed, they should raise them with Dr Katrena Stephenson at LGAT (Katrena.stephenson@lgat.tas.gov.au) as soon as possible.

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 13th of April 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 lunch.

Current Policy
The forum supports current policy in relation to Code of Conduct and the Standards Panel.
That Members note the following report.

Background comment:
The Tasmanian Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program, Chemsafe Homes Tasmania, continues to operate with success around Tasmania. Collections in December 2010 in Spreyton, Burnie, Launceston, Deloraine, Glenorchy, Huonville, Sorell and Tasman yielded over 15000 kg of waste dropped off by 404 participants.

Thus far from 18 drop-off days since beginning in November 2009, the program has collected over 40000 kg of material.

Future collections have been scheduled for March 2011 and will service Kingston, New Norfolk, Brighton, Hamilton, Wynyard, Ulverstone, Sheffield, George Town, St Helens, Triabunna, Oatlands and Campbell Town.

The program coordinator will provide a two year report by June 30, 2011 against a number of key performance indicators such as participation rate, volume of waste collected, cost per kilo collected, number of reported incidents, community attitude, frequency of community approaching councils with household hazardous waste, and other indicators.

Chemsafe Homes Tasmania is promoted using a brochure delivered to all homes across Tasmania. This primary vehicle for advertising the drop-off days is recognised as the best way to ensure the broadest promotion to all Tasmanians residents as the target audience is “householders” and their waste. The collection days are also promoted via media releases, radio interviews and newspaper articles.

Some recent negative feedback from residents receiving a brochure, but not a collection day in their area, has highlighted the desire of residents to have better access to drop-off days and also that the program is successful in raising the awareness of household hazardous wastes.

Budget Impact
Does not apply.

Current Policy
Where possible, the HHW collection program approach is to be aligned with Regional, State and National Controlled Waste Strategies.
 ITEM: ROADS REPORT, CRANES  
Contact Officer – Melanie Brown  

That Members note the following report.  

Background comment:  
It has been a busy start to the year in relation to roads. Following are a number of updates relating to key areas of activity.

COAG Road Reform Plan Feasibility Study – Consultation process  
In December a 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.

The road reform objectives identified by COAG are:

- Promoting the more efficient, productive and sustainable provision and use of freight infrastructure; and
- Ensuring that national heavy vehicle road prices promote the efficient, safe and sustainable use of infrastructure, vehicles and transport modes.

The three key areas for road reform have been identified as:

- Pricing – current network average charges provide negligible signals to heavy vehicle road users about the costs of using particular roads or to infrastructure providers about the demand for different roads;
- Funding – the ‘disconnect’ between heavy vehicle road charges and future road spending can lead to inefficient decisions;
- Incentives – the current arrangements for provision of road infrastructure are unlikely to provide an incentive framework for providing road infrastructure services efficiently.

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 the 21st of 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 along with both State and Local 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 last year 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 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.

One of the predominant issues affecting the granting of permits is the lack of capacity of certain bridges and structures around the state. Obviously the capacity and performance of bridges, like other infrastructure, change and deteriorate as they age, and thus whilst road networks may be capable of withstanding the impact of heavy vehicles and cranes, bridge structures along such networks may prove a weak link and thus preclude access.

DIER intends to devise an electronically available network route map for the various classes of cranes, which indicates clearly where each class may travel, 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;
- 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.

LGAT received a letter of support from Minister O’Byrne in February, indicating the Minister’s commitment to fully considering all potential options to address this matter.

Further, representatives from LGAT met with DIER in 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 2011.

**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 e.g. 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 was 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 Impact**
Does not apply.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.
ITEM: CLIMATE CHANGE UPDATE  
Contact Officer – Melanie Brown

That Members note the following report.

**Noted**

**Climate Change Partnership Agreement**

Subsequent to its General Meeting in November 2010, LGAT has been liaising with the Tasmanian Climate Change Office in an effort to address the key issues requiring modification before Local Government would be willing to enter into a Partnership Agreement with the State Government.

LGAT wrote to the Tasmanian Climate Change Office (TCCO) in November to raise the key issues identified in the General Meeting. It was proposed at the time that in order to progress the Agreement the following process should be considered:

1. That there be a reconvening of the Climate Change Partnership Committee (CCPC) to consider the outcome of the General Meeting and options moving forward and that membership be broadened to include a General Manager (selected through a nomination process).
2. That working groups be established to develop implementation plans associated with each of the actions in the Agreement and that these working groups include officers from Local Government.
3. That a formal consultation schedule be established to ensure that councils are satisfied that the Agreement will deliver the necessary change.
4. That once all partners are happy with the Agreement that the Agreement be signed by the Premier’s Local Government Council.

The CCPC was reconvened in February 2011, and representatives from LGAT met with the Tasmanian Climate Change Office to discuss the issues surrounding a redeveloped Agreement. The CCPC was advised that Nick Heath from Hobart City Council has accepted a nomination to be the representative General Manager on the CCPC and will attend future meetings.

The issue of coastal climate change impacts was noted by the CCPC, along with an acknowledgement that the current planning schemes do not contain adequate mechanisms for dealing with coastal climate change concerns. The Tasmanian Planning Commission is currently developing state-wide Codes, including a coastal vulnerability code, which will be appended to the planning schemes. It is agreed that there needs to be an appropriate process to assist Local Government with coastal climate change impacts to allow increased surety in decision making.

The Natural Hazards Policy Statements could potentially address some of the issues surrounding coastal erosion and inundation.

The proposed way forward for the CCPC is likely to involve the following activities:

- A review of the issues and current practices within Tasmanian councils and other Australian jurisdictions;
- Continued development of Natural Hazards Policy Statements, specifically those relating to coastal inundation and erosion; and
- Development of a state-wide Code on coastal vulnerability, which may include progressing stage two of the Coastal Vulnerability Project.
The TCCO will now work with the Local Government Division and the Tasmanian Planning Commission to develop a process to assist Local Government with coastal climate change impacts. Once this has occurred, the CCPC will meet again.

Working groups and associated timelines will be addressed at the next Committee meeting.

**Planet Footprint**
In January 2010, LGAT reached terms of agreement with Planet Footprint for the provision of data analysis services over the next three years, until the end of 2013. Planet Footprint will provide state-wide or regional aggregated data upon request from LGAT, subject to the terms of the agreement.

**Budget Impact**
Does not apply.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.

---

**20 ITEM: CONFERENCE UPDATE**
**Contact Officer – Stephanie Watson**

| That Members note the following report. | Noted |

**Background comment:**
Arrangements are now underway for the 99th Local Government Conference, to be held at Wrest Point in Hobart from 20-22 July. Special birthday celebrations will be a highlight of the event as 2011 coincides with the 100th year of LGAT. The theme for this year’s conference will be 100 Years Long – 100 Years Strong.

The Conference Dinner will be held at the Hobart Function and Conference Centre on Elizabeth Pier and, in a departure from previous years, the announcement of the Local Government Award winners will not be made at the dinner, but during conference proceedings at Wrest Point on Friday, 22 July. By booking a smaller venue for the dinner, we aim to reduce overall costs of staging the event and, in doing so, pass on those cost savings to delegates in attendance.

Due to the fall in the number of participants attending the Partner’s Program in recent years (just 8 people in 2010), this event will be dropped from the Conference program in 2011.

This year’s ALGWA cocktail function will take place at Government House on 20 July as part of ALGWA’s 60-year birthday celebrations.

The Local Government Awards for Excellence brochure will soon be distributed to councils. All member councils are encouraged to nominate for this year’s Awards to showcase the many outstanding Local Government achievements as we celebrate our association for the last 100 years.

**Budget Impact**
Where possible, LGAT will reduce conference expenditure in ways that will not compromise the quality of the event and aims to pass on those savings to delegates.

Current Policy
Does not apply.

21 ITEM: MOTION: LGAT CONFERENCE

Central Coast Council/Glamorgan Spring Bay

That the LGAT undertake a review of conference structure and costs to ensure the attendance of as many Elected Members and staff as possible.

Carried

LGAT comment:
In organising the Local Government Conference and Dinner, LGAT is mindful of the need to keep costs down to enable maximum participation and to ease the financial burden on councils. This has largely been achieved by gaining substantial financial and in-kind sponsorship support for the event, and through effective negotiation with venues, suppliers, speakers and entertainers for competitive rates. As a highlight of the conference, LGAT is also committed to providing a memorable, quality dinner for delegates as well as an event that our sponsors are proud to support.

In response to council feedback received following the 2008 conference, the cost of the dinner was reduced from $140 (in 2008) to $130 (in 2009 & 2010). To enable this, LGAT ceased the statewide filming and post production of the Awards for Excellence finalists, instead presenting the Awards with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

Due to increasing costs since this time (e.g. venue hire, AV expenses, food and wine), the level of sponsorship for the dinner has been doubled to prevent any additional financial burden on councils.

Other measures which have been taken to minimise costs include reducing spending on theming by up to 40% (despite the perception that the dinners have been more lavish each year). This has been achieved by limiting the total spend and gaining in-kind sponsorship support from the theme artist. The cost of the shuttle bus to and from the dinner is fully subsidised by a sponsor, and LGAT has sought cheaper sources of wine than the expensive varieties typically offered in-house. A very reasonable fee has also been negotiated with all the performing artists for the dinner.

Despite these measures, LGAT has at times run at a loss on the dinner due to unforeseen circumstances, such as when the dinner had to be relocated from the City Hall to the Derwent Entertainment Centre at extremely short notice due to the requirement to use City Hall as a flu clinic during the Swine Flu outbreak.
Measures being taken to reduce the cost of the 2011 dinner include booking a smaller venue (with limited seating), reducing the cost of AV hire at the dinner by staging the Awards presentation during plenary sessions instead, and by hiring a dinner venue that will require less decoration due to its scenic waterfront location.

**Budget Impact**
The conference is run on a cost recovery basis but with significant savings to attendees as a consequence of attracting a high level of sponsorship.

**Current Policy**
The LGAT is required under the Association Rules to run a conference annually.

**22 ITEM: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FORUM**
Contact Officer – Ivan Zwart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Members note a Local Government Community Development Forum was held on 24 March, 2011 in Launceston.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background comment:**
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 from 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**
The forum is being run on a cost recovery basis.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.

**23 ITEM: MOTION: BLUEPRINT FOR AN ACTIVE AUSTRALIA**
Central Coast Council/Kentish Council

That the LGAT encourage the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources to use the document "Blueprint for an active Australia", developed by the Heart Foundation, as a guide for future policy.

Carried

LGAT comment:
LGAT was a member of the ‘Healthy By Design’ steering committee, along with the State Government and other stakeholders, in 2009. The committee assisted The Heart Foundation and Premier’s Physical Activity Council in developing a guidelines paper, titled "Healthy by Design: A guide to planning and designing environments for active living in Tasmania" (2009/2010). The aim of this paper is to provide a powerful tool that assists professionals to incorporate health into daily planning decisions and create environments that encourage physical activity and social interaction.

The guidelines are a valuable resource, providing design considerations for walking and cycling routes, streets, local destinations, open spaces, public transport and strategies for fostering community spirit.

Facilities and spaces that are healthy by design will have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of Tasmanians, providing more access to alternative transport options and more opportunities for physical activity.

As stated in the ‘Healthy By Design’ document, the State Government is currently undertaking several key projects that will influence transport and land use planning outcomes.

The Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) will deliver the following projects:

- Tasmanian Urban Passenger Transport (TUPT) Study
- Tasmanian Passenger Transport (TPF) Framework

The TUPT Study includes the development of a Draft Tasmanian Transport Walking and Cycling Strategy. The strategy sets out actions that provide a starting point from which to ensure that transport and land use systems create a more supportive and encouraging environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

The TPF Framework provides the future direction for sustainably moving people and creating liveable and well-connected urban communities. In developing the framework, the government is focused on improving outcomes in the following key areas that complement the strategies surrounding ‘Healthy by Design’.

- **Liveable and accessible communities**—recognising the need for more compact, connected communities that integrate with existing public transport corridors, reduce overall distances travelled and reduce car reliance through the provision of safe walking and cycling opportunities.
- **Healthy, active communities**—many car based trips are short journeys. There is significant opportunity to substitute many car based trips with walking and cycling.
- **Integrated transport and land use planning**—to ensure land use decisions complement and support the passenger transport system. While land use planning decisions of the past cannot be changed, existing metropolitan areas can be made more sustainable.

Budget Impact
Does not apply.
Current Policy
Does not apply.

24 ITEM: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ANNUAL REPORT *
Contact Officer – Katrena Stephenson

Clarence City Council/Circular Head Council

That all Members agree to support and implement the new Local Government Environmental Health Annual Report.

Carried

Background comment:
The following information has been provided by Environmental Health to support this motion:

Historically LG Annual Reports have been submitted to the Director of Public Health (DPH) in accordance with Local Government Act. There has usually been a small section on Environmental Health (EH) incorporated into that report.

Section 72 of the LGA states -

(1) A council must prepare an annual report containing all of the following:

(ab) a statement of its goals and objectives in relation to public health for the preceding financial year;

(1A) A statement under subsection (1)(ab) is to –

(a) state the extent to which the council has carried out its functions under the Public Health Act 1997 and the Food Act 2003; and

(b) state the resources allocated to public health; and

(c) state the extent to which its goals, objectives, policies and programs in relation to public health met the needs of persons within its municipal area; and

(d) include details of the completion of any strategies.

The information would in most cases have been provided by the Senior Environmental Health Officer however there has been significant variation in the quantity and/or quality of the information.

In some cases we would receive a couple of pages and in other cases, this would amount to only a few paragraphs.
The type of information currently provided consists of the number of –

- registered food businesses
- licensed places of assembly
- vaccinations
- complaints
- water samples

Only about 20% of past annual EH statements have been considered ‘acceptable’. Unfortunately this has not enabled the DPH to make any real assessment of EH status in Tasmania. So what needs to change?

It is the view of the DPH that a separate and more comprehensive environmental health-only report needs to be submitted by LG EHOs. The information/data needs to be

- In a consistent format
- More meaningful
- More qualitative
- More representative
- Linked to an EH assessment

This can be achieved by standardising the reporting tool/format and the DPH is able to do this by virtue of –

Section 27(1)(c) Public Health Act 1997
Section 100 Food Act 2003

These statutes allow the DPH to request information from Councils relating to the performance of functions under the Acts. This would enable them to gain a consistent Statewide picture of environmental health activities and outcomes rather than 29 disparate snap-shots from each Council.

As a consequence of this standardised reporting, there would be an assessment of:

- what’s working across the State and what’s not;
- an early indication of EH issues across State;
- an avenue to inform new policy and/or legislation;
- an opportunity to identify need for new resources; and
- a tool for EHOs to promote the breadth of work to Council and thereby raising its profile within Council.

The data likely to be collected will be -

- Preferably easy to collect
- Not duplicating existing efforts
- Quantitative initially to establish a baseline
- More qualitative data over time;
- In a templated questionnaire format

So what happens to the information? It will be the intention of DHHS to review the data each year and provide feedback (eg trends) to Councils. Ultimately there will be a “State of Environmental Health Report” – possibly every three years.
A draft questionnaire has been developed and is at Attachment to Item 24. This is a prototype of the reporting tool and was based on the tool used in South Australia and modified/adapted for Tasmania. It was developed by a LG Focus Group (that DHHS set up) and has been circulated to all LG EHOs across the State for comment.

If this proposal is adopted then we would expect that the data collection would commence in 2011-2012 and the first LG EH Annual Report would be due in September 2012.

All Senior EHOs have provided feedback on the questionnaire and indicated their willingness to complete this report.

More information can be obtained from Stuart Heggie, State Manager, Environmental Health, Department of Health & Human Services, who giving a presentation at this meeting.

**Budget Impact**
In nearly all cases, the data being collected would ordinarily be kept by the Senior EHOs as part of their day-today work so budget impact would be minimal.

**Current Policy**
Does not apply.

### 25 Item  ENVIRONMENTAL DISPUTE MEDIATION SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer – Katrena Stephenson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobart City Council/Kentish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**That Members endorse financial and planning support for the 2011/2012 financial year for a proposed ‘Environmental Dispute Mediation Service’, to foster the resolution of disputes in the community about environmental management issues.**

Carried

**Background comment:**
A detailed project proposal was presented at the November 2010 General Meeting and received “in-principle” support. Briefly, the proposal originated from the Environment Protection Policy (EPP) Review Panel’s 2007 review of public submissions to the Draft Environment Protection Policy (Noise). One of the recommendations in the Panel’s report was the investigation of the use of mediation procedures as an early step in dealing with noise complaints and in particular, neighbourhood noise complaints. This was essentially recognising that the EPP is not intended for use as a regulatory tool in the same way as, say, the noise regulations under EMPCA.

Informal discussions held with Local Government Environmental Health Officers in 2009 suggested that there could be up to 150 referrals per annum to a state-wide service. Although the original proposal was only intended to deal with noise disputes, there is no reason why it could not be expanded to cover other environmental issues.

The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has confirmed funding of $50,000 from the Environment Protection Fund. The proposal for a 50/50 funding partnership between the Board of the EPA and Local Government (via LGAT) was given in-principle support at the November 2010 General Meeting. The funds are expected to be sufficient for the trial to last for approximately 12 months with ongoing funding to be sought if the trial is successful.
The details of the referrals process and style of agreement will be developed by the EPA in partnership with Local Government and RMPAT, under the direction of the Project’s Steering Committee. Project governance, reporting and evaluation would be overseen by a Steering Committee comprised of senior officers from the administrative and funding partners.

It is expected that the service will free up a significant amount currently spent by Environmental Health Officers in trying to resolve disputes. One of the main objectives of the trial would be to estimate the long term value of such benefits.

**Budget Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost: $50,000 for the 2011/2012 financial year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LGAT will be seeking that an independent review of the project is undertaken prior to any consideration of any future funding.

**26 ITEM: CLOSURE**

There being no further business the President declared the meeting closed at 2.20pm.