



WEDDIN SHIRE COUNCIL

To Avoid Delay when
Replying or Telephoning

Please Quote:

Your Ref:

All Correspondence to be addressed to:
The General Manager
Camp Street or P.O. Box 125
GRENFELL NSW 2810

Tel: (02) 6343 1212
Fax: (02) 6343 1203
Email: mail@weddin.nsw.gov.au
website: weddin.local-e.nsw.gov.au
A.B.N. 73 819 323 291

MINUTES OF THE WEDDIN SHIRE COUNCIL ORDINARY MEETING HELD THURSDAY, 30 MAY 2013 COMMENCING AT 5.00PM

27 May 2013

Dear Councillor

NOTICE is hereby given that an **EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE SHIRE OF WEDDIN** will be held in the Council Chambers, Grenfell on **THURSDAY, 30 MAY 2013**, commencing at **5.00 PM** and your attendance is requested.

(Note: supper on conclusion)

Yours faithfully

T V LOBB
GENERAL MANAGER

BUSINESS:

To consider the Independent Local Government Review Panel's preliminary "Future Directions" report.

AGENDA:

1. Apologies
2. Correspondence
3. Reports (a) General Manager
(b) Director Corporate Services
4. Closure

PRESENT: The Mayor Clr M J Liebich in the Chair, Crs, G B Halls, G McClelland, A C Griffiths, C Brown and J E Parlett.
General Manager (T Lobb), Director Corporate Services (G Carroll), Director Engineering (W Twohill) and Director Environmental Services (B Hayes).

APOLOGY: Cr J C Niven, N W Hughes.

RESOLVED: Cr Brown and Cr Halls that the apologies be accepted.

The Mayor formally welcomed Council's new Director Environmental Services Mr Brendan Hayes to Weddin Shire Council and on behalf of Council wished Brendan all the very best in his future endeavours.

**CORRESPONDENCE TO BE PRESENTED TO THE EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING OF
THE WEDDIN SHIRE COUNCIL HELD, 30 MAY 2013**

SECTION C - Matters for consideration

1. Report on Financial Assessment, Sustainability and Benchmarking for Weddin Shire Council (8 March 2013) by TCorp.

Previously forwarded – see Reference Material

2. Report on Financial Sustainability of the NSW Local Government Sector (April 2013) by TCorp

Previously forwarded – see Reference Material.

3. Report on Future Directions for NSW Local Government – Twenty Essential Steps (April 2013) by the Independent Local Government Review Panel

Previously forwarded – see Reference Material.

4. Position Paper on Local Government Reform Heads of Consideration (21 May 2013) by CENTROC

See Reference Material.

5. Advice to Centroc on submission to Review Panel into Local Government (14 May 2013) by Blayney Shire Council

See Reference Material.

RESOLVED: Cr Brown and Cr Parlett that the correspondence be noted except where otherwise resolved.

27 May 2013

The Mayor and Councillors
Weddin Shire Council
GRENFELL NSW 2810

Dear Councillors

I wish to report as follows:

1. Introduction

This extra-ordinary meeting was called to discuss the implications of the preliminary report titled “Future Directions for NSW Local Government – Twenty Essential Steps” produced by the Independent Local Government Review Panel.

Submissions on this report are invited up until Friday 28 June 2013. The final report by the Panel is now due in September 2013, following which the NSW Government will consider its adoption, part or otherwise.

In response to a request from councillors to simplify the report, I have attempted to summarise the main issues of each section and have provided some comments on the matters raised. Assessments of the available options are given at the end.

Step 1. Face the Challenges of Change

Main Issues - population growth/decline
 - aging population
 - mining vs agriculture
 - new technologies
 - tighter fiscal environment
 - increased efficiency and productivity

Comments - whilst the latest census shows the shire population is stable, there is a shift from rural residents to Grenfell.
 - the aging population requires increased health services and increased attention to facilities such as footpaths, wheelchair ramps, handrails etc.
 - new mining will offer opportunities for employment and for economic growth, but at the expense of agricultural production.
 - grants are unlikely to increase
 - more services may have to be tendered eg. garbage collection.

Step 2. Create a Sustainable System

Main Issues - great weight is placed on ‘strategic capacity’ and an adequate revenue base.
 - regional groupings are supported, but not ROCs
 - need to balance increased scale with loss of ‘local’ connection.
 - ‘new look’ county councils are proposed for strategic functions.
 - amalgamations are an essential element
 - government’s policy of ‘no forced amalgamations’ was acknowledged.
 - concern expressed that there is little likelihood of voluntary amalgamations.

- Comments
- Weddin's Financial Sustainability Rating was 'moderate', which indicates it has an adequate capacity to meet its financial obligations in the short to medium term (being the next five years), but may not be able to address the infrastructure backlog.
 - Weddin was given an outlook of 'Negative' which indicates the FSR is likely to deteriorate.
 - information on the 'local boards' is yet to be provided.
 - amalgamations are clearly on the table.
 - The next State election in 2015 may see the Government change its policy of no forced amalgamations.

Step 3. Keep the 'Local' in Local Government

- Main Issues
- the need to retain local identity is acknowledged,
 - post-amalgamation options are discussed
 - Local Boards are proposed as one option but no information on them is available
 - they are proposed for rural councils with population less than 5000
 - they are also proposed as a transitional measure to amalgamation.
- Comments
- it is not possible to comment on 'local boards' at this stage.
 - they are likely to be an inferior substitute for the present councils.

Step 4. Confront Financial Realities

- Main Issues
- The TCorp report is referred to and underpins this section
 - the TCorp report expresses concern at :
 - operating deficits
 - deteriorating sustainability
 - the annual asset management gap
 - the infrastructure backlog
 - regional performance
 - "at risk" councils are defined as having:
 - Moderate FSR and Negative outlook
 - population less than 10,000 in 2036
 - declining or marginal populations
 - low rating base
- Comments
- aspects of the TCorp report are discussed in the Director Corporate Services report following,
 - the only 'at risk' criteria that Council can immediately address is the 'Negative' Outlook (see Item 2 following),
 - staff are already planning to review the asset management calculations to better reflect the actual service life of various assets.
 - extending asset lives, adopting residual values will decrease the infrastructure backlog and depreciation.

Step 5. Ensure Fiscal Responsibility

- Main Issues - doesn't mean low rates and no loans
 - responsible approach is to increase rates, have an operating surplus, and borrow for the infrastructure backlog.
 - small councils with limited staff resources,
 - Shortage of personnel with necessary financial and asset management skills
 - Delivery Program embeds fiscal responsibility
- Comments - following changes adopted at the May meeting, Weddin will not have a deficit in 2013/14 and has proposals for borrowings and a special rate variation in 2014/15.
 - Weddin does have a low rate base
 - Weddin does have limited staff resources
 - the amended Long Term Financial Plan shows a surplus after 2013/14.

Step 6 Bolster the Revenue Base

- Main Issues - options for rate-pegging are discussed
 - pensioner concessions should be reviewed
 - non-rateable land should be reviewed eg forests, national parks
 - councils should make applications for Special Rate Variations (SRVs)
 - general increase up to 3% above the rate peg suggested.
 - distribution of FAGs should be reviewed.

- Comments - Weddin has already agreed to submit a SRV application for 2014/15.

Step 7 Tackle the Infrastructure Backlog

- Main Issues - the TCorp report nominates the annual asset management gap and the cumulative infrastructure backlog as the highest priority.
 - TCorp nominated Weddins infrastructure backlog as \$9.6m, based on Schedule 7.
- Comments - Staff are already planning to review the service life of assets to better reflect the actual service life of various assets.
 - extending service lives will decrease the infrastructure backlog and depreciation

Step 8 Promote Innovation, Productivity and Competitiveness

- Main Issues - assessing service quality and efficiency needs to be part of the performance framework
 - the need to adapt best practice is promoted
 - skills shortages are of growing concern
 - an important and innovative element of IPR is the requirement for councils to prepare a 4 year workforce strategy.
- Comments - smaller councils like Weddin received constant feedback from the community.
 - Weddin has suffered from skill shortages at specialist level eg.DES
 - best practice is being pursued but can meet opposition,
 - regional contracts can improve efficiency at the cost of local employment.

Step 9 Advance Improvement and Accountability

- Main Issues - compliance takes precedence over excellence and innovation
- compliance tasks should be reduced where possible
- benchmarking should be improved
- red tape should be reduced
- internal and performance auditing should be strengthened
- an AGM is suggested.
- Comments - Weddin tends to operate on a “shoe string” budget: there is little scope for activities beyond compliance.
- tasks which do not have a public demand (eg annual report) are performed minimally.
- staff do not have the time to complete all the industry surveys we receive.
- decisions are taken to concentrate resources on production and service provision rather than paperwork red tape.

Step10. Improve Political Leadership

- Main Issues - the role of councillors can be confusing and contradictory between community representation and good governance.
- mandatory, ongoing professional development is required.
- there is no definitive evidence regarding the pros and cons of wards.
- limit of 3 terms suggested
- there is a need for more women, young people and minorities
- pre-election awareness sessions are proposed to improve quality of candidates
- Comments - Weddin councillors have generally been held in high regard
- pre-election awareness sessions can also be a deterrent
- the overly-bureaucratic application of the Elections Funding Act requires simplification.

Step 11 Enhance the Status of Mayors

- Main Issues - the current system depends heavily on a close and effective Mayor-GM relationship.
- increasing emphasis is being placed on the mayor as a political and civic leader
- the mayor should be expected to have a thorough grasp of strategic and financial matters
- the mayor should be able to present the budget to the council and community
- mayors will need additional knowledge and skills, and specialised professional development.
- mayors should generally be popularly elected
- the term of a mayor elected by the council should be at least 2 years.
- Comments - conversely, the Local Government Act Review Task Force is espousing a continuation of the present arrangements regarding Mayors and General Managers.

Step 12. Revisit Council – Management Relations

- Main Issues
- the line between ‘policy’ and ‘management’ is often blurred
 - Councils involvement in the organisation structure needs to be clarified,
 - the mayor should lead the appointment and performance reviews of the General Manager
 - the General Manager’s position should be automatically advertised after 10 years service
 - a harmonious and productive relationship between the Mayor and General Manager is essential for the effective functioning of councils.
 - all General Managers should be required to undertake ongoing professional development.
- Comments
- the interpretation of ‘operational matters’ is one of the biggest areas of disagreement between staff and councillors.

Step 13. Build Strong Regions

- Main Issues
- ROCs have played a valuable role in regional advocacy and shared service delivery
 - the panel has concluded that a more robust, statutory framework is required at regional level,
 - new look multi-purpose County Councils could be established,
 - some councils (Weddin is one) would become Local Boards
 - membership of County Councils should comprise the mayors of member councils and the chairs of Local Boards.
 - the chairperson would be the Mayor of the regional centre (ie Orange)
 - the regional centre council (ie Orange) would house the secretariat and support its operations.
 - water utilities (eg CTW) should be incorporated into the County Council.
- Comments
- the proposed County Council is comprised of 12 existing councils and CTW.
 - the exact nature of Local Boards is yet to be explained
 - any such proposal would need to be independent of the regional centre council
 - this type of proposal is favoured by Blayney Shire Council (see correspondence item no 5)
 - centralizing of some specialist services has merit for smaller councils. However this could also be done under a different structure eg.ROC’s.

Step 14. Reconfigure Rural Councils

- Main Issues
- 52 small rural-remote councils are considered ‘at risk’.
 - an over-riding consideration for rural councils is the weakness of their own – source revenue base (ie low rates base)
 - populations of less than 5000 will not normally be sufficient to support a ‘standard’ local government.
 - councils with populations between 5,000 and 10,000 should be kept under review.
 - experience elsewhere indicates that NSW cannot continue to support such a large number of councils with populations less than 10,000
 - the preferred option for Weddin is to “merge” with Forbes and/or Bland Councils.
 - the alternative option is to be a Local Board in the Central West County Council.
 - Weddin is listed with a declining population which is incorrect.

- Comments
- Weddin is considered to have more involvement with Cowra and Young than Forbes, and almost nil with Bland.
 - the changes to Council's forward budget resolved at the May meeting have given Weddin a surplus after only 1 year.
 - this would upgrade the long term outlook from Negative to Neutral, addressing part of the 'at risk' assessment.

Step 15. Reshape Metropolitan Councils

Not applicable to Weddin

Step 16. Strengthen the Hunter, Central Coast and Illawarra

Not applicable to Weddin

Step 17. Establish a "Western Region" Authority

Not applicable to Weddin

Step 18. Progress the State-Local Agreement

- Main Issues
- a cooperative relationship between State-Local Government is crucial.
 - partnerships with Government departments are promoted
 - an amendment to the State Constitution is suggested.

- Comments
- these issues rely almost totally on the good will of the government at the time
 - local government can do little to improve them if there is state government resistance.

Step 19. Refocus Local Government NSW

- Main Issues
- the formation of Local Government NSW (LGNSW) as a single association is applauded
 - promotion of good governance is essential eg. by strengthening professional development and mentoring.
 - LGNSW should give a high priority to reputation management including poor behavior by councils or individual councillors.

- Comments
- these are matters for LGNSW directors to consider.

Step 20. Drive and Monitor Ongoing Reform

- Main Issues
- a temporary Local Government Development Board is proposed to manage reform.
 - various incentives are discussed,
 - a number of "barriers" to reform are listed
 - a proactive role for the Boundaries Commission is suggested.
 - repositioning the Division of Local Government is proposed.

- Comments
- many of the so called barriers are actually significant matters of concern to either or both the councils or the community.

For Information

Noted

2. Option 1 – Standing Alone

There is no doubt that the preferred option of Council and the local community will be to remain as a stand-alone local government area. However the Panel has repeatedly stated that the status quo is not an option, and this view point may well be adopted by the Government, especially if the financial indicators are adverse.

To have any chance of continuing to stand alone, council must address its financial deficiencies.

Council's FST of "moderate" is the minimum for a stand-alone council and is an indication of short to medium term viability. The rating reflects Councils good level of reserves and previous good management.

The problem area is the Council's long-term viability, where TCorp has rated the prospects as Negative. As reported to Council's May meeting, steps need to be taken to lift Council's low rate base. This will be best done by borrowing, with repayment covered by Special Rate Variations and interest rate subsidies.

The alternative budget adopted at Council's May meeting has already made an impact to the Long Term Financial Plan, lifting the bottom line into surplus from 2014/15. Figure 1 shows a comparison between the original 10 year plan and the amended plan based on the alternative budget. On this basis alone, Council can argue its long term outlook should be lifted from 'Negative' to 'Neutral', helping to remove it from the 'at risk' category.

In addition to these financial measures, Council staff are planning to review the asset management plans for the many assets but particularly roads, to ensure that the selected service life corresponds with the actual life. Extension of the service life of assets and provision for residual values will reduce depreciation and the infrastructure backlog, which will also help in maintaining the bottom line in the black.

For Information

Noted

EXTRA-ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING 30 MAY 2013

2012/2022 Long Term Financial Plan									
2012/2016 Delivery Program									
Operational									
Budget 2012/13	Projected 2013/14	Projected 2014/15	Projected 2015/16	Projected 2016/17	Projected 2017/18	Projected 2018/19	Projected 2019/20	Projected 2020/21	Projected 2021/22
\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total income from continuing operations	10971	11355	11752	12164	12589	13030	13486	13958	14447
Total expenses from continuing operations	11383	11781	12344	12767	13204	13657	14127	14611	15113
Operating result from continuing operations	-412	-426	-591	-603	-615	-627	-640	-653	-667
Net operating result for the year	-412	-426	-591	-603	-615	-627	-640	-653	-667
Net operating result for the year before grants and contributions provided for capital purposes	-1242	-1285	-1480	-1523	-1567	-1613	-1661	-1709	-1759

2013/2023 Long Term Financial Plan									
2014/2017 Delivery Program									
Operational									
Projected 2013/14	Projected 2014/15	Projected 2015/16	Projected 2016/17	Projected 2017/18	Projected 2018/19	Projected 2019/20	Projected 2020/21	Projected 2021/22	Projected 2022/23
\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total income from continuing operations	11946	12314	12631	12956	13290	13632	13984	14346	14717
Total expenses from continuing operations	11139	11394	11711	12044	12374	12653	12941	13237	13543
Operating result from continuing operations	807	920	920	911	915	979	1043	1109	1174
Net operating result for the year	807	920	920	911	915	979	1043	1109	1174
Net operating result for the year before grants and contributions provided for capital purposes	-40	56	39	13	-1	45	90	136	182

Figure 1 – Comparison of Long Term Financial Plans

3. Option 2 – Merger with Forbes and/or Bland Shires

Comments in this item are made on the basis that Option 1 is not available.

It is not known why Weddin was nominated to merge with Forbes, except that it is also included in the 'at risk' category, possibly because its projected population in 2036 is only 8,400 and declining. If Weddin had to merge, it would be useful to also consider Cowra and Young as alternatives.

Another factor is that only 2.4% of Weddin Shire residents work in Forbes Shire, whereas 5.4% work in Cowra Shire and 6.1% in Young Shire which indicates that Grenfell residents are more aligned to Young and Cowra than Forbes.

A comparison of the TCorp ratings for the nearby councils is given in Figure 2 below:

Council	FSR	Outlook	Population 2036
Bland	Weak	Neutral	5,200 (declining)
Forbes	Moderate	Neutral	8,400 (declining)
Cowra	Sound	Negative	13,500
Young	Sound	Negative	14,800
Weddin	Moderate	Negative	3,000 (declining)

Figure 2 – Comparison of TCorp Ratings

A major concern of mergers is the effect on rates. The table below (Figure 3) compares the average rates for the surrounding councils in 2010/11.

Council	Residential	Business	Farmland
Cowra	\$402	\$2408	\$1344
Forbes	\$626	\$2341	\$1966
Young	\$484	\$2348	\$1753
Weddin	\$363	\$917	\$1106

Figure 3 – Comparison of Average Rates (2010/11)

This table clearly shows that Weddin Shire ratepayers will suffer a significant increase in rates whichever neighbouring council is merged with.

For Information

Noted

4. Option 3 – Central West County Council

The Panel's report recommends that Weddin become a Local Board within the proposed Central West County Council. It is difficult to properly assess this option when the details of these local boards are unknown. However it would cover a huge area with Weddin on its extremity, so the level of service for Weddin Shire would be expected to be low, and ratepayers would have to travel to Orange to see an official. The major decision making would be remote and unlikely to be influenced by local priorities. As much as the Panel talks up the need for stronger and viable councils, there is no doubt the effect on a community like Weddin's would be significantly adverse, almost to the point of disenfranchisement.

However, the idea of having specialist services concentrated in a central office may have merit. Weddin has experienced difficulties in the past in attracting people like planners and designers, so a county council with specific responsibility may be a way to cope with the problems. It could also be the design and technical centre for water and sewer operations, and could lead to the rationalization of common functions such as payroll and rates in time. Alternatively these services may be available at cost from another council. Eg. Cowra, Young or Forbes Councils.

A full county council as proposed by the Panel is not considered a good option, even if the 12 member councils were ever to agree on how to form it.

For Information

Noted

5. Consideration of Options

There is no doubt the Panel's report is causing a lot of angst and has thrown much of local government into turmoil. Never-the-less Council must itself participate in the self-examination process and keep an open mind on the options should any one be declared unavailable.

There are a number of decisions that Council needs to make, as covered by the following:

RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that:

- (i) Council prioritise the options in order of preference,
- (ii) Council authorise the Mayor and General Manager to meet with their counterparts in the surrounding shires to discuss possible options for cooperation (or mergers, in the event this may be required.)
- (iii) Council consider its submission to the Panel (by 28 June 2013).

RESOLVED: Cr McClelland and Cr Brown that:

- i) Council's first preference is to stand alone and develop a Regional Alliance of Councils (RAC) with surrounding councils or a Regional Strategic Council (RSC) through Centroc.
- ii) Council authorise the Mayor and General Manager to meet with their counterparts in the surrounding shires to discuss possible options for cooperation.
- iii) consideration of the County Council model and amalgamations be deferred pending further information.

RESOLVED: Cr McClelland and Cr Halls that except where otherwise dealt with the General Manager's report be adopted.

T V LOBB
GENERAL MANAGER

27 May 2013

The General Manager
Weddin Shire Council
GRENFELL NSW 2810

Dear Councillors

I wish to report as follows:

1. TCorp Report, A1.6

The final Financial Assessment, Sustainability and Benchmarking Report undertaken by TCorp has been received by Council.

The report has been prepared for the Division of Local Government, the Independent Review Panel and Council. It determined Councils Financial Sustainability Rating (FSR) to be moderate in the short to medium term and negative in the long term.

THE REPORT

While we are aware that we need to change to remain financially viable over the next ten years the report was very disappointing in its “methodology” for the following reasons:

- the report which will be used by the Independent Review Panel to assist forming their opinion or conclusions, appears to be designed to “paint” a very bad picture of all Councils financial position.
- there has been no recognition that Councils are increasingly being “squeezed” financially as our income is being reduced (ie rate pegging and we do not receive a share of the GST) and our expenditure/costs are increasing at an alarming rate.
- there has been no recognition of Council having to fund “unfunded mandates” or cost shifting from the State Government.
- there has been no recognition that Councils are required to use a Commercial Accounting Standard on a Local Government/Public Authority. As a consequence Councils are being forced to include millions of dollars in our operating statements as a depreciation expense as we are required to depreciate assets such as roads, buildings and various amenities.
- while it is accepted that depreciation is a legitimate operating expense it is unrealistic to expect Councils to be able to fund this exorbitant expense if our funding is restricted by rate pegging , not being able to receive a share of the GST as well as having our access to other revenue sources restricted. As stated previously depreciation is accounted for in Councils operating statement causing an operating loss which is one of the key criteria TCorp is using against Councils in determining their financial sustainability.
- in regards to Asset Management and more specifically infrastructure backlog the data TCorp used was from Special Schedule 7 in Councils financial statements which is unaudited. Not only is the data unaudited it is unreliable as it was only an estimate and Councils were not aware this data was going to be used against them in an Assessment, Sustainability and Benchmarking report.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER REGIONAL COUNCILS

Listed below is a comparison of the Financial Sustainability Ratings (FSR) and outlooks of various Regional Councils in comparison to Weddin Shire:

Table 1

Council	FSR	Outlook
Blayney	Moderate	Negative
Bland	Weak	Neutral
Boorowa	Moderate	Negative
Coolamon	Sound	Negative
Cowra	Sound	Negative
Forbes	Moderate	Neutral
Harden	Moderate	Negative
Lachlan	Moderate	Negative
Parkes	Moderate	Negative
Temora	Sound	Neutral
Young	Sound	Negative
Weddin	Moderate	Negative

FUTURE DIRECTION

While we need to object to the method in the way the report was undertaken we also need to realise and accept that we need to change to remain viable in the long term and continue to operate as Weddin Shire Council.

Listed below are actions we could consider and continue to consider undertaking to assist in achieving this goal:

- utilise borrowings to fund various future capital projects.
- apply for the interest rate subsidy under the Local Infrastructure Renewal Scheme.
- apply for a special rate variation to fund borrowings for specific projects.
- endeavour to source additional Federal Government Grants.
- campaign for Rural and Regional areas to receive a greater share of the Financial Assistance Grants (FAG).
- endeavour to receive a share of the GST.
- endeavour to receive a share of mining royalties.
- continue to campaign against unfunded mandates.
- accept depreciation as a legitimate operating expense. However, at the next valuation of roads introduce a residual value and extend the life of the asset which will reduce the depreciation expense considerably.
- as a last option consider reducing the level of service which would reduce expenses. However, this may not be a desirable course of action.

We also need to continue with resource sharing, bulk purchasing and training initiatives through organisations such as Centroc as well as considering other options that may provide opportunities to undertake these initiatives on a Regional basis while still remaining as Weddin Shire Council.

At the ordinary meeting on Thursday 16 May, Council resolved as follows:

That Council:

- i) submit an objection to the Member for Burrinjuck the Hon Katrina Hodgkinson in regards to the “methodology” used in formulating the TCorp report and request the matter to be taken up with the Minister for Local Government.*
- iii) submit an objection to Local Government NSW and request they also take the issue up with the Minister for Local Government.*

This resolution is currently in the process of being implemented.

We also need to advise that while we have various objections to the report we do accept that we need to take various measures to ensure fiscal responsibility and that we achieve the long term goal of financial sustainability.

RECOMMENDATION: That Council:

- ii) advise that while Council has various objections to the report we accept that we need to change, confront financial realities and are planning to take various measures to ensure fiscal responsibility and that we achieve the long term goal of financial sustainability.
- iv) continue to consider the options and actions as detailed in the Future Direction section as listed above.

RESOLVED: Cr Brown and Cr Parlett that Council:

- ii) advise that while Council has various objections to the report we accept that we need to change, confront financial realities and are planning to take various measures to ensure fiscal responsibility and that we achieve the long term goal of financial sustainability.
- iv) continue to consider the options and actions as detailed in the Future Direction section as listed above.

GLENN CARROLL
DIRECTOR
CORPORATE SERVICES

RESOLVED: Cr Brown and Cr Griffiths that except where otherwise dealt with the Director Corporate Services report be adopted.

CLOSURE: There being no further business the meeting closed at 6.50 pm.

Taken as read and confirmed as a true record this day 20 June 2013.

..... General Manager.....Mayor