

SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS IN THE BASE GRANT MODEL

Replacement of the Unemployment Cost Adjustor with a

SEIFA based Cost Adjustor

Commission Decision - CD20-01

October 2019

STATE GRANTS COMMISSION



Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
TRIENNIAL REVIEW CONTEXT	5
1. BACKGROUND TO REVIEW OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT COST ADJUSTOR	6
2. PROPOSAL TO REPLACE UNEMPLOYMENT COST ADJUSTOR WITH AN IRSD INFORMED SEIFA COST ADJUSTOR	9
3. DESIGN OF THE NEW COST ADJUSTOR	11
4. FEEDBACK	13
SUBMISSIONS AND TIMEFRAMES	14
APPENDICES	15

Executive Summary

The State Grants Commission's Base Grant Model currently includes an Unemployment Cost Adjustor as a proxy measure for measuring socio-economic factors/demographics of a community and effects on council expenditure.

Over the past two years, the Commission has:

- Asked councils if socio-economic factors are appropriately reflected in the Commission's Unemployment Cost Adjustor, and if not, what would be a better measure of the impacts. The Commission heard from councils that socio-economic factors/demographics of a community do impose on councils and this impost is much more broadly felt than the areas that the Commission's Unemployment Cost Adjustor currently applies¹; and
- Designed a potential cost adjustor based on the Socio-Economic Indexes For Areas (SEIFA) using the Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage (IRSD) measure and modelled the potential impact of such a cost adjustor in the Commission's Base Grant Model compared to the Commission's existing Unemployment Cost Adjustor.

The Commission consulted with councils on DP19-01 as part of the 2019 Hearings and Visits, and received written submissions on the SEIFA IRSD proposal. The feedback received from councils on the proposal indicated consistent support. The Commission discussed with councils the effect of concentrations of disadvantaged, the quantum of the costs adjustor (redistributive effect) and the expenditure categories to which a SEIFA Cost Adjustor should apply.

Following consideration of the submissions from councils and after further consideration of the relationship between the expenditure categories impacted by lower SEIFA ranked councils, the Commission has now made a decision that instead of its Unemployment Cost Adjustor, it would adopt an IRSD SEIFA Cost Adjustor as follows:

- commencing from the end of the 2019-22 Triennium;

¹ The Dropping off the Edge Index (<https://dote.org.au/findings/full-report/>) was also suggested but the Commission determined that the socio-economic review only focus on using the SEIFA indicator.

Commission Decision CD20-01 SEIFA IRSD Cost Adjustor

- based on whole Local Government Areas rather than at the Australian Bureau of Statistics' Statistical Area Level 4 (SA4) level;
- applying to the Planning and Community Amenities expenditure category only; and,
- with an expenditure redistributive impact of at least \$1 million.

The Commission is circulating this proposal to councils to seek final views on this methodology change prior to its implementation.

Subject to council feedback and in line with the Commission's Triennium policy, this change is expected to first apply for determining the 2021-22 Financial Assistance Grant allocations.

Triennium Review Context

The State Grants Commission (the Commission) is an independent statutory body established under the *State Grants Commission Act 1976* and is responsible for recommending the distribution of Australian Government and State Government funds to Tasmanian local government authorities. To ensure that the distribution of available funds is as equitable and contemporary as possible, the Commission continually monitors council practices and updates assessment methods and data where appropriate.

To provide some structure to updating the distribution methods of the Australian Government Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs), the Commission operates a triennial review policy whereby major methodology changes are introduced only every three years, with data updates and minor changes applied every year.

Overview of Triennial Review Period (FAGs)

Distribution	Action
2018-19	Method Changes + Data Updates
2019-20	Data Updates
2020-21	Data Updates
2021-22	Method Changes + Data Updates

As part of the Commission's review process, and in accordance with the Commission's 2019-22 Triennium Work Plan, the Commission is advising councils of its preliminary decision to remove the Unemployment Cost Adjustor it currently uses in its Base Grant Model and replace it with a SEIFA IRSD informed cost adjustor at the conclusion of the current triennium.

The Commission is providing councils with the opportunity to comment further on the Commission's preliminary decision, prior to implementation.

1. Background to review of the Unemployment Cost Adjustor

Currently the only socio-economic related cost adjustor the Commission recognises in its Base Grant Model is the Unemployment Cost Adjustor. Appendices 1 and 2 detail both the current design and its redistributive effect of the Unemployment Cost Adjustor based on the 2018-19 Base Grant Model. The 2018-19 Base Grant Model has been used for the purposes of this paper to maintain consistency with discussions with councils as part of DP19-01.

In December 2017 the State Grants Commission (the Commission) released as part of its suite of publications to discuss with councils at the 2018 Hearings and Visits, a Conversation Starter paper titled *CS18-02: Socio-economic Impacts*. The Conversation Starter sought council comments on how different demographic groups presented challenges for councils beyond the standard service delivery cost for its population. The Commission asked councils if different demographic groups presented challenges for councils, and if so, which groups and in what forms were the challenges manifesting. The Commission sought this information to help it understand the main issues and drivers, and extent of the impacts, councils were experiencing as a result of different demographic groups in each municipality. The Commission sought to understand the extent to which these may, or may not, be adequately captured, or are consistent with, the Commission's Unemployment Cost Adjustor relativities and expenditure categories (Health Housing and Welfare and Law Order and Public Safety).

At its 2018 Hearings and Visits conducted in February-March 2018 and in written submissions received by the Commission, the Commission heard that socio-economic factors/demographics of a community impose costs on councils, these cost imposts have a much broader impact on council expenditure than the categories to which the Commission's current Unemployment Cost Adjustor applies, and these are influenced by the characteristics of the local government area's population such as income, education, health, and cultural background.

The following is a list of the examples provided by councils as demonstrating how the socio-economic characteristics of its population affect service delivery/expenditure priorities:

- an ageing population places greater demand on council services and infrastructure needs, along with the necessity to continue using traditional engagement and communication methods;
- most councils have some involvement in youth programs, support, or the employment of dedicated youth officers;
- a lack of youth transport to further education or for employment is requiring some councils to provide some services to help support its community;
- the provision of support services to assist residents from varying cultural backgrounds;
- the provision of support services to assist residents with disabilities; and
- the need to consider differing service delivery in areas where unemployment and low incomes are prevalent.

In the cities and some coastal areas, councils noted that there is an extreme divide between the wealthy and low income areas, and this also creates challenges for rating and revenue raising. While noting this, the Commission's review of the socio-economic effects review in the 2019-22 Triennium has been limited to only be considering the impacts of socio-economic factors on councils' expenditure requirements. It did not consider matters relating to the capacity to pay.

At the 2018 Hearings and Visits there was a considerable amount of support expressed for the Commission to replace its Unemployment Cost Adjustor with some measure that reflects the broader socio-economic factors that councils face. Of those councils seeking to have a socio-economic indicator included in the Base Grant Model, there was wide, although not total, support for using the Socio-Economic Indexes For Areas (SEIFA) index which is produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) every five years. Some reasons given for supporting the use of a SEIFA informed cost adjustor included that it is available for all local government areas, is an ongoing and periodically available indicator that has extensive rigour underpinning its calculation. It is a widely recognised and understood measure of population demographics, designed to return a statistically comparative measure between different geographic areas.²

Previous Commissions have considered the possibility of using SEIFA in the Base Grant Model. However, at that time it was determined that an unemployment measure was a reasonable proxy for measuring socio-economic disadvantage. This approach was taken on the basis that SEIFA, whose results are ordinal (1st, 2nd, 3rd...) rather than cardinal (1, 2, 3,...) in nature, is only available from census data, while unemployment data is obtainable annually. Therefore the Unemployment Cost Adjustor was retained because of its simplicity, and the availability of timely data.

Due to the broadening of the socio-economic factors impacting on councils, the Commission considered it appropriate to review this matter again and sought councils' views and comments

² The Dropping off the Edge Index (<https://dote.org.au/findings/full-report/>) was also suggested but the Commission determined that the socio-economic review only focus on using the SEIFA indicator.

Commission Decision CD20-01 SEIFA IRSD Cost Adjustor

on the proposal to change the Commission's method for assessing expenditure requirements for councils.

The Commission first proposed and sought feedback from councils on the proposed cost adjustor and its suitability as a replacement to the Commission's existing Unemployment Cost Adjustor.

The Commission has decided against augmenting the Unemployment Cost Adjustor with a SEIFA based enhancement.

For background information on the review undertaken to date, please refer to: [DP19-01 - Socio-economic Factors in the Base Grant Model - Proposal to replace the Unemployment Cost Adjustor with ah SEIFA based Cost Adjustor.](#)

2. Proposal to replace Unemployment Cost Adjustor with an IRSD informed SEIFA Cost Adjustor

The Unemployment Cost Adjustor currently only redistributes expenditure of approximately \$1 million in the Health, Housing and Welfare and Law Order and Public Safety expenditure categories of its Base Grant Model(Refer Appendices 1 and 2), whereas the effects councils reported incurring included expenditure areas such as community amenities and community halls. Expenditure of this type, however, forms a subset of the Commission's Planning and Community Amenities and Recreation and Culture expenditure categories respectively (Refer Appendix 4).

The Commission is of the view that disadvantages arising from socio-economic demographics of a population do exist, and that a cost adjustor solely based on unemployment statistics does not fully reflect the situations facing councils. The Commission has designed, and intends to replace the current Unemployment Cost Adjustor at the end of the 2019-22 Triennium with, an IRSD SEIFA Cost Adjustor to give a more holistic, inclusive view of socio-economic disadvantage. The Commission has also decided to apply this new cost adjustor to Planning and Community Amenities expenditure category only. The Commission is of the view that this will result in outcomes being more justifiable and reflective of councils' relative socio-economic disadvantage in accordance with the research project findings of expenditure category correlations.

Furthermore, the Commission has decided to remove its Unemployment Cost Adjustor at the conclusion of the 2019-22 Triennium.

The Commission is now seeking council feedback on its intended direction, prior to implementation.

The Commission also notes that the issue of the ageing population was raised by most councils as part of the 2019 Hearings and Visit discussions. Councils provided numerous examples of the impact the ageing population is having on councils, included:

Commission Decision CD20-01 SEIFA IRSD Cost Adjustor

- increased demand for higher level services and facilities to maintain fitness. This ranged from providing outdoor equipment, constructing walking tracks and other improvements to infrastructure. Several councils indicated they were having to accelerate their footpath renewal programs by many years, and footpaths are now needing to be wider to enable mobility scooters to navigate;
- increased demand for public transport services as the ageing population stop driving. Councils are increasingly putting on public transport services e.g. community cars to get people to and from medical or other appointments and installing and reinstalling bus stops.
- Reduced opportunity to achieve savings, with the higher age demographic increasing the cost of communication as this demographic generally prefers to engage with councils in traditional manners such as standard mail and participating in community forums.
- The impact on employers and employment was also raised. For example, small businesses operators who have global markets now wanting to retire, but struggling to find anyone to take over the businesses. Councils are also directly affected in terms of the ageing of their workforce, as its skilled and senior management workforce is increasing approaching retirement age,

The Commission notes the issues raised by councils in response to an increase in the proportion of older population. While noting the issues, the Commission also notes that Tasmania's population is ageing overall and that all municipalities are experiencing this.

The Commission has since determined that ageing in itself is not having a disproportional impact on some councils more than others. Rather, the aspects of disadvantage that can occur as people age, will be reflected and captured in the SEIFA scores.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that no further action needs to be taken in relation to the issue of the ageing profile of communities itself.

3. Design of the new Cost Adjustor

The Commission has designed its IRSD SEIFA cost adjustor (Refer Appendices 5 and 8), using a similar design as the Victorian Grants Commission SEIFA cost adjustor. This weights councils based on their SEIFA score and relative populations.

This SEIFA IRSD cost adjustor uses the SEIFA IRSD scores from the ABS and weights them by population on a scale of between 1 and 2 - with the council with the least IRSD disadvantage (currently Hobart) being assigned an index of 1, and the council with the most disadvantage (currently George Town) being assigned an index of 2. Councils are then ranked relatively between these two scores, based on their score relative to the minimum and maximum IRSD scores. The index is then converted to a population weighted raw cost adjustor. The Population Weighted Average (PWA) cost adjustor range is set to a value that results in a redistributive effect approximately similar to that created by the current Unemployment Cost Adjustor.

The use of the 1-2 range enables those councils with the most disadvantaged population to rank higher than those with the least disadvantaged populations.

The 2018-19 Base Grant Model has been used to demonstrate the modelling of the SEIFA IRSD Cost Adjustor impact.

Appendix 5 reflects the proposed design of the SEIFA IRSD Cost Adjustor as discussed with councils in DP19-01. The range factor of 2.6 per cent when applied to Planning and Community Amenities and Recreation and Culture expenditure categories as per the DP19-01 Appendices, provided an expenditure redistributive effect similar to the current Unemployment Cost Adjustor.

Appendix 6 demonstrates the changes to the expenditure categories from the Unemployment Cost Adjustor to the new SEIFA IRSD Cost Adjustors in matrix format. The expense categories to which the cost adjustor is applied has now been changed to the Planning & Community Amenities expenditure category only. Appendix 7 shows that the expenditure redistributive effect of the cost adjustor, if applied to only the Planning and Community Amenities expenditure category and using the same range factor as in DP19-01, is only \$306 803 overall (with Glenorchy City Council receiving the most expenditure redistribution benefit of \$65 730).

Commission Decision CD20-01 SEIFA IRSD Cost Adjustor

Appendices 8 and 9 reflect the modelled expenditure redistributive effects of the proposed SEIFA IRSD Cost Adjustor, and its expenditure redistributive effect on the new expenditure category if the range factor of the cost adjustor is increased to 7.5 per cent to have a similar expenditure redistributive effect as the Unemployment Cost Adjustor. Under these conditions, the total expenditure redistributive effect overall is \$902 817 (with Glenorchy City Council receiving the most expenditure redistribution benefit of \$193 420). This compares to the Unemployment Cost Adjustor's expenditure redistributive effect overall of \$924 594 (and Launceston City Council receiving the most expenditure redistribution benefit of \$262 078).

4. Feedback

The Commission has now made a decision that instead of its Unemployment Cost Adjustor, it would adopt an IRSD SEIFA Cost Adjustor as follows:

- commencing from the end of the 2019-22 Triennium;
- based on whole Local Government Areas rather than at the Australian Bureau of Statistics' Statistical Area Level 4 (SA4) level;
- applying to the Planning and Community Amenities expenditure category only; and,
- with an expenditure redistributive impact of at least \$1 million.

Please advise if your council has any further feedback or data on the Commission's Decision.

Submissions and timeframes

The Commission invites comments and input from councils on the issues raised within this Commission Decision paper.

Submissions should be forwarded to the Commission Executive Officer as follows:

- By post: Executive Officer
State Grants Commission
GPO Box 147
HOBART TAS 7001
- By email: SGC@treasury.tas.gov.au

Submissions close on Friday **24 December 2019**.

Further details regarding the annual assessments and methodology used by the Commission can be found in the [State Grants Commission 2018-19 Annual Report, including 2019-20 Financial Assistance Grant Recommendations](#), the [State Grants Commission 2019-20 Financial Assistance Grant Data Tables](#) and the [State Grants Commission Financial Assistance Grant Distribution Methodology](#) paper. These documents are available on the Commission website. Go to the Commission webpage (<https://www.treasury.tas.gov.au/state-grants-commission>) and then click Methodology and Publications.

Any queries should be directed to the Executive Officer on (03) 6166 4274.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1 UNEMPLOYMENT COST ADJUSTOR - as per Base Grant Model 2016-17 Expenditures, 2018-19 Base Grant Distributions

	DATA			Pop Weighted Avg (PWA)		COST ADJUSTOR				
	Population	Unemployment Rate	Unemployment Index	STEP 1	STEP 2	RAW CA	Range Factor	Ranged CA	Rank	
	2017p <i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = b / Avg b</i>	<i>d = a x c</i>	<i>e = Σd / Σa</i>	<i>f = c / e</i>	RF-> 4.420	<i>g = (c+RF)/(e+RF)</i>		
Break O'Day	6 167	11.05%	1.75	10 796		1.729		1.136	2	
Brighton	16 872	10.37%	1.64	27 708		1.622		1.116	3	
Burnie	19 245	7.34%	1.16	22 367		1.148		1.028	10	
Central Coast	21 908	5.04%	0.80	17 503		0.789		0.961	22	
Central Highlands	2 139	8.27%	1.31	2 803		1.294		1.055	7	
Circular Head	8 145	4.04%	0.64	5 209		0.632		0.931	27	
Clarence	55 659	5.06%	0.80	44 606		0.791		0.961	20	
Derwent Valley	10 148	8.90%	1.41	14 303		1.392		1.073	5	
Devonport	25 317	7.33%	1.16	29 386		1.146		1.027	11	
Dorset	6 715	6.46%	1.02	6 872		1.011		1.002	14	
Flinders	943	6.52%	1.03	974		1.020		1.004	13	
George Town	6 846	11.37%	1.80	12 329		1.778		1.145	1	
Glamorgan Spring Bay	4 555	5.09%	0.81	3 675		0.797		0.962	19	
Glenorchy	46 790	9.40%	1.49	69 648		1.470		1.088	4	
Hobart	52 191	4.06%	0.64	33 594		0.636		0.932	26	
Huon Valley	16 919	7.38%	1.17	19 777		1.154		1.029	9	
Kentish	6 319	5.55%	0.88	5 554		0.868		0.975	16	
King Island	1 614	1.87%	0.30	479		0.293		0.868	29	
Kingborough	36 734	3.56%	0.56	20 703		0.557		0.917	28	
Latrobe	11 108	4.11%	0.65	7 236		0.643		0.934	25	
Launceston	67 004	8.56%	1.36	90 832		1.339		1.063	6	
Meander Valley	19 583	4.63%	0.73	14 366		0.724		0.949	24	
Northern Midlands	13 128	5.14%	0.81	10 685		0.804		0.963	18	
Sorell	14 648	5.90%	0.93	13 687		0.923		0.986	15	
Southern Midlands	6 103	5.05%	0.80	4 886		0.791		0.961	21	
Tasman	2 389	6.58%	1.04	2 488		1.029		1.005	12	
Waratah-Wynyard	13 791	5.20%	0.82	11 366		0.814		0.965	17	
West Coast	4 176	8.15%	1.29	5 390		1.275		1.051	8	
West Tamar	23 721	4.85%	0.77	18 222		0.759		0.955	23	
STATE TOTAL	520 877	AVG = 6.31%		527 445	PWA = 1.013	PWA = 1.000		PWA = 1.000		
						max = 1.778		max = 1.145		
						min = 0.293		min = 0.868		

APPENDIX 2 2018-19 BGM COST ADJUSTOR IMPACTS: UNEMPLOYMENT - The effect of the Unemployment Cost Adjustor on each expenditure category (2016-17 Data)

	GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE	HEALTH HOUSING AND WELFARE	LAW ORDER AND PUBLIC SAFETY	PLANNING & COMMUNITY AMENITIES	WASTE MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENT	RECREATION AND CULTURE	OTHER	TOTAL EXPENDITURE EFFECT	IMPACT ON APPLICABLE EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES	IMPACT ON NON-ROADS EXPENDITURE	RANK - % ON NON-ROADS EXP	2017-18 BGM TOTAL CA EFFECT
Break O'Day	+ 0	+ 40 082	+ 11 819	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 51 900	+13.6%	+0.9%	2	+ 54 279
Brighton	+ 0	+ 93 554	+ 27 586	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 121 140	+11.6%	+0.8%	3	+ 145 885
Burnie	+ 0	+ 25 360	+ 7 478	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 32 838	+2.8%	+0.2%	10	+ 74 852
Central Coast	+ 0	- 41 221	- 12 155	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 53 376	-3.9%	-0.3%	22	- 34 990
Central Highlands	+ 0	+ 5 613	+ 1 655	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 7 268	+5.5%	+0.4%	7	+ 8 019
Circular Head	+ 0	- 26 763	- 7 892	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 34 654	-6.9%	-0.5%	27	- 36 056
Clarence	+ 0	- 103 517	- 30 524	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 134 041	-3.9%	-0.3%	20	- 156 896
Derwent Valley	+ 0	+ 35 465	+ 10 457	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 45 922	+7.3%	+0.5%	5	+ 68 149
Devonport	+ 0	+ 33 017	+ 9 736	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 42 753	+2.7%	+0.2%	11	+ 87 151
Dorset	+ 0	+ 640	+ 189	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 828	+0.2%	+0.0%	14	- 4 621
Flinders	+ 0	+ 167	+ 49	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 216	+0.4%	+0.0%	13	- 518
George Town	+ 0	+ 47 523	+ 14 013	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 61 536	+14.5%	+1.0%	1	+ 58 116
Glamorgan Spring Bay	+ 0	- 8 253	- 2 434	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 10 686	-3.8%	-0.3%	19	- 9 747
Glenorchy	+ 0	+ 196 097	+ 57 823	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 253 920	+8.8%	+0.6%	4	+ 256 240
Hobart	+ 0	- 169 568	- 50 000	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 219 568	-6.8%	-0.5%	26	- 257 484
Huon Valley	+ 0	+ 23 291	+ 6 868	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 30 159	+2.9%	+0.2%	9	+ 40 160
Kentish	+ 0	- 7 437	- 2 193	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 9 629	-2.5%	-0.2%	16	+ 672
King Island	+ 0	- 10 178	- 3 001	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 13 179	-13.2%	-0.9%	29	- 13 033
Kingborough	+ 0	- 145 253	- 42 831	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 188 084	-8.3%	-0.6%	28	- 220 072
Latrobe	+ 0	- 35 335	- 10 419	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 45 755	-6.6%	-0.4%	25	- 43 958
Launceston	+ 0	+ 202 397	+ 59 681	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 262 078	+6.3%	+0.4%	6	+ 220 434
Meander Valley	+ 0	- 48 119	- 14 189	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 62 308	-5.1%	-0.3%	24	- 81 859
Northern Midlands	+ 0	- 22 973	- 6 774	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 29 747	-3.7%	-0.2%	18	- 42 768
Sorell	+ 0	- 10 089	- 2 975	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 13 064	-1.4%	-0.1%	15	- 24 197
Southern Midlands	+ 0	- 11 396	- 3 360	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 14 756	-3.9%	-0.3%	21	- 11 993
Tasman	+ 0	+ 609	+ 180	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 789	+0.5%	+0.0%	12	+ 9 645
Waratah-Wynyard	+ 0	- 22 886	- 6 748	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 29 634	-3.5%	-0.2%	17	- 13 902
West Coast	+ 0	+ 10 230	+ 3 017	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 13 247	+5.1%	+0.3%	8	+ 23 534
West Tamar	+ 0	- 51 056	- 15 055	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 66 111	-4.5%	-0.3%	23	- 95 042
<i>SUM REDISTRIBUTED</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>714 045</i>	<i>210 549</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>924 594</i>				<i>1 047 136</i>
<i>AS PROPN OF CAT EXP</i>	<i>0.000%</i>	<i>2.866%</i>	<i>2.866%</i>	<i>0.000%</i>	<i>0.000%</i>	<i>0.000%</i>	<i>0.000%</i>		<i>2.866%</i>	<i>0.142%</i>		

APPENDIX 3 COMPARISON OF UNEMPLOYMENT COST ADJUSTOR AND SEIFA RELATIVE RANKINGS

Unemployment	Cost adjustor 2017-18 BGM				Cost adjustor 2018-19 BGM				12 mth change in CA ranking	SEIFA indexes 2016 Census			Change	
	Population	Unemployment (Jun 15-Jun 16)			Population	Unemployment (Jun 16-Jun 17)				(IRSD ranking order)	IRSD			difference between Unemployment Ranking v SEIFA Ranking
council	2016p	Rate	Adjustor	Rank	2017p	Rate	Adjustor	Rank		council	Score	Ranking		
Break O'Day	6 453	10.97%	1.135	3	6 167	11.05%	1.136	2	↑	Break O'Day	893	5	↓	-3
Brighton	16 101	11.29%	1.146	1	16 872	10.37%	1.116	3	↓	Brighton	869	2	↓	1
Burnie	19 779	8.66%	1.061	8	19 245	7.34%	1.028	10	↓	Burnie	915	9	↓	1
Central Coast	22 313	5.98%	0.975	17	21 908	5.04%	0.961	22	↓	Central Coast	952	18	↓	4
Central Highlands	2 301	8.51%	1.056	9	2 139	8.27%	1.055	7	↑	Central Highlands	894	6	↓	1
Circular Head	8 187	4.57%	0.929	26	8 145	4.04%	0.931	27	↓	Circular Head	936	14	↑	13
Clarence	55 175	5.34%	0.954	21	55 659	5.06%	0.961	20	↑	Clarence	1002	27	↓	-7
Derwent Valley	10 045	10.16%	1.109	4	10 148	8.90%	1.073	5	↓	Derwent Valley	891	4	↓	1
Devonport	25 579	8.47%	1.055	10	25 317	7.33%	1.027	11	↓	Devonport	902	7	↓	4
Dorset	7 078	6.44%	0.989	14	6 715	6.46%	1.002	14	↓	Dorset	917	10	↓	4
Flinders	786	6.44%	0.989	15	943	6.52%	1.004	13	↑	Flinders	976	24	↓	-11
George Town	6 870	10.99%	1.136	2	6 846	11.37%	1.145	1	↑	George Town	857	1	↓	0
Glamorgan Spring Bay	4 528	5.69%	0.965	20	4 555	5.09%	0.962	19	↑	Glamorgan Spring Bay	939	16	↓	3
Glenorchy	46 143	9.54%	1.089	5	46 790	9.40%	1.088	4	↑	Glenorchy	906	8	↓	-4
Hobart	51 127	4.25%	0.919	27	52 191	4.06%	0.932	26	↑	Hobart	1043	29	↓	-3
Huon Valley	16 577	7.98%	1.039	12	16 919	7.38%	1.029	9	↑	Huon Valley	967	22	↓	-13
Kentish	6 497	6.82%	1.002	13	6 319	5.55%	0.975	16	↓	Kentish	939	15	↓	1
King Island	1 583	2.65%	0.867	29	1 614	1.87%	0.868	29	↓	King Island	988	25	↓	4
Kingborough	36 197	3.73%	0.902	28	36 734	3.56%	0.917	28	↓	Kingborough	1038	28	↓	0
Latrobe	11 097	4.79%	0.936	23	11 108	4.11%	0.934	25	↓	Latrobe	965	21	↓	4
Launceston	67 181	8.40%	1.053	11	67 004	8.56%	1.063	6	↑	Launceston	940	17	↓	-11
Meander Valley	19 801	4.70%	0.933	25	19 583	4.63%	0.949	24	↑	Meander Valley	970	23	↓	1
Northern Midlands	12 758	5.09%	0.946	22	13 128	5.14%	0.963	18	↑	Northern Midlands	959	19	↓	-1
Sorell	14 146	5.91%	0.972	18	14 648	5.90%	0.986	15	↑	Sorell	962	20	↓	-5
Southern Midlands	6 303	5.81%	0.969	19	6 103	5.05%	0.961	21	↓	Southern Midlands	934	13	↑	8
Tasman	2 404	8.77%	1.065	7	2 389	6.58%	1.005	12	↓	Tasman	925	12	↓	0
Waratah-Wynyard	14 276	6.28%	0.984	16	13 791	5.20%	0.965	17	↓	Waratah-Wynyard	918	11	↓	6
West Coast	4 435	9.42%	1.085	6	4 176	8.15%	1.051	8	↓	West Coast	871	3	↓	5
West Tamar	23 343	4.73%	0.934	24	23 721	4.85%	0.955	23	↓	West Tamar	1000	26	↓	-3
STATE TOTAL	519 063	AVG = 6.68%	PWA = 1.000		520 877	AVG = 6.31%	PWA = 1.000							

Note: the 12 month change in population in the Unemployment section of the above table, includes the impact of the population rebasing by the ABS.

APPENDIX 4 EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES

STATE GRANTS COMMISSION EXPENDITURE CATEGORY	CDC/ABS FUNCTION
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	<u>Legislative, Executive, Financial & Fiscal Affairs</u>
LAW ORDER AND PUBLIC SAFETY	<u>Public Order, Fire and Safety</u>
HEALTH HOUSING & WELFARE	<u>Nursing Homes/Aged care</u>
HEALTH HOUSING & WELFARE	<u>Nursing and convalescent home services</u>
HEALTH HOUSING & WELFARE	<u>Aged Services</u>
HEALTH HOUSING & WELFARE	<u>Community and Public Health</u>
HEALTH HOUSING & WELFARE	<u>Housing</u>
HEALTH HOUSING & WELFARE	<u>Welfare</u>
WASTE MANAGEMENT & ENVIRONMENT	<u>Household Garbage/Solid Waste Management</u>
WASTE MANAGEMENT & ENVIRONMENT	<u>Other Protection of the Environment</u>
WASTE MANAGEMENT & ENVIRONMENT	<u>Protection of biodiversity and habitat</u>
PLANNING & COMMUNITY AMENITIES	<u>Community and Regional Development</u>
PLANNING & COMMUNITY AMENITIES	<u>Community Amenities</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Sport and Physical Recreation venues and facilities</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Recreation Parks & Reserves</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Sport and Physical Recreation services n.e.c.</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Libraries</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Art Museums</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Other Museums and Cultural Heritage</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Performing Arts</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Cultural or Arts Services n.e.c.</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Community Centres and Halls</u>
RECREATION & CULTURE	<u>Recreation, Culture and Religion n.e.c.</u>
ROADS	<u>Road, Bridge and Street Infrastructure</u>
ROADS	<u>Local</u>
ROADS	<u>State</u>
ROADS	<u>Commonwealth</u>
ROADS	<u>Road Plant, Parking and Other Road Transport</u>
OTHER	<u>Water</u>
OTHER	<u>Sewerage</u>
OTHER	<u>Air, Water, Rail Transport and Communications</u>
OTHER	<u>Education</u>
OTHER	<u>Fuel and Energy</u>
OTHER	<u>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</u>
OTHER	<u>Mining, Manufacturing and Construction</u>
OTHER	<u>Other Economic Affairs</u>
OTHER	<u>Other Purposes</u>

APPENDIX 5 PROPOSED SEIFA IRSD COST ADJUSTOR - (ALL COUNCILS)

	DATA		
	Population	SEIFA IRSD Score	SEIFA
	2017p	Rate	Index
	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	$c = b / Avg\ b$
Break O'Day	6 167	894	1.80
Brighton	16 872	871	1.92
Burnie	19 245	915	1.69
Central Coast	21 908	952	1.49
Central Highlands	2 139	891	1.82
Circular Head	8 145	940	1.55
Clarence	55 659	1002	1.22
Derwent Valley	10 148	893	1.81
Devonport	25 317	902	1.76
Dorset	6 715	918	1.67
Flinders	943	967	1.41
George Town	6 846	857	2.00
Glamorgan Spring Bay	4 555	939	1.56
Glenorchy	46 790	906	1.74
Hobart	52 191	1043	1.00
Huon Valley	16 919	962	1.44
Kentish	6 319	939	1.56
King Island	1 614	988	1.30
Kingborough	36 734	1038	1.03
Latrobe	11 108	970	1.39
Launceston	67 004	936	1.58
Meander Valley	19 583	976	1.36
Northern Midlands	13 128	959	1.45
Sorell	14 648	965	1.42
Southern Midlands	6 103	934	1.59
Tasman	2 389	917	1.68
Waratah-Wynyard	13 791	925	1.63
West Coast	4 176	869	1.94
West Tamar	23 721	1000	1.23
STATE TOTAL	520 877		1.5523
Min Value:		857	2
Max Value:		1043	1

Pop Weighted Avg (PWA)	
STEP 1	STEP 2
$d = a \times c$	$e = \Sigma d / \Sigma a$
11 107	
32 474	
32 489	
32 626	
3 887	
12 655	
67 928	
18 332	
44 509	
11 228	
1 328	
13 692	
7 102	
81 254	
52 191	
24 287	
9 852	
2 091	
37 721	
15 468	
105 549	
26 637	
19 057	
20 791	
9 679	
4 007	
22 540	
8 083	
29 205	
757 770	PWA = 1.455

COST ADJUSTOR				
RAW CA	Range	Ranged	CA	Rank
$f = c / e$	Factor			
	RF-> 19.826		$g = (c+RF)/(e+RF)$	
1.238			1.016	6
1.323			1.022	3
1.160			1.011	9
1.024			1.002	18
1.249			1.017	4
1.068			1.005	17
0.839			0.989	27
1.242			1.017	5
1.208			1.014	7
1.149			1.010	11
0.968			0.998	22
1.375			1.026	1
1.072			1.005	15
1.194			1.013	8
0.687			0.979	29
0.987			0.999	20
1.072			1.005	15
0.891			0.993	25
0.706			0.980	28
0.957			0.997	23
1.083			1.006	14
0.935			0.996	24
0.998			1.000	19
0.976			0.998	21
1.090			1.006	13
1.153			1.010	10
1.123			1.008	12
1.330			1.023	2
0.846			0.989	26
PWA = 1.000			PWA = 1.000	
max = 1.375			max = 1.026	
min = 0.687			min = 0.979	

APPENDIX 6 COST ADJUSTOR APPLICATION MATRIX

CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT COST ADJUSTOR MATRIX APPLICATION

	<-- ABSENTEE POPN	<-- CLIMATE	<-- DISPERSION	<-- ISOLATION	<-- POPN DECLINE	<-- REGIONAL RESPNSIB	<-- SCALE (ADMIN)	<-- SCALE (OTHER)	<-- TOURISM	<-- U/EMPLOYMENT	<-- WORKER INFLUX
Largest CA shift	33.8%	10.1%	20.0%	30.1%	5.4%	34.2%	200.0%	50.0%	9.0%	14.5%	5.9%

STEP 2. ALLOCATE COST ADJUSTORS (X), TO EACH EXPENDITURE CATEGORY (Y)

	<-- ABSENTEE POPN	<-- CLIMATE	<-- DISPERSION	<-- ISOLATION	<-- POPN DECLINE	<-- REGIONAL RESPNSIB	<-- SCALE (ADMIN)	<-- SCALE (OTHER)	<-- TOURISM	<-- U/EMPLOYMENT	<-- WORKER INFLUX
GENERAL ADMIN											
EDUCATION HH&W											
LAW ORDER PUB SAFETY											
PLANNING & COMM AMENITIES											
WASTE MGT & ENVIRONMT											
RECREAT & CULTURE											
OTHER											

	<-- ABSENTEE POPN	<-- CLIMATE	<-- DISPERSION	<-- ISOLATION	<-- POPN DECLINE	<-- REGIONAL RESPNSIB	<-- SCALE (ADMIN)	<-- SCALE (OTHER)	<-- TOURISM	<-- SEIFA	<-- WORKER INFLUX
SEIFA COST ADJUSTOR MATRIX APPLICATION											
Largest CA shift	33.8%	10.1%	20.0%	30.1%	5.4%	34.2%	200.0%	50.0%	9.0%	2.6% & 7.5%	5.9%
STEP 2. ALLOCATE COST ADJUSTORS (X), TO EACH EXPENDITURE CATEGORY (Y): PROPOSAL for SEIFA Indicator											
GENERAL ADMIN											
EDUCATION HH&W											
LAW ORDER PUB SAFETY											
PLANNING & COMM AMENITIES											
WASTE MGT & ENVIRONMT											
RECREAT & CULTURE											
OTHER											

APPENDIX 7 PROPOSED SEIFA IRSD COST ADJUSTOR - (ALL COUNCILS) - The effect of the SEIFA Cost Adjustor on each expenditure category (2016-17 Data)

	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	HEALTH HOUSING AND WELFARE	LAW ORDER AND PUBLIC SAFETY	PLANNING & COMMUNITY AMENITIES	WASTE MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENT	RECREATION AND CULTURE	OTHER	TOTAL EXPENDITURE EFFECT	IMPACT ON APPLICABLE EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES	IMPACT ON NON-ROADS EXPENDITURE	RANK - % IMPACT ON NON-ROADS
Break O'Day	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 10 647	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 10 647	+2.8%	+0.2%	6
Brighton	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 39 530	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 39 530	+3.8%	+0.3%	3
Burnie	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 22 392	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 22 392	+1.9%	+0.1%	9
Central Coast	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3 763	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3 763	+0.3%	+0.0%	18
Central Highlands	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3 865	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3 865	+2.9%	+0.2%	4
Circular Head	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 4 019	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 4 019	+0.8%	+0.1%	17
Clarence	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 65 036	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 65 036	-1.9%	-0.1%	27
Derwent Valley	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 17 792	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 17 792	+2.8%	+0.2%	5
Devonport	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 38 279	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 38 279	+2.4%	+0.2%	7
Dorset	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 7 273	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 7 273	+1.7%	+0.1%	11
Flinders	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 217	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 217	-0.4%	-0.0%	22
George Town	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 18 609	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 18 609	+4.4%	+0.3%	1
Glamorgan Spring Bay	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 2 370	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 2 370	+0.8%	+0.1%	15
Glenorchy	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 65 730	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 65 730	+2.3%	+0.2%	8
Hobart	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 118 342	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 118 342	-3.7%	-0.2%	29
Huon Valley	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 1 629	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 1 629	-0.2%	-0.0%	20
Kentish	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3 287	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3 287	+0.8%	+0.1%	16
King Island	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 1 280	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 1 280	-1.3%	-0.1%	25
Kingborough	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 78 370	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 78 370	-3.4%	-0.2%	28
Latrobe	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 3 452	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 3 452	-0.5%	-0.0%	23
Launceston	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 40 245	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 40 245	+1.0%	+0.1%	14
Meander Valley	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 9 234	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 9 234	-0.8%	-0.1%	24
Northern Midlands	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 208	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 208	-0.0%	-0.0%	19
Sorell	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 2 588	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 2 588	-0.3%	-0.0%	21
Southern Midlands	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3 993	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3 993	+1.1%	+0.1%	13
Tasman	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 2 652	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 2 652	+1.8%	+0.1%	10
Waratah-Wynyard	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 12 350	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 12 350	+1.4%	+0.1%	12
West Coast	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 10 008	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 10 008	+3.9%	+0.3%	2
West Tamar	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 26 446	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 26 446	-1.8%	-0.1%	26
SUM REDISTRIBUTED	0	0	0	306 803	0	0	0	306 803			
AS PROPN OF CAT EXP	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.555%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%		0.951%	0.047%	

APPENDIX 8 PROPOSED SEIFA IRSD COST ADJUSTOR - (ALL COUNCILS) - increased range factor

SEIFA COST ADJUSTOR (SEIFA SCORES ALL, Revised Range Factor)

	DATA			Pop Weighted Avg (PWA)		COST ADJUSTOR			
	Population	SEIFA IRSD Score	SEIFA	STEP 1	STEP 2	RAW CA	Range	Ranged	Rank
	2017p	Rate	Index			$f = c / e$	Factor	CA	
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	$c = b / Avg\ b$	$d = a \times c$	$e = \sum d / \Sigma a$	$RF \rightarrow 5.777$	$g = (c+RF)/(e+RF)$			
Break O'Day	6 167	894	1.80	11 107		1.238		1.048	6
Brighton	16 872	871	1.92	32 474		1.323		1.065	3
Burnie	19 245	915	1.69	32 489		1.160		1.032	9
Central Coast	21 908	952	1.49	32 626		1.024		1.005	18
Central Highlands	2 139	891	1.82	3 887		1.249		1.050	4
Circular Head	8 145	940	1.55	12 655		1.068		1.014	17
Clarence	55 659	1002	1.22	67 928		0.839		0.968	27
Derwent Valley	10 148	893	1.81	18 332		1.242		1.049	5
Devonport	25 317	902	1.76	44 509		1.208		1.042	7
Dorset	6 715	918	1.67	11 228		1.149		1.030	11
Flinders	943	967	1.41	1 328		0.968		0.994	22
George Town	6 846	857	2.00	13 692		1.375		1.075	1
Glamorgan Spring Bay	4 555	939	1.56	7 102		1.072		1.014	15
Glenorchy	46 790	906	1.74	81 254		1.194		1.039	8
Hobart	52 191	1043	1.00	52 191		0.687		0.937	29
Huon Valley	16 919	962	1.44	24 287		0.987		0.997	20
Kentish	6 319	939	1.56	9 852		1.072		1.014	15
King Island	1 614	988	1.30	2 091		0.891		0.978	25
Kingborough	36 734	1038	1.03	37 721		0.706		0.941	28
Latrobe	11 108	970	1.39	15 468		0.957		0.991	23
Launceston	67 004	936	1.58	105 549		1.083		1.017	14
Meander Valley	19 583	976	1.36	26 637		0.935		0.987	24
Northern Midlands	13 128	959	1.45	19 057		0.998		1.000	19
Sorell	14 648	965	1.42	20 791		0.976		0.995	21
Southern Midlands	6 103	934	1.59	9 679		1.090		1.018	13
Tasman	2 389	917	1.68	4 007		1.153		1.031	10
Waratah-Wynyard	13 791	925	1.63	22 540		1.123		1.025	12
West Coast	4 176	869	1.94	8 083		1.330		1.066	2
West Tamar	23 721	1000	1.23	29 205		0.846		0.969	26
STATE TOTAL	520 877		1.5523	757 770	PWA = 1.455	PWA = 1.000		PWA = 1.000	
Min Value:		857	2			max = 1.375		max = 1.075	
Max Value:		1043	1			min = 0.687		min = 0.937	

APPENDIX 9 PROPOSED SEIFA IRSD COST ADJUSTOR - (ALL COUNCILS) - Increased range factor - The effect of the SEIFA Cost Adjustor on each expenditure category (2016-17 Data)

	GENERAL ADMINISTRAT ION	HEALTH HOUSING AND WELFARE	LAW ORDER AND PUBLIC SAFETY	PLANNING & COMMUNITY AMENITIES	WASTE MANAGEMEN T AND ENVIRNEMEN	RECREATION AND CULTURE	OTHER	TOTAL EXPENDITURE EFFECT	IMPACT ON APPLICABLE EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES	IMPACT ON NON-ROADS EXPENDITURE	RANK - % IMPACT ON
Break O'Day	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 31 330	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 31 330	+8.2%	+0.6%	6
Brighton	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 116 324	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 116 324	+11.1%	+0.8%	3
Burnie	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 65 893	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 65 893	+5.5%	+0.4%	9
Central Coast	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 11 073	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 11 073	+0.8%	+0.1%	18
Central Highlands	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 11 373	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 11 373	+8.6%	+0.6%	4
Circular Head	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 11 826	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 11 826	+2.3%	+0.2%	17
Clarence	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 191 380	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 191 380	-5.6%	-0.4%	27
Derwent Valley	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 52 355	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 52 355	+8.3%	+0.6%	5
Devonport	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 112 643	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 112 643	+7.2%	+0.5%	7
Dorset	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 21 402	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 21 402	+5.1%	+0.3%	11
Flinders	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 639	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 639	-1.1%	-0.1%	22
George Town	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 54 760	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 54 760	+12.9%	+0.9%	1
Glamorgan Spring Bay	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 6 973	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 6 973	+2.5%	+0.2%	16
Glenorchy	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 193 420	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 193 420	+6.7%	+0.5%	8
Hobart	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 348 239	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 348 239	-10.8%	-0.7%	29
Huon Valley	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 4 794	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 4 794	-0.5%	-0.0%	20
Kentish	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 9 673	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 9 673	+2.5%	+0.2%	15
King Island	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 3 767	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 3 767	-3.8%	-0.3%	25
Kingborough	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 230 617	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 230 617	-10.1%	-0.7%	28
Latrobe	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 10 157	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 10 157	-1.5%	-0.1%	23
Launceston	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 118 427	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 118 427	+2.9%	+0.2%	14
Meander Valley	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 27 174	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 27 174	-2.2%	-0.2%	24
Northern Midlands	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 613	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 613	-0.1%	-0.0%	19
Sorell	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 7 617	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 7 617	-0.8%	-0.1%	21
Southern Midlands	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 11 750	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 11 750	+3.1%	+0.2%	13
Tasman	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 7 803	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 7 803	+5.3%	+0.4%	10
Waratah-Wynyard	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 36 341	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 36 341	+4.3%	+0.3%	12
West Coast	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 29 450	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	+ 29 450	+11.4%	+0.8%	2
West Tamar	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 77 821	+ 0	+ 0	+ 0	- 77 821	-5.3%	-0.4%	26
SUM REDISTRIBUTED	0	0	0	902 817	0	0	0	902 817			
AS PROPN OF CAT EXP	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	1.634%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%		2.798%	0.139%	



Tasmanian
Government

State Grants Commission

21 Murray Street
HOBART TAS 7000

Phone: 03 6166 4274

Fax: 03 6173 0219

Visit: www.treasury.tas.gov.au/state-grants-commission