



Tasmania

## State Grants Commission

---

**ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2000-01**

Please address any enquiries to:

The Secretary  
State Grants Commission  
GPO Box 147B  
HOBART TASMANIA 7001.

Telephone: 03 6233 2293  
Facsimile: 03 6233 2492  
E-mail: [david.hope@treasury.tas.gov.au](mailto:david.hope@treasury.tas.gov.au)

This report is available on the World Wide Web at:

***[www.treasury.tas.gov.au/sgc](http://www.treasury.tas.gov.au/sgc)***

ISSN 1327-4406

The Hon. Dr David Crean MLC  
TREASURER

Dear Treasurer

In accordance with Section 9 (3) of the *State Grants Commission Act (No. 40 of 1976)*, I have pleasure in presenting the State Grants Commission's Annual Report and recommendations of financial assistance for local government authorities in Tasmania. This is the twenty fifth Annual Report of the Commission, and relates to grants for payment in the 2000-01 financial year.

Yours sincerely

I G Inglis  
CHAIRMAN

# CONTENTS

---

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LEGISLATION GOVERNING THE GRANTS	1
3. LEVEL OF ASSISTANCE FOR 2000-01	2
4. INVESTIGATIONS AND INQUIRIES	3
5. PRINCIPLES AND METHODS	4
Base grant distribution	4
Calculation of standardised revenue	5
Calculation of standardised expenditure	5
Application of council-specific disability factors	8
(i) Scale	8
(ii) Population dispersion	8
(iii) Isolation	9
(iv) Regional responsibility	10
(v) Population growth/population decline	10
(vi) Worker influx	10
(vii) Absentee population	11
(viii) Age profile	11
(ix) Unemployment	11
(x) Tourism	11
(xi) Day-tripper	12
(xii) Equivalent tenements	12
Identified local road fund distribution	12
6. ISSUES REVIEWED FOR THE ASSESSMENTS	13
(i) Review of the “Mulholland” asset preservation model	13
(ii) The distribution of heavy vehicle motor tax revenue to councils	15
(iii) Review of disability factor weightings	16
(iv) Calculation of rate revenue	16
(v) Treatment of Specific Purpose Payments (SPPs)	17
(vi) Cost of major flood damage	17
(vii) Cost of waste management – landfill operations	17
7. OUTCOMES OF THE 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS	18
Base grants	18
Identified local road grants	18
Total grants	18

8. ISSUES FOR FUTURE ASSESSMENTS	19
9. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	21
10. RECOMMENDATIONS	21
11. CONCLUSION	22
APPENDICES	
1. Mathematical form of the equalisation model	24
2. Example of the application of disability factors	25
3. Example of the application of the Mulholland Model for assessment of road expenditure needs	26
4. Total grants provided in 1999-00	28
5. Population of local government areas as at 1 January 2000	29
6. Length of local government roads as at 21 March 1999	30
7. Municipal property valuations as at 1 July 1999	31
8. Rate revenue received by local government 1998-99	32
9. Standardised revenue and specific purpose payments 2000-01	33
10. Standard expenditure 2000-01	34
11. Standardised expenditure 2000-01	36
12. Disability factors 2000-01	38
13. Mulholland model disability factors	40
14. Representation at Commission discussions in 2000	42



# 1 - INTRODUCTION

---

The Commission was established under the *State Grants Commission Act 1976*. It is responsible for making recommendations to the Treasurer concerning the distribution of Commonwealth financial assistance grants and identified local road funds to local government.

In performing its task the Commission, *inter alia*, adopts the principle of horizontal fiscal equalisation to ensure that as far as possible, a grant is sufficient to enable a municipality to function, by reasonable effort, at a standard not lower than the average standard of other municipalities within the State.

The above mentioned Act provides that the Commission comprise four members: a chairman, who is appointed by the Governor; two representatives of local government nominated by the Minister for Local Government from a list of four names submitted by the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT); and one person nominated by the Secretary of the Department of Treasury and Finance and approved by the Treasurer.

The current members of the Commission are:

Mr I.G. Inglis CB	Chairman
Mr B.A. Southorn PSM	representative of local government
Mrs L.A. Scott	representative of local government
Mr R.C. Close	nominee of the Secretary of the Department of Treasury and Finance

# 2 - LEGISLATION GOVERNING THE GRANTS

---

The Commonwealth *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1995* replaced the earlier 1986 Act in April 1995, which in turn had replaced the *Local Government (Personal Income Tax Sharing) Act 1976*. The Act provides the conditions that must be fulfilled for the States to receive funds, and stipulates the basis for distributing the funds among local governing bodies.

The Act also provides that a set of national principles governing the distribution of grants be developed in consultation with the States, Territories and Local Government. The principles came into effect on 1 July 1996.

The main principle continues to be full horizontal fiscal equalisation. However, this is qualified somewhat by the minimum grant principle, which ensures that no local governing body will be allocated an amount in a year that is less than the amount that would be allocated to that body if 30 per cent of the State entitlement were allocated amongst local governing bodies in the State on an equal per capita basis.

The other principles include the need for effort neutrality in the assessments, inclusion of other grant support, recognition of the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and the distribution of identified local road funds. These principles are described in full in Section 5.

The principle regarding identified local road funds recognises the relative needs of councils for roads expenditure and the preservation of their road assets, but has no regard to councils' fiscal capacities. These funds remain separately identified but are untied and are not required to be spent on roads.

The Commonwealth Act provides for the base grant to be distributed on a population share basis among the States and the Northern Territory. This share is determined by the Commonwealth Statistician, based on State populations as at 31 December in the year prior to the application of the grants. Road funds are distributed between the States and Territories on the basis of historical shares as defined in the *Australian Land Transport Development Act 1988*.

A review of the *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1995* commenced during 2000 and is due to be completed by 30 June 2001. See Section 8 of this Report for a more detailed discussion of the review.

### 3 - LEVEL OF ASSISTANCE FOR 2000-01

The amount of general purpose financial assistance provided for local government by the Commonwealth was advised by the Commonwealth Minister on 7 July 2000 as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Financial assistance for local government – 2000-01**

	National pool of funds	Tasmanian grant entitlement	Proportion of national pool	Change from 1999-00 final grants
	\$	\$	%	%
Base grant	914,829,515	22,531,691	2.5	2.4
Road grant	405,936,778	21,511,781	5.3	3.9
Total grant	1,320,766,292	44,043,472	3.3	3.1

Prior to 2000-01, the escalation in the national pool of local government financial assistance was partly determined by underlying movements in general purpose payments to the States. With the reform of Commonwealth-State financial arrangements stemming from the introduction of *A New Tax System (ANTS)*, general purpose payments to the States were abolished from 1 July 2000, and replaced by revenues collected from the Goods and Services Tax (GST). This brought to an end the nexus between State and local government grants and accordingly it became necessary to amend the *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1995* to recognise this fact.

From 2000-01 onwards the national quantum of local government general purpose financial assistance will be linked to annual changes in both the Australian population and the consumer price index, so that the pool is maintained in “real per capita” terms. The final year for which the previous arrangements existed, ie. 1999-00 becomes the base for determining the size of the local government grant pool in each subsequent year. The Treasurer retains the discretion to adjust the indexation factor providing there are special circumstances for doing so, and that the objects of the Act are taken into consideration.

In line with long term trends, Tasmania’s base grant did not increase by the full level of the indexation applied to the national pool, as the estimated Tasmanian population decreased as a proportion of the national population. According to the latest ABS



estimates, Tasmania's share of total national population fell from 2.50% at 31 December 1998 to 2.46% at 31 December 1999.

The Commonwealth has determined that there will be a positive adjustment of \$73,387 to the 1999-00 estimated grant entitlement of \$42,635,085, as the estimated inflation figure of 2.95% used to determine last year's pool was lower than the actual level of inflation of 3.09%. Therefore, the "final" 1999-00 grant entitlement for Tasmania has been calculated by the Commonwealth as \$42,708,472 (which is \$42,635,085 plus \$73,387). Details are provided in Appendix 4.

The adjustment will be added to the 2000-01 quarterly payments, based on the distribution of the 1999-00 grants. This will mean that the cash actually paid to councils in 2000-01 will be the estimated 2000-01 entitlement of \$44,043,472 plus the positive adjustment to the 1999-00 grants of \$73,387, which is a total of \$44,116,859.

## 4 - INVESTIGATIONS AND INQUIRIES

---

Section 8 of the *State Grants Commission Act 1976* provides that, for the purpose of making recommendations to the State Treasurer, the Commission may hold such inquiries and make such investigations as it considers necessary.

Under Section 11 of the Commonwealth Act, a State is not entitled to its grant unless the Commission has held public hearings in connection with the recommendations and permitted or required local governing bodies in the State, or associations of those bodies, to make submissions to it in connection with the recommendations.

In accordance with these requirements the Commission conducted a series of regional hearings which Councils, the public and media representatives were free to attend. The dates for the hearings were:

Launceston	9 March 2000 - for northern and north-eastern councils.
Devonport	15 and 17 March 2000 - for western and north-western councils; and
Hobart	6 April 2000 - for southern and eastern councils.

In addition to the abovementioned hearings, the Commission visited ten municipalities throughout the State and considered written submissions from a majority of councils.

The most notable issues considered by the Commission for the 2000-01 assessments included:

- outcomes of the Mulholland Model update and review;
- distribution of heavy vehicle motor tax revenue to councils in 2000-01; and
- transactions to be classed as 'rates' in the calculation of standardised revenue.

Details of the Commission's considerations and conclusions in relation to these and other matters are reported in Section 6.

## 5 - PRINCIPLES AND METHODS

---

### BASE GRANT DISTRIBUTION

The national principles for the distribution of base grants (Section 9 payments under the Commonwealth Act) are shown in the box below.

#### **National principles for the distribution of base grants**

##### *1. Horizontal Equalisation*

General purpose grants will be allocated to local governing bodies, as far as practicable, on a full horizontal equalisation basis as defined by the Act. This is a basis that ensures that each local governing body in the State/Territory is able to function, by reasonable effort, at a standard not lower than the average standard of other local governing bodies in the State. It takes account of differences in the expenditure required by those local governing bodies in the performance of their functions and in the capacity of those local governing bodies to raise revenue.

##### *2. Effort Neutrality*

An effort or policy neutral approach will be used in assessing expenditure requirements and revenue raising capacity of each local governing body. This means as far as practicable, policies of individual local governing bodies in terms of expenditure and revenue effort will not affect the grant determination.

##### *3. Minimum Grant*

The minimum general purpose grant allocation for a local governing body in a year will not be less than the amount to which the local governing body would be entitled if 30% of the total amount of general purpose grants to which the State Territory is entitled under Section 9 of the Act in respect of the year were allocated among local governing bodies in the State/Territory on a per capita basis.

##### *4. Other Grant Support*

Other relevant grant support provided to local governing bodies to meet any of the expenditure needs assessed should be taken into account using an inclusion approach.

##### *5. Aboriginal Peoples and Torres Strait Islanders*

Financial assistance shall be allocated to councils in a way which recognises the needs of Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islanders within their boundaries.

The Commission's equalisation model is based on the 'balanced budget' approach. That is, each local governing body's grant entitlement is derived from the difference between:

- the expenditure ‘required’ to provide a common range of services, given its unique cost conditions (standardised expenditure); and
- revenue that could be raised by applying a standard or average rate per dollar of assessed annual values to all rateable property in that local governing body (standardised revenue), *plus* specific purpose payments received that are treated by the ‘inclusion’ approach, as defined later in this section.

The difference between standardised expenditure and standardised revenue is the ‘standardised deficit’. This becomes the net standardised deficit after adjustment for specific purpose payments and any special allowances. It should be noted that the total net standardised deficit normally exceeds the total of grant funds available. Accordingly, the final step in determining grant entitlements is to proportionately adjust the individual net standardised deficits to account for the shortfall.

Specific purpose payments are treated by either the ‘inclusion’ or ‘deduction’ approach. The ‘inclusion’ approach recognises funds received by councils as contributing to normal expenditure for the purpose of calculating expenditure standards. They are treated as a source of revenue and subsequently deducted from a municipality’s standardised deficit. Using the ‘deduction’ approach, funds are excluded from expenditure and revenue data prior to the determination of expenditure standards. The deduction approach is employed where;

- a council is effectively acting as an agent of the State or Commonwealth Governments and the specific purpose payment is a reimbursement of costs incurred; or
- grants for a particular service are received by only a relatively small number of councils, and the service is generally provided only where grants are received.

Equalisation therefore occurs on the basis of ‘net’ expenditures where this particular approach to the treatment of specific purpose payments is adopted. Further information on the Commission’s treatment of particular SPPs is given in Section 6.

A full explanation of the operation of the model is provided below, and a mathematical representation of the Commission’s distribution model is set out in Appendix 1.

It must be noted that no matter how sophisticated the Commission’s methodology might become, there is always the need for the Commission to exercise broad judgement as it considers the many and varied issues which confront it each year as it goes about its task of grant assessments.

### ***Calculation of standardised revenue***

A council’s revenue capacity, or standardised revenue, is determined by multiplying the rateable assessed annual value (AAV) of properties in the municipality by the average rate charged across the State. The Commission uses AAV data, adjustment factors and exempt AAV information supplied by the Office of the Valuer-General, and rate revenue information contained in the ABS local government finance statistics. An adjustment is made to account for the value of properties which are partially exempt from rates, that is, liable for service charges only.

The rateable AAV for each council is determined and then adjusted using the Valuer-General’s adjustment factors so that all figures are expressed in terms of a common valuation year. Total adjusted rateable AAV for the State is divided by the total rate revenue raised by all councils to yield a State average rate in the dollar. Standardised revenue for each council is then the product of its adjusted rateable AAV and the State average rate levied per dollar of AAV. The final standardised revenue for each council

used in the base grant assessments is the relevant three-year averaged standardised revenue. The standardised revenue of each council is shown in Appendix 9, while adjusted rateable AAV and rate revenues are shown in Appendices 7 and 8, respectively.

### *Calculation of standardised expenditure*

#### *Roads*

The Commission uses a modified version of the Mulholland asset preservation model to assess standardised road expenditure, based on each councils' road assets. Several significant improvements to this model were made for the 2000-01 assessments, and these are described in more detail in Section 6 of this Report.

The fundamental basis of the Mulholland asset preservation model is that, in statistical terms, a kilometre of road has an 'expected life', assuming it is appropriately constructed and maintained. At the end of this period, it will require re-construction followed by a new cycle of maintenance and rehabilitation in order to preserve it at an acceptable standard. The 'expected life', or durability, of a kilometre of road maintenance work will clearly differ depending upon both the type of activity (sealing, re-grading) and the type of road (urban sealed, urban unsealed, rural sealed, rural unsealed) involved. Similar arguments hold with respect to both road rehabilitation and road re-construction work.

*Performance standards* specify, for each road type, the length of road requiring re-construction, re-grading or re-sealing each year in order to preserve the existing road asset. For example, if the seal on a 9km stretch of road has an expected life of 30 years, then, on average, 300m will need to be sealed each year to maintain the road at the current standard. In this case, the performance standard is approximately 0.03, or 3%. Average costs per kilometre for each road type and activity combination have been derived from published unit price estimates for the same undertakings. For any given council, specific disabilities may increase or decrease the average cost of undertaking a given activity.

The model recognises 'Climate', 'Drainage', 'Material', 'Soil', 'Terrain', and 'Traffic' disabilities in road rehabilitation and re-construction, and 'Climate', 'Material', 'Terrain' and 'Traffic' disabilities in road maintenance. The need for different sub-base depths (re-construction only) is incorporated within the workings of the model. The model adopted by the Commission now also recognises a 'Remoteness' disability factor, and an 'Urbanisation' disability adjustment for all activities. These are intended to capture elements of expenditure disabilities not otherwise accounted for in the model, and apply to a minority of councils only.

The model also makes an allowance for additional bridge-related maintenance, by converting bridge areas to equivalent road lengths (which involves multiplication by ten to recognise the greater cost per equivalent area) and adding these lengths to the road lengths used in the model.

Hence in assessing 'road' expenditure needs for a given council, performance standards are applied to each category of road (urban sealed, urban unsealed, rural sealed, rural unsealed) to determine the length of road to be maintained, rehabilitated and reconstructed in that year in order to preserve the existing road structure. The relevant disability factors and costs per kilometre are then applied to each of these figures and the whole is summed to yield standardised 'road' expenditure for that council. The rehabilitation element was introduced this year following the review referred to in Section 6.

The method by which standardised expenditure for roads is calculated is illustrated in Appendix 3 by a simplified example.

*All other functions*

In general, the cost of providing council services varies depending upon the number of residents. Therefore, to determine the standard expenditure that is ‘required’ to provide a service, the Commission multiplies the State average expenditure per person by the number of residents in each municipality.

Many councils face a range of unavoidable cost pressures in providing services. This means that they cannot provide a service at the standard level of expenditure. This is recognised by the Commission through the application of council-specific disability factors, which represent these unavoidable cost pressures, to standard expenditure to determine the standardised expenditure for each council. This method of estimating standardised expenditure is applied to all expenditure categories except the road category.

An explanation of the types of expenditure that comprise each expenditure function is set out in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Description of expenditure functions**

<b>Expenditure function</b>	<b>Explanation of expenditure function</b>
General administration	Legislative, executive, financial and fiscal affairs relating to general purposes only ie. not solely related to any one of the purposes listed below.
Health, housing and welfare	Nursing homes and other services for the aged, community health services, health inspections; family and child welfare; housing services.
Sanitation and the environment	Household and other garbage services, urban storm water drainage, street cleaning, flood mitigation and other protection of the environment.
Planning and community amenities	Planning and building services, street lighting, public conveniences, shopping malls, cemeteries and crematoria.
Recreation and culture	Public halls and civic centres, swimming pools, parks and playing grounds, sports assistance and promotion; libraries and other cultural services.
Water	Provision of water services.
Sewerage	Provision of sewerage services.
Roads	Re-construction and maintenance of roads and bridges.
Public safety	Fire protection, animal control and other public order and control.
Other	Expenditure on items not elsewhere classified. Includes: saleyards and markets; tourism and area promotion; aerodrome operations; communications; and natural disaster relief.

*Application of council-specific disability factors*

Disability factors are used to reflect unavoidable relative cost disadvantages councils face in providing services. A range of factors have been developed to account for differences between councils in the demand for a service as well as variations in the per unit cost of supplying that service.

A factor is calculated for each municipality by comparing its demand or supply disadvantage with the State average. The councils which demonstrate the least relative disadvantage for the class of disability concerned are assigned a minimum factor of 1.00. All other councils are compared to those councils on the minimum to determine their relative disability factors.

The following disability factors have been carefully considered by the Commission and a method adopted to quantify them:

- Scale
- Isolation
- Population Growth
- Worker Influx
- Unemployment
- Tourism
- Climate
- Dispersion
- Regional Responsibility
- Population Decline
- Absentee Population
- Age Profile
- Day-trippers
- Equivalent Tenements.

Table 3 overleaf indicates the disability factors that are applied to each expenditure category.

An outline of the approach developed by the Commission to quantify each of the above-mentioned factors is provided below. The 'climate' disability factor is not specifically dealt with as the Commission continues to use broad judgement in determining this factor.

(i) *Scale*

The scale disability accounts for the diseconomies of small scale that councils face in providing some services. Diseconomies occur where the cost per person of a certain activity is greater for councils with a small population than those with larger ones. For example, each council requires a general manager whether the municipal population is 1,000 or 100,000. The cost per person of the general manager is therefore much greater for smaller councils than for larger ones.

Different expenditure categories show varying degrees of diseconomy, so three scale categories have been developed - high, medium and low. The application of these to the different expenditure categories is detailed in Table 3 on the next page.

(ii) *Population Dispersion*

The dispersion disability relates to the additional costs incurred in servicing a widely scattered population within a municipality. The Commission recognises that associated costs arise from the need to both duplicate services and incur greater travelling and communication costs than would otherwise be the case.

This disability factor is determined according to: the total area of the municipality relative to population (population density); the number of population centres (for which a minimum level of service is provided); and the total road length within the municipality.

The Commission intends to complete a review of the suitability of the existing calculation method during 2000-01. See Section 8 of this Report for further information.

**Table 3: Application of disability factors to expenditure standards**

Expenditure Category	Disability Factors	
<b>General Administration</b>	Scale (high) Dispersion Isolation Regional Responsibility Worker Influx	Absentee Population Population Decline Population Growth Tourism
<b>Health, Welfare and Housing</b>	Scale (medium) Dispersion Isolation Unemployment	Absentee Population Population Decline Population Growth
<b>Sanitation and the Environment</b>	Scale (medium) Dispersion Tourism Worker Influx	Absentee Population Climate Day-tripper Population Growth
<b>Planning and Community Amenities</b>	Scale (medium) Dispersion Isolation Regional Responsibility Population Growth Tourism	Absentee Population Age Profile Climate Day-tripper Population Decline
<b>Recreation and Culture</b>	Scale (medium) Dispersion Isolation Regional Responsibility Population Growth Tourism	Absentee Population Age Profile Climate Day-tripper Population Decline
<b>Water</b>	Dispersion Population Growth Tourism Climate	Absentee Population Population Decline Worker Influx Equivalent tenements
<b>Sewerage</b>	Dispersion Population Growth Tourism Climate	Absentee Population Population Decline Worker Influx Equivalent tenements
<b>Public Safety</b>	Scale (low) Dispersion Isolation	Age Profile Population Decline Population Growth
<b>Other</b>	Scale (low)*	

\* Both Flinders and King Island councils receive the Scale (high) factor for expenditure classified to *Other*.

(iii) *Isolation*

This factor recognises the increased costs which arise from geographical isolation. Such costs are associated with attracting staff to remote areas, communicating with relevant bodies, travelling and the supply of necessary construction and maintenance materials.

This disability factor is calculated according to the distance between a municipality's main centre and the closest major regional population centre, and the distance from Hobart, the main administrative and political focus within the State.

(iv) *Regional Responsibility*

A disability is recognised by the Commission for those authorities (host municipalities) which provide particular services for the residents of surrounding municipalities, without there being a counter-balancing use of services in surrounding municipalities by residents of the regional centre, or any offsetting cash contribution for the use of those facilities.

The Commission recognises the fact that certain towns and cities throughout the State act as regional focal points for the provision of some services. The expenditure categories which cover these services are General Administration, Planning and Community Amenities and Recreation and Culture.

Assessing the extent to which responsibilities are exercised involves making use of a regression equation to predict the relationship between the population served and the level of expenditure. The resulting equation is used to estimate the population which on average could be effectively serviced by the particular level of expenditure by a municipality. The disability factor is then calculated having regard to the magnitude of this 'implied population' relative to that of the host municipality and the relative level of responsibility of each regional centre to that of other regional centres.

It is important to note that levels of responsibility are relative to the size of the regional centre. Therefore, while a regional centre may effectively service a small surrounding population, if the surrounding population is large relative to the size of the 'host', a relatively high degree of responsibility will be recognised.

(v) *Population Growth / Population Decline*

The Commission recognises that a local governing body faces certain expenditure disabilities as a result of not being able to continually change staff numbers and the scale of infrastructure in response to fluctuations in population levels. Such changes typically require planning and implementation horizons of several years or more. As a consequence, councils are often faced with excess or inadequate capacity in certain service areas depending on whether they are faced with rapid population decline or growth. Both circumstances are believed to confront councils with added expenditure burdens.

The disability factors are determined by comparing the average annual rate of population growth/decline for a particular municipality over a five year period, against the average rate of population growth/decline for either growing or declining councils in the State as a whole.

The Commission has determined that it will only allow growth and decline factors for councils that experience significant levels of population change. Accordingly, as from the 1999-00 assessments, a threshold of 2% for both population growth and decline has been implemented.

(vi) *Worker Influx*

This disability factor reflects the additional costs imposed on those municipalities which have significant daily net influxes of non-resident workers. It is felt that this effect is likely to have an impact which is in excess of the more general effect of regional responsibility.

Consideration is given for potential worker influx for the major population centres in the State. Municipalities outside these main centres are unlikely to have sufficient



commercial or industrial development relative to their surrounding regions to cause any net influx of non-resident workers which impose a significant cost on the municipality.

Determination of this factor involves estimating, from 1996 Census data provided by the ABS, both the number of residents working outside the municipality and the number of non-residents working within the municipality. The difference, or the net worker inflow, is then used to derive a disability factor in relation to actual total population. Factors are now allocated to Hobart, Glenorchy, Launceston and Burnie.

*(vii) Absentee Population*

Allowance is made by the Commission for the additional population which is not captured in the Census statistics but which nevertheless must be serviced. Specific reference is made here to those municipalities which have a significant number of holiday residences.

The calculation of this disability factor is based on the proportion of dwellings in each municipality which were unoccupied at the time of the 1996 Census.

For the 2000-01 assessments the Commission has made an adjustment to the absentee population factor in order to recognise the situation faced by the West Coast Council where mine workers reside outside of the municipality between shifts. It was accepted that the existing unoccupied dwelling statistics do not adequately reflect this phenomenon.

*(viii) Age Profile*

A disability factor based on the proportions of residents aged 0-5 years, 15-25 and over 65 has been calculated by the Commission. This disability factor reflects the additional costs associated with having a higher than average proportion of the population in these groups. For example, additional costs may be incurred in the provision of health and welfare services for infants and retirees, or in the provision of sporting facilities for people under 25.

*(ix) Unemployment*

A disability factor reflecting the level of unemployment within a municipality has been calculated by the Commission using data on income support payments from Centrelink. This disability factor has been calculated to capture the costs to councils of having a higher than average proportion of working-age residents unemployed. For example, additional expenditure might be incurred in the provision of recreation/leisure facilities or welfare programs as a result of the need to cater for unemployed residents.

*(x) Tourism*

The Commission recognises that councils generally incur additional costs as a result of tourist influx through increased use of council resources and infrastructure. A disability factor that seeks to recognise these costs has been determined on the basis of the equivalent number of tourist beds in all establishments ranging from motels to registered camping grounds in each municipality.

*(xi) Day-tripper*

Significant numbers of day-trippers who make use of council facilities are recognised as increasing council costs. Details of the number of tourist attractions and an index of visitor frequency have been combined with a factor representing the distance from major population centres and the population of those centres, to determine a relative disability. Municipalities close to large population centres receive higher factors.

*(xii) Equivalent tenements*

The use of population to estimate standard water and sewerage expenditure does not recognise expenditures incurred in providing water and sewerage services to non-residential establishments. Therefore, a factor has been developed to recognise the cost of providing these services to commercial properties. This has been done by dividing the total value of serviced commercial properties by the modal residential assessed annual value in each water and sewerage district to determine the number of residential 'equivalent tenements'. From the 2000-01 assessments, a disability factor is recognised for all councils, whereas previously it was only applied to those councils with greater than one thousand equivalent tenements.

## IDENTIFIED LOCAL ROAD FUND DISTRIBUTION

The national principle governing the distribution of road grants (Section 12 payments under the Commonwealth Act) is shown in the box below:

### **National principle for the distribution of road grants**

#### *Identified Road Component*

The identified road component of the financial assistance grants should be allocated to local governing bodies as far as practicable on the basis of the relative needs of each local governing body for roads expenditure and to preserve its road assets. In assessing road needs, relevant considerations include length, type and usage of roads in each local governing area.

To accord with this principle, while ensuring that the grant distribution reflects the particular needs of Tasmanian councils, the road grants are distributed in the following manner:

#### *Road preservation component - 66.5% of funds*

- based on the relative road expenditure needs of each council as determined using the Mulholland asset preservation model (as explained on page 6);

#### *Bridge expenditure component - 28.5% of funds*

- based on relative bridge deck areas (including all concrete and wooden bridges, and box culverts over 3 metres total span);

#### *Special needs, or 'betterment' component - 5% of funds*

- allocated to councils with an above average proportion of rural unsealed roads, based on rural unsealed road lengths.

## 6 - ISSUES REVIEWED FOR THE ASSESSMENTS

---

Many councils made representations to the Commission during the course of the 2000-01 assessments regarding council-specific issues related to the Commission's methodology. The Commission considered all the points raised by individual councils as a part of its grant assessment procedure, and wishes to thank councils for their comments and input. While the issues raised are too numerous to list, a number of issues of more general relevance were considered by the Commission during the 2000-01 grant assessments, as discussed below.

### *(i) Review of the "Mulholland" Asset Preservation Model*

During 1999-00, the Commission conducted a partial review and update of the Mulholland-based road needs assessment model. This Model was first used in the base grant assessments in 1994-95 and in the road grant assessments in 1996-97. While the disability factors were reviewed and refined in 1995-96, no other components of the methodology, such as the average cost estimates, had been updated or reviewed since the model was introduced. Accordingly, after some five years of operation, the Commission decided that the Model components should be reviewed and relevant information updated.

The breadth and complexity of the issues raised necessitated a three-stage review process. The first stage was conducted using regional "peer groups" of council engineering staff, with a private consultant (*CSL Engineers*) employed as a facilitator. The issues addressed in the first stage were described in detail in last year's Report. The major decisions reached following the first stage of the review were:

1. Revised definitions for roads and bridges were adopted. These definitions recognised all bridges over three metres total span, including box culverts but excluding pipe culverts, irrespective of length;
2. Minor changes were made to the application of the existing disability factors, with an increase in the number of factors applied to road maintenance;
3. Revisions were made to five of the eight performance standards, most notably –
  - reconstruction of *urban sealed* roads increased from 30 years to 55 years;
  - reconstruction of *rural sealed* roads increased from 25 to 50 years; and
  - reconstruction of all *unsealed* roads removed entirely from the model.

The second stage again involved *CSL Engineers*, in collaboration with a consultative committee of six council engineers. This stage of the review focussed on four aspects of the Mulholland Model:

1. The need to recognise road rehabilitation/partial reconstruction activity by councils, and how this should be accomplished by the Model;
2. The standardisation of on-costs by councils in their estimates of average unit costs;
3. The recognition of table drains in the calculation of costs for work on rural roads, and the design specifications for such drains; and
4. The suitability of bridge deck area as the sole determinant of council bridge asset preservation responsibilities.

Following discussion of the recommendations relating to these issues with councils, the Commission decided to adopt a number of significant modifications to the Mulholland model. These are listed below.

1. Road rehabilitation will be included in the Mulholland Model as a separate activity, with its calculated annual cost requirement being added to those for maintenance and reconstruction to determine the total standardised expenditure for roads. The design and cost specifications, disability factors and performance standards recommended by *CSL Engineers* have been adopted.
2. The average per kilometre cost of each activity will be determined on the basis of published indicative prices and prices obtained directly from suppliers. These will replace the existing average costs derived from data returns supplied by councils.
3. Table drains will be included in the design specifications (and hence the costs) for the maintenance, rehabilitation and reconstruction of rural roads.
4. Bridge deck area will be the sole measure of bridge asset preservation responsibilities.

The third stage of the review involved a reappraisal of the *cost* disability factor used in the Mulholland model. The cost factor was designed to recognise various expenditure disabilities which are not captured by the existing standard Mulholland factors (as listed on page 6). These relate mainly to cartage costs in remote areas and the additional expense incurred when road works are undertaken in heavily built-up or urbanised areas.

The conclusion reached by the review of the cost factor was that it was probably not accurately capturing the range of expenditure disabilities that it was intended to, and that an alternative was required. The third phase of the model review process thus became the development of new disability factors to replace the cost factor. Again the Commission was assisted in this task by *CSL Engineers*, and the advice of councils during, and subsequent to, the 2000 hearings and visits.

After careful deliberation, the Commission decided to recognise two new disabilities in the Mulholland model for the 2000-01 assessments. These are described below.

- *Remoteness* – this disability is intended to recognise the added costs faced by councils which must transport road making equipment and material over exceptional distances. The Commission has judged that, at this stage, there is a lack of sufficiently consistent and objective evidence to support the application of this factor to any councils other than Flinders and King Island, where the existence of a significant remoteness disability is indisputable.

The remoteness factor is based on the *isolation* factor currently used in the equalisation model for allocating the base grant. It is applied to all activities recognised in the Mulholland model.

- *Urbanisation* – this disability is intended to recognise the extra expenditure incurred by councils which are required to undertake road works in heavily urbanised environments. Such environments are characterised by intensive commercial activity together with high volumes of traffic, which impose particular difficulties on road works activities. Although most councils would experience this situation to some extent, the Commission has judged that it would be significant enough to warrant recognition only in the cases of Burnie, Clarence, Devonport, Hobart, Glenorchy and Launceston. For each of these councils, only one distinct ‘central business district’ area has been recognised.

The urbanisation disability is incorporated in the model by augmenting the length of urban sealed roads used in the calculations. Based on information received from councils and CSL Engineers, a list of relevant individual roads has been established for each of the six councils. The same sources have produced an estimated cost differential of three to one for works on these roads as compared to standard or average urban sealed roads. Taken together, this information has enabled the total length of urban sealed roads to be notionally increased thereby recognising the expenditure disability.

The Commission has resolved that the remoteness factor and urbanisation disability adjustment should replace the cost factor. However, removal of the existing cost factor does have significant ramifications for the distribution of ILRF grants, and the Commission has decided that the cost factor should be phased-out over two years. The values given for the cost factor in Appendix 13 reflect this decision.

***(ii) The Distribution of heavy vehicle motor tax revenue to councils***

As stated in last year's Annual Report, the Commission has been preparing to assume an additional responsibility in recommending the distribution amongst councils of State motor taxes collected on the registration of heavy vehicles (known as "NRTC funds")<sup>1</sup>.

The Commission will be empowered to make formal recommendations to the Treasurer on matters other than the distribution of Financial Assistance Grants when enabling legislation has been approved by State Parliament.

Since 1996-97, the State Government has distributed a share, totalling \$1.5 million per annum, of heavy vehicle motor taxes to councils to supplement their road maintenance programs. The present distribution regime is regarded as an interim measure and is based primarily on past road toll collections. The State Government is seeking to put in place a more appropriate and long term revenue sharing arrangement, and it has requested that the State Grants Commission investigate an alternative method of distributing the local government share of these funds.

On the basis of discussions with councils during the 1999 hearings and visits, the Commission resolved to adopt a course of action involving both short and long term elements. In the short term, (beginning with the 2000-01 distribution), the Commission has proposed a transitional arrangement under which the available funds will be allocated according to the volumes of heavy vehicle traffic utilising local roads.

Specifically, the method will determine council shares of *vehicle kilometres* (VK) relating to heavy freight vehicles of AUSTRROADS Class 4 and above. Councils were asked to nominate a maximum of ten roads which are most important in terms of heavy vehicle traffic. For each of these, the length (or relevant portion thereof) was multiplied by the estimated average daily number of vehicles using that road, with the data being supplied by the individual councils. Statistics on traffic volumes were not available and so a data collection exercise was undertaken specifically for this task.

In the past, there was considerable variation between councils in the collection of road tolls. As a result, the alternative distribution of these funds based on VK will necessarily differ considerably from the existing distribution. Broadly speaking, the replacement method will produce a more even allocation of funds across councils, reflecting the fact that the actual distribution of heavy vehicle traffic is more even than is the pattern of historic road toll collections. The Commission recognises the need for

---

<sup>1</sup> After the National Road Transport Commission, which determines the nationally uniform taxation rates.

stability in council funding and has thus proposed that the new distribution should be phased-in over five years. This approach will allow councils to adjust while the progression to a more accurate and equitable distribution system takes place.

As outlined to councils in the 2000 hearings and visits, the Commission believes that the most attractive option for distributing these funds in the longer term lies with the results of the *Major Freight Demanders Survey*, which is planned by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) for 2001. This will be an update of a similar study conducted in 1997, which is to be expanded to include local government roads and a wider range of industries and vehicle types. It is anticipated that the statistics gathered from this survey will enable a more accurate measurement of each council's share of the State's heavy freight burden, including recognition of relative tonnages. When this study is completed, the Commission will evaluate the results and, after consultation with councils, consider the nature and timing of the application of the information to the distribution of heavy vehicle motor tax revenues.

It should be noted that, as with the Financial Assistance Grants, the Commission will have no role in determining the total quantum of funds available for distribution, but only the distribution of a given amount.

### ***(iii) Review of disability factor weightings***

The review of disability factors during 1998-99 concentrated on the suitability of the *weightings* assigned to each factor. This process was described in detail in last year's Report. Having analysed a large volume of information supplied by councils, and discussed that information with councils, the Commission determined that the weightings applied to four disability factors should be modified. These factors, and the nature of the modifications made, are listed below.

*dispersion* - weighting adjusted so as to increase the significance of this factor;  
*absentee population* - weighting adjusted so as to decrease the significance of this factor;  
*tourism* - weighting adjusted so as to decrease the significance of this factor ; and  
*worker influx* - weighting adjusted so as to decrease the significance of this factor.

These changes were given effect for the 2000-01 grant recommendations.

### ***(iv) Calculation of rate revenue***

The Commission uses ABS statistics on council rate revenue to calculate the average rate in the dollar, which in turn is used to determine standardised revenue. Until the 2000-01 assessments, the item classed as 'rates' included (among other transactions) the base or fixed component of water rates, and excluded charges for water usage levied on a per unit basis, such as excess water charges.

In light of the ongoing reform of council water charging practices, the Commission decided to review the basis for determining revenue from water rates. While some councils continue to apply only a set AAV-related charge for residential water usage, increasingly councils are implementing two-part tariffs where metering allows the actual usage of water to be charged for by volume. Commencing with the 2000-01 grants, all revenues from the sales of water (including charges levied strictly on a consumption basis) will be regarded as rate income.

### ***(v) Treatment of Specific Purpose Payments (SPPs)***

For the 2000-01 assessments the Commission reviewed the treatment of particular specific purpose payments (SPPs) regularly received by councils. As outlined on page

5, the Commission applies inclusion where an SPP is in the form of general revenue assistance which is generally received by most or all councils. In all other cases the deduction treatment is applied. Having regard to these conventions, the following decisions were made:

<i>SPP</i>	<i>Adopted treatment</i>
ILRF grants	Inclusion
State motor tax from heavy vehicles	Inclusion
Grants received under <i>Roads and Jetties Act 1935</i>	Deduction
Natural Heritage Trust grants	Deduction

***(vi) Cost of major flood damage***

Meander Valley Council sought assistance in relation to the direct costs arising from two episodes of major flooding involving the Meander River in November 1998 and March 1999. The Commission judged that retrospective recognition of these costs was warranted, based on the criteria established by past practice in relation to similar events. Consistent with established practice, one third of the total value of major remedial works was added to the standardised deficit of Meander Valley prior to the final calculation of grants.

***(vii) Cost of waste management -landfill operations***

During the 2000-01 assessments the Commission considered the issue of expenditure disabilities faced by councils in locating and developing landfill sites for waste disposal. It was claimed that urban councils experienced an inherent disability in this regard compared to rural councils. Following research on this matter, the Commission reached the conclusion that there was little evidence of any significant difference in expenditure disabilities between urban and rural councils.

The State Government has embarked on a comprehensive review program of all council landfills, with a view to rationalising their total number. In conjunction with this, higher standards of waste disposal are being progressively enforced as various licences expire and sites reach the end of their useful life. This is a situation which will eventually confront all councils, and has already become a serious financial matter for some, both urban and rural.

## 7 - OUTCOMES OF THE 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS

---

### *Grant Recommendations*

A number of significant changes have been made to the Commission's methodology for the 2000-01 grant recommendations, relating to both the base and ILRF grants. These changes produced considerable volatility in grant outcomes for some councils, and because of this the Commission decided that limits should be imposed on inter-year movements by 'capping' these so that no council received a grant increase of more than 10% or a grant reduction of more than 5%.

### *Base grants*

The movements in base grants in 2000-01 for individual councils tend to be greater than those observed in 1999-00. While in 1999-00 the maximum decrease was 5.4%, and the maximum increase 7.9%, for 2000-01 three councils will receive the maximum increase of 10%, and three the maximum decrease of 5%.

The main factors causing increased volatility in the base grant for 2000-01 were:

- expansion of the 'rates' item used to calculate standardised revenue;
- adjustment of the weightings applying to the *population dispersion*, *absentee population*, *tourism* and *worker influx* disability factors; and
- the updating of the population centres component of the *population dispersion* disability factor, which resulted in very substantial increases in the number of centres recognised for certain councils.

As is often the case, movements in base grant levels have also resulted from:

- changes in relative needs due to differential growth rates of net AAV, which are particularly affected by the timing of council revaluations;
- population growth differentials; and
- changing council disability factors, reflecting changes in the underlying data used to calculate the factors.

### *ILRF (road) grants*

As described in Section 6, the Mulholland model used to allocate 66.5% of the ILRF grants has been subject to major revision for the 2000-01 assessments. In addition, the definitions employed to quantify bridge deck area, which accounts for 28.5% of the ILRF distribution, have been significantly altered. The aggregate impact of these changes has produced the need for capping of ILRF grant movements in 2000-01. Seven councils are to receive the maximum increase of 10%, while two will receive the maximum decrease of 5%.

In contrast, all councils received increased ILRF grants in 1999-00, with the greatest grant gain being 5.7%, and the smallest 1.1%. As in 1999-00, the changes in ILRF grants for 2000-01 are attributable to changes in road lengths (including changes in surface type) and bridge deck areas, although these are of less importance than the exceptional factors described above.

### *Total grants*

When the two grants are combined, the net effect is that seven councils will receive a grant reduction, with the maximum fall being 4.8%, compared to 2.2% in the previous



year. Of the remaining councils, ten will receive a grant increase of more than 5%, with the maximum gain being 10% (compared to 6.4% in 1999-00).

## 8 - ISSUES FOR FUTURE ASSESSMENTS

---

### *Disability factor updates and reviews*

During 1999-00 the Commission updated the serviced population centres component of the *population dispersion* disability factor. It has commenced a review of the entire method by which the factor is calculated, and intends to complete this exercise for the 2001-02 assessments. As part of the review, council input will be sought on various options for improving the existing approach.

The Commission also proposes to investigate the feasibility of using a single disability factor for measuring relative social disadvantage, which may allow the total number of factors in the equalisation model to be reduced. It is anticipated that the new single factor would be based on the ABS measure *Social and Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA)*, which is derived from Census data.

The Commission intends to review the recognition of disabilities caused by population decline. It wishes to determine whether its methodology provides sufficient allowance for councils which are experiencing continuous and significant population decline, both in absolute terms and relative to the State average. Under the existing approach, expenditure needs are directly related to change in resident population, on the assumption that population is the most appropriate indicator of the need to provide services. Consequently, continual relative population decline leads to a diminishing assessed expenditure need, which (all else remaining equal) will produce a grant reduction. However, there is a question whether expenditure needs will decline at the same rate as population, at least in relation to some functions.

### *Council support of medical and emergency services*

For the 1999-00 assessments, the Commission decided to recognise the direct financial support which some rural councils provide to general practitioners in order to attract and retain their services. It considered that this was an exceptional circumstance involving the provision of an essential service. The provision of special allowances to eligible councils will continue in the 2000-01 grants.

For some years a number of councils have sought assistance in regard to their financial support of other medical facilities and emergency services, such as district hospitals, ambulance stations and SES groups. The Commission intends to investigate the nature of these arrangements and make a determination as to whether these outlays warrant explicit recognition in the equalisation process.

### *Review of the Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1995*

Section 17 of The *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1995* requires that the Commonwealth Minister undertake a review of the Act before 30 June 2001. On 19 June 2000 the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government announced the terms of reference for the review, which is to be conducted by the Commonwealth Grants Commission (CGC). The review is to examine and report on:

- 1) the effectiveness of the current arrangements under the Act to achieve the purposes of the Act and the goals in providing the grants that are referred to in Section 3 of the Act;
- 2) the appropriateness of the current National Principles and, in particular, the retention of or variations of the minimum grant for the general purpose component in Section 6 of the Act; and
- 3) the consistency with the National Principles of the methodology and policies used by each of the State and Territory Grants Commissions in distributing funds to councils.

As required by Section 17 of the Act, the review shall also examine and report on:

- (i) the effectiveness of the arrangements under this Act in relation to ensuring that the allocation of funds for local government purposes is made on a full horizontal equalisation basis as mentioned in paragraph 6(2)(a); and
- (ii) the impact of the Act on the raising of revenue by local governing bodies and on the assistance provided by the States to local governing bodies; and
- (iii) the implications of any changes in the functions or responsibilities of local government bodies; and
- (iv) the eligibility for assistance under this Act of bodies declared by the Minister under Section 4 to be local government bodies.

The Review will not address the interstate distribution of the general purpose and local road grants or the quantum of funds available under the Act.

The Commission made a preliminary submission to the Review in response to the initial discussion paper prepared by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. It also participated in a forum discussion with the CGC held in Hobart on 17 July 2000, at which aspects of its methodology were discussed, along with many issues pertinent to the terms of reference. Detailed discussions have also been held at officer level concerning the Commission's approach to the grant distribution task and the rationale for this approach.

The Commission intends to discuss the progress of the Review with councils during the 2001 hearings and visits program.

## 9 - GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

---

### **Application of Grants**

As in the past, the grants for 2000-01 are of a general nature and may be used for recurrent or capital expenditure purposes or to support revenue requirements. They may be applied in whatever manner a council sees fit, subject only to the provisions of the Tasmanian *Local Government Act 1993*.

### **Interstate Conference**

The Northern Territory Local Government Grants Commission hosted the annual Conference of State Grants Commissions in Darwin, NT from 4 to 7 October 1999. As is the normal practice, the Conference included reports by each Commission on its activities during the year. Sessions were held concerning alternatives to the prevailing minimum grant principle, and on the review of Indigenous Funding by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Perspectives on equalisation for local government grants were received from representatives of various Northern Territory councils, including those from the Tiwi Islands' community government councils.

## 10 - RECOMMENDATIONS

---

In accordance with Section 3(2) of the *State Grants Commission Act 1976*, the Commission has proposed the payment of grants as indicated in Table 4.

The Commission's recommendations of financial assistance for councils for 2000-01 were conveyed to the Treasurer on 25 July 2000, and his acceptance thereof was advised to the Chairman by letter dated 26 July 2000.

## 11 - CONCLUSION

---

Attached to this Report are appendices which contain information used for the grant assessments. Also appended are details of the hearings conducted by the Commission during 2000 and some statistical tables relating to local government activities in Tasmania, which are presented for the benefit of interested persons reading this Report.

The Commission wishes to express its appreciation to all local governing bodies throughout the State for their co-operation and assistance in 1999-00.

During the year, Mr L.J. Mooney retired as a member of the Commission after ten years' service as a local government representative. He had an unrivalled knowledge of Tasmanian local government and the Commission wishes to acknowledge the valuable contribution which he made to its work. Following Mr Mooney's retirement, Mrs L.A. Scott was appointed to the Commission on the nomination of the Minister for Local Government.

The Commission also acknowledges the support given by the Secretary of the Department of Treasury and Finance, Mr D.W. Challen, the staff of the Economic and Financial Policy Division generally and the Commission's Secretary, Mr David Hope.

I.G. Inglis  
CHAIRMAN

L.A. Scott  
MEMBER

B.A. Southorn  
MEMBER

R.C. Close  
MEMBER

David Hope  
SECRETARY

October 2000

**TABLE 4**  
**RECOMMENDED GRANTS FOR 2000-01**

<b>Council</b>	<b>Base <i>Per Capita</i> Component <i>Base Grant</i></b>		<b>Identified Local Road Component</b>	<b>Total Grant</b>
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Break O'Day	674,017	116	871,969	1,545,985
Brighton	708,630	55	309,228	1,017,859
Burnie	938,215	48	703,822	1,642,037
Central Coast	1,233,182	59	1,014,365	2,247,547
Central Highlands	571,004	228	766,997	1,338,001
Circular Head	813,962	96	902,636	1,716,597
Clarence	1,149,562	24	794,764	1,944,326
Derwent Valley	576,512	59	474,079	1,050,591
Devonport	792,801	32	615,757	1,408,558
Dorset	791,428	107	1,089,749	1,881,178
Flinders	382,744	400	363,320	746,065
George Town	558,949	82	395,034	953,983
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	391,588	94	440,781	832,369
Glenorchy	630,441	14	796,529	1,426,970
Hobart	663,041	14	918,784	1,581,826
Huon Valley	942,002	70	1,007,595	1,949,597
Kentish	649,409	118	680,737	1,330,146
King Island	351,190	196	396,379	747,569
Kingborough	983,337	35	750,055	1,733,392
Latrobe	440,131	55	347,852	787,983
Launceston	1,691,899	27	1,613,042	3,304,942
Meander	1,153,081	66	1,193,009	2,346,090
Northern Midlands	1,162,343	99	1,309,237	2,471,580
Sorell	639,013	58	519,964	1,158,976
Southern Midlands	739,058	132	1,275,519	2,014,577
Tasman	266,115	118	214,149	480,264
Waratah/Wynyard	943,636	68	797,165	1,740,801
West Coast	686,649	121	366,660	1,053,310
West Tamar	1,007,750	51	582,604	1,590,354
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22,531,691</b>	<b>48*</b>	<b>21,511,781</b>	<b>44,043,472</b>

\* State average per capita base grant

## APPENDIX 1

### MATHEMATICAL FORM OF THE EQUALISATION MODEL

The balanced budget distribution model is of the following general form:

$$G_i = \frac{E_i - R_i - SPP_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{29} (E_i - R_i - SPP_i)} \times G$$

- $G_i$  is the equalisation grant for council  $i$ ;  
 $E_i$  is the 'expenditure need' of council  $i$  (or standardised expenditure);  
 $R_i$  is the standardised revenue for council  $i$ ;  
 $SPP_i$  is specific purpose payments treated by the 'inclusion' approach for council  $i$ ; and  
 $G$  is the total amount made available by the Commonwealth for distribution amongst all councils in Tasmania in any year.

For each council,  $E_i$ ,  $R_i$  and  $SPP_i$  are calculated for the three most recent years for which data is available. The average of these three values is taken to determine the final values for use in the grant allocations.

The **standardised expenditure** component for council  $i$ ,  $E_i$ , is the sum of the 'expenditure needs' of a common range of ' $n$ ' municipal functions. That is:

$$E_i = e_i(1) + \dots + e_i(n)$$

$e_i(n)$  is the standardised expenditure of council  $i$  on function  $n$  and is given by:

$$e_i(n) = es_i(n) \times da_i(n)$$

$es_i(n)$  is the standard expenditure on function  $n$  for council  $i$ , and is given by:

$$es_i(n) = EX(n) / P \times p_i$$

- $P$  is the total population of the State  
 $EX(n)$  is the total State expenditure on function  $n$ , net of specific purpose payments treated by the 'deduction' approach  
 $p_i$  is the total population of council  $i$

$da_i(n)$  is the cumulative disability allowance for function  $n$  for council  $i$  and is given by:

$$\left[ \sum_{k=1}^j df(k_n) - (j-1) \right]$$

- $df(k_n)$  are disability factors applying to function  $n$   
 $j$  is the total number of disability factors applying to function  $n$

The **standardised revenue** for council *i* is the product of the total adjusted value of rateable property and a standard rate in the dollar. That is:

$$R_i = AAV_i \times r_s$$

- AAV<sub>i</sub>* is the total adjusted value of the rate base in council *i*, net of fully unrateable properties and with allowance made for partially rateable properties (see Appendix 7);
- r<sub>s</sub>* is the standard rate in the dollar calculated as the average rate in the dollar collected across all councils. This is found by dividing total rate revenue (Appendix 8) by total adjusted rateable AAV (Appendix 7); and
- R<sub>i</sub>* is the standardised revenue.

## APPENDIX 2

### EXAMPLE OF THE APPLICATION OF DISABILITY FACTORS

To demonstrate the application of disability factors, consider a local government authority with a standard expenditure of \$100,000 in a particular expenditure category and disability factor values of:

Isolation	1.03
Scale	1.05
Population Growth	1.02
Tourism	1.08

The cumulative disability factor is calculated as:

$$(1.03 + 1.05 + 1.02 + 1.08) - 3 = 1.18$$

Standardised expenditure is then calculated simply by multiplying the standard by the cumulative disability factor as follows:

$$\$100,000 \times 1.18 = \$118,000$$

The general method of calculating standardised expenditures and an explanation of how disability factors are determined is detailed in Section 5 of this Report.

## APPENDIX 3

### EXAMPLE OF THE APPLICATION OF THE MULHOLLAND MODEL FOR ASSESSMENT OF ROAD EXPENDITURE NEEDS

Consider a municipality which has a local road network of 100km of sealed urban, 200km of sealed rural and 300km of unsealed rural roads; its disability factors combine to give 1.15 for reconstruction and rehabilitation, and 1.06 for maintenance.

The **indicative average costs** per km of the activities are:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Road type</u>			
	<i>Sealed urban</i> ( <i>\$</i> )	<i>Sealed rural</i> ( <i>\$</i> )	<i>Unsealed urban</i> ( <i>\$</i> )	<i>Unsealed rural</i> ( <i>\$</i> )
Reconstruction	338,000	125,300	n/a	n/a
Rehabilitation	315,000	72,000	n/a	n/a
Maintenance*	21,000	15,000	480	480

The **estimated useful lives** of the activities are:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Road type</u>			
	<i>Sealed urban</i> ( <i>years</i> )	<i>Sealed rural</i> ( <i>years</i> )	<i>Unsealed urban</i> ( <i>years</i> )	<i>Unsealed rural</i> ( <i>years</i> )
Reconstruction	55	50	n/a	n/a
Rehabilitation	30	25	n/a	n/a
Maintenance*	15	20	0.57	0.40

The **performance standards** (proportion requiring work each year, annualised over entire useful life ) applied for the activities are:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Road type</u>			
	<i>Sealed urban</i> ( <i>%</i> )	<i>Sealed rural</i> ( <i>%</i> )	<i>Unsealed urban</i> ( <i>%</i> )	<i>Unsealed rural</i> ( <i>%</i> )
Reconstruction	1.82	2	n/a	n/a
Rehabilitation	3.33	4	n/a	n/a
Maintenance*	6.67	5	176	250

\* In this illustration, the specific activity for sealed roads is re-sealing, and the activity used for unsealed roads is routine grading. Additional maintenance activities are recognised in the actual model used by the Commission.

#### Annual reconstruction<sup>2</sup> costs are:

- length of sealed road requiring reconstruction in any year is  $(100 \times 0.0182) + 200 \times 0.02) = 1.82\text{km} + 4\text{km} = 5.82 \text{ km}$ ;
- standard expenditure for reconstruction of sealed roads is  $(1.82 \times 338000) + (4 \times 125,300) = \$1,116,360$ ;

<sup>2</sup> Reconstruction is defined as the complete replacement of a road, including the base layers, in order to reinstate it to the approximate original specifications.



- standardised expenditure is found by applying combined disability factor -  $\$1,116,360 \times 1.15 = \$1,283,814$ ;
- ***total annual reconstruction cost = \$1,283,814***

(Note: reconstruction not applied to unsealed roads)

**Annual rehabilitation<sup>3</sup> costs are:**

- length of sealed road requiring rehabilitation in any year is  $(100 \times 0.033) + (200 \times 0.04) = 3.33\text{km} + 8\text{km} = 11.33\text{km}$ ;
- standard expenditure for rehabilitation of sealed roads is  $(3.33 \times 315,000) + (8 \times 72,000) = \$1,624,950$ ;
- standardised expenditure is found by applying combined disability factor -  $1.15 \times \$1,624,950 = \$1,868,692$ ;
- ***total annual rehabilitation cost = \$1,868,692***

(Note: reconstruction not applied to unsealed roads)

**Annual maintenance<sup>4</sup> costs are:**

- length of sealed roads requiring maintenance (re-sealing) in any year is  $(100 \times 0.067) + (200 \times 0.05) = 6.7\text{km} + 10\text{km} = 16.7\text{km}$
- standard expenditure for sealed road maintenance is  $(6.7 \times 21,000) + (10 \times 15,000) = \$290,700$ ;
- standardised expenditure is found by applying combined disability factor -  $\$290,700 \times 1.06 = \$308,142$ ;
- length of unsealed road requiring maintenance (routine grading) is  $300 \times 2.5 = 750\text{km}$ ;
- standard expenditure for unsealed road maintenance is  $750 \times 480 = \$360,000$ ;
- standardised expenditure is found by applying combined disability factor -  $\$360,000 \times 1.06 = \$381,600$ ;
- ***total annual maintenance cost = (308,142 + 381,600) = \$689,742***

**Total standardised road expenditure for council:**

= \$1,283,814 (reconstruction)  
 + \$1,868,692 (rehabilitation)  
 + \$689,742 (maintenance)  
 = **\$3,842,248**

<sup>3</sup> *Rehabilitation* is defined as the complete replacement of the pavement of a road, where the foundations are strengthened and a new surface is overlaid.

<sup>4</sup> *Maintenance* encompasses (for sealed roads) resealing and thin asphalt overlaying, and (for unsealed roads) routine grading and re-sheeting. For both types of surface, recognition is given to auxillary minor repairs to the surface and maintenance of associated roadside structures.

## APPENDIX 4

### TOTAL GRANTS PROVIDED IN 1999-00 \*

<i>Council</i>	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Recommended base grant 1999-00</i>	<i>Recommended road grant 1999-00</i>	<i>Base grant adjustment 1999-00</i>	<i>Road grant adjustment 1999-00</i>	<i>Total grant provided 1999-00</i>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Break O'Day	662,847	792,699	1,367	1,078	1,457,990
Brighton	745,927	308,528	1,538	420	1,056,412
Burnie	983,449	740,865	2,028	1,007	1,727,349
Central Coast	1,178,250	922,150	2,429	1,254	2,104,083
Central Highlands	601,056	791,684	1,239	1,077	1,395,056
Circular Head	812,390	912,942	1,675	1,241	1,728,249
Clarence	1,058,413	764,165	2,182	1,039	1,825,798
Derwent Valley	546,525	489,244	1,127	665	1,037,561
Devonport	776,923	594,305	1,602	808	1,373,638
Dorset	798,038	1,080,111	1,645	1,469	1,881,263
Flinders	367,860	363,969	758	495	733,082
George Town	554,860	362,622	1,144	493	919,119
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	364,618	417,366	752	568	783,304
Glenorchy	615,832	791,473	1,270	1,076	1,409,650
Hobart	649,124	835,258	1,338	1,136	1,486,857
Huon Valley	932,169	1,016,514	1,922	1,382	1,951,987
Kentish	629,603	657,036	1,298	893	1,288,831
King Island	350,958	399,728	724	544	751,953
Kingborough	959,583	789,531	1,978	1,074	1,752,166
Latrobe	400,119	321,909	825	438	723,291
Launceston	1,538,090	1,533,217	3,171	2,085	3,076,563
Meander	1,048,256	1,084,758	2,161	1,475	2,136,650
Northern Midlands	1,128,984	1,190,216	2,328	1,619	2,323,146
Sorell	600,817	477,875	1,239	650	1,080,581
Southern Midlands	711,312	1,219,117	1,466	1,658	1,933,553
Tasman	261,661	216,127	539	294	478,622
Waratah/Wynyard	942,615	741,810	1,943	1,009	1,687,377
West Coast	722,789	333,328	1,490	453	1,058,060
West Tamar	1,013,831	529,640	2,090	720	1,546,281
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,956,899</b>	<b>20,678,186</b>	<b>45,267</b>	<b>28,120</b>	<b>42,708,472</b>

\* The final grant entitlement for 1999-00 was \$42,708,472 based on actual inflation for the year, whereas the recommended entitlement was \$42,635,085. Consequently, the 1999-00 recommended grants have been scaled up by the amounts shown in Columns 3 and 4 to reflect 'actual' final grant entitlements. The underpayment of \$73,387 is to be paid by adjusting the quarterly instalments in the 2000-01 financial year as specified in the Commonwealth Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1995.

## APPENDIX 5

### POPULATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS

<i>Council</i>	<i>Estimated Resident Population as at 30 June 1999</i>
Break O'Day	5,786
Brighton	12,885
Burnie	19,480
Central Coast	21,058
Central Highlands	2,508
Circular Head	8,515
Clarence	48,891
Derwent Valley	9,811
Devonport	24,462
Dorset	7,415
Flinders	957
George Town	6,780
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	4,174
Glenorchy	43,860
Hobart	46,128
Huon Valley	13,552
Kentish	5,495
King Island	1,790
Kingborough	28,252
Latrobe	8,008
Launceston	62,897
Meander	17,475
Northern Midlands	11,778
Sorell	10,927
Southern Midlands	5,610
Tasman	2,257
Waratah/Wynyard	13,887
West Coast	5,695
West Tamar	19,928
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>470,261</b>

*Source:*

*Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS)  
Regional Population Growth Cat. No. 3218.0*

## APPENDIX 6

### LENGTH OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ROADS AS AT JANUARY 2000

<i>Council</i>	<i>Urban Sealed km</i>	<i>Urban Unsealed km</i>	<i>Rural Sealed km</i>	<i>Rural Unsealed km</i>	<i>Total Roads km</i>	<i>Bridge Deck Areas m<sup>2</sup></i>
Break O'Day	75.45	39.88	106.51	334.06	555.90	7,913.5
Brighton	70.35	4.60	37.78	38.19	150.92	1,529.0
Burnie	119.58	0.10	160.77	71.65	352.10	2,115.2
Central Coast	126.67	1.24	395.91	138.06	661.88	5,446.0
Central Highlands	12.35	3.68	78.88	653.36	748.27	4,244.0
Circular Head	39.30	2.12	209.77	517.27	768.46	4,831.0
Clarence	241.38	3.60	122.02	59.37	426.36	1,159.0
Derwent Valley	32.00	4.40	65.41	228.54	330.35	4,000.4
Devonport	162.07	0.34	68.12	14.56	245.09	1,065.0
Dorset	45.58	9.04	198.55	485.20	738.37	8,660.0
Flinders	6.95	3.11	66.76	308.62	385.44	1,230.0
George Town	34.72	2.82	108.24	138.29	284.07	2,175.0
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	49.14	24.24	78.35	196.47	348.20	2,536.1
Glenorchy	239.11	0.19	34.35	15.88	289.53	1,937.7
Hobart	286.63	16.39	0.00	0.00	303.02	5,750.0
Huon Valley	23.84	8.76	126.98	596.10	755.68	8,532.0
Kentish	18.26	1.99	215.69	249.35	485.29	4,879.0
King Island	7.74	12.81	35.83	365.03	421.41	993.0
Kingborough	108.57	0.00	128.63	272.53	509.73	3,254.0
Latrobe	45.98	2.50	141.22	73.95	263.65	1,795.0
Launceston	346.50	0.00	142.05	240.62	729.17	5,123.0
Meander	109.77	13.07	432.75	253.36	808.95	8,446.2
Northern Midlands	79.51	14.38	465.52	413.24	972.65	9,191.2
Sorell	30.69	40.65	86.13	176.60	334.07	4,157.5
Southern Midlands	29.85	12.87	160.20	638.44	841.35	11,756.0
Tasman	1.36	4.72	46.18	154.78	207.04	1,146.0
Waratah/Wynyard	66.85	5.46	192.78	274.55	539.64	4,826.0
West Coast	67.76	17.01	14.91	76.31	175.99	2,526.6
West Tamar	71.73	5.15	187.37	183.92	448.17	2,888.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,549.69</b>	<b>255.12</b>	<b>4,107.65</b>	<b>7,168.28</b>	<b>14,080.75</b>	<b>124,105.65</b>

Source:

*State Grants Commission Local Road Lengths, updated in 2000 to reflect additions, deletions and changes in road status.*

*These figures also reflect the new road and bridge definitions introduced for the 2000-01 assessments.*

## APPENDIX 7

### MUNICIPAL PROPERTY VALUATIONS AS AT 1 JULY 1999

<i>Council</i>	<i>Year of last revaluation</i>	<i>Assessed Annual Value</i>	<i>Rateable Assessed Annual Value<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Assessed Annual Value adjustment factor<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Adjusted rateable Assessed Annual Value</i>
		\$			
Break O'Day	1995	21,642,018	20,801,904	1.02	21,217,943
Brighton	1994	33,406,490	32,293,609	1.05	33,908,289
Burnie	1996	84,199,070	77,604,086	1.00	77,604,086
Central Coast	1994	62,255,225	58,774,213	1.05	61,712,923
Central Highlands	1996	13,586,164	12,647,838	1.00	12,647,838
Circular Head	1995	32,191,004	30,517,982	1.05	32,043,881
Clarence	1995	174,660,526	169,054,916	1.00	169,054,916
Derwent Valley	1998	30,904,787	94,387,887	1.00	94,387,887
Devonport	1997	98,516,452	26,143,114	1.00	26,665,977
Dorset	1998	27,141,091	28,630,796	1.02	28,630,796
Flinders	1999	3,962,429	3,542,895	1.00	3,542,895
George Town	1994	22,878,202	21,593,771	1.00	21,593,771
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	1999	22,864,407	22,253,333	1.00	22,253,333
Glenorchy	1999	175,828,294	171,359,377	1.00	171,359,377
Hobart	1996	356,163,479	317,052,073	1.00	317,052,073
Huon Valley	1994	40,881,167	39,576,777	1.00	39,576,777
Kentish	1995	16,302,403	15,692,328	1.00	15,692,328
King Island	1998	95,438,995	9,881,371	1.00	9,881,371
Kingborough	1997	10,364,988	91,309,114	1.00	91,309,114
Latrobe	1997	30,861,643	29,927,416	1.00	29,927,416
Launceston	1997	272,362,911	254,099,870	1.00	254,099,870
Meander	1999	61,867,882	60,312,416	1.05	60,312,416
Northern Midlands	1994	40,008,406	38,471,489	1.00	38,471,489
Sorell	1998	36,505,420	35,609,357	1.00	35,609,357
Southern Midlands	1995	19,869,888	19,178,898	1.00	19,178,898
Tasman	1999	11,115,587	10,329,989	1.00	10,329,989
Waratah/Wynyard	1998	42,550,104	40,978,397	1.00	40,978,397
West Coast	1997	18,520,543	17,827,359	1.00	17,827,359
West Tamar	1995	57,171,751	56,021,563	1.00	56,021,563
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,914,021,326</b>	<b>1,805,874,138</b>		<b>1,812,892,329</b>

Source:

*Office of the Valuer-General*

<sup>1</sup> Total AAV modified to allow for both fully and partially exempt AAV.

<sup>2</sup> These factors, provided by the Valuer-General, are used by the Commission to bring all AAV estimates to a common base year.

## APPENDIX 8

### RATE REVENUE RECEIVED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT 1998-99

<i>Council</i>	<i>Ordinary Services</i>	<i>Water and Sewerage*</i>	<i>Total Rate Revenue</i>
	\$	\$	\$
Brighton	2,430,000	2,716,000	5,146,000
Burnie	7,829,653	4,579,420	12,409,073
Central Coast	5,775,000	4,343,000	10,118,000
Central Highlands	1,030,000	240,000	1,270,000
Circular Head	3,142,210	1,670,857	4,813,067
Clarence	12,853,000	10,192,000	23,045,000
Devonport	8,281,244	9,574,919	17,856,163
Dorset	1,760,000	1,142,000	2,902,000
Break O'Day	1,895,269	1,119,995	3,015,264
Flinders	397,646	88,588	486,234
George Town	2,641,398	1,354,510	3,995,908
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	1,601,000	1,510,627	3,111,627
Glenorchy	9,524,658	16,785,304	26,309,962
Hobart	28,035,999	10,545,644	38,581,643
Huon Valley	4,054,000	2,060,000	6,114,000
Kentish	969,000	516,000	1,485,000
King Island	806,620	315,146	1,121,766
Kingborough	7,240,117	6,460,424	13,700,541
Latrobe	2,175,000	2,231,000	4,406,000
Launceston	21,329,000	18,548,000	39,877,000
Meander Valley	4,233,691	2,458,363	6,692,054
Derwent Valley	2,613,000	2,173,000	4,786,000
Northern Midlands	3,176,000	1,862,000	5,038,000
Sorell	3,501,000	1,363,000	4,864,000
Southern Midlands	1,466,627	674,591	2,141,218
Tasman	905,000	0	905,000
Waratah/Wynyard	3,556,880	2,809,576	6,366,456
West Coast	1,715,624	1,631,903	3,347,527
West Tamar	3,798,923	3,771,563	7,570,486
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>148,737,559</b>	<b>112,737,430</b>	<b>261,474,989</b>

Source:

*Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS)  
Government Finance Statistics, Tasmania Cat. No. 5501.6*

\* Includes all revenue from water sales.

## APPENDIX 9

### STANDARDISED REVENUE AND SPECIFIC PURPOSE PAYMENTS 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS\*

<i>Council</i>	<i>Standardised Revenue</i>	<i>Specific Purpose Payments Treated by Inclusion</i>
	\$	\$
Break O'Day	3,060,282	858000
Brighton	4,890,621	303000
Burnie	11,192,903	800000
Central Coast	8,900,907	980000
Central Highlands	1,824,208	961000
Circular Head	4,621,716	980000
Clarence	24,382,933	751000
Derwent Valley	4,129,444	475000
Devonport	13,613,645	586000
Dorset	3,846,056	1126000
Flinders	510,995	365000
George Town	3,114,488	369000
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	3,209,617	422000
Glenorchy	24,715,307	778000
Hobart	45,728,688	848000
Huon Valley	5,708,192	1084000
Kentish	2,263,318	677000
King Island	1,425,198	407000
Kingborough	13,169,591	755000
Latrobe	4,316,456	321000
Launceston	36,649,038	1721000
Meander Valley	8,698,911	1126000
Northern Midlands	5,548,775	1322000
Sorell	5,135,968	491000
Southern Midlands	2,766,189	1249000
Tasman	1,489,903	214000
Waratah/Wynyard	5,910,349	714000
West Coast	2,571,255	330000
West Tamar	8,080,037	532000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>261,474,989</b>	<b>21,545,000</b>

\* These are the values for the latest year only. The grant calculations use an average of the most recent three years' values.

## APPENDIX 10

### STANDARD EXPENDITURE, 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS

<i>Council</i>	<i>General Administration</i>	<i>Health Housing &amp; Welfare</i>	<i>Sanitation And the Environment</i>	<i>Recreation &amp; Culture</i>
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Break O'Day	685,466	140,648	327,878	440,683
Brighton	1,526,482	313,214	730,160	981,369
Burnie	2,307,789	473,528	1,103,882	1,483,669
Central Coast	2,494,735	511,886	1,193,303	1,603,855
Central Highlands	297,122	60,965	142,122	191,019
Circular Head	1,008,769	206,986	482,523	648,534
Clarence	5,792,101	1,188,462	2,770,528	3,723,720
Derwent Valley	1,162,306	238,490	555,964	747,242
Devonport	2,898,005	594,632	1,386,199	1,863,117
Dorset	878,453	180,247	420,189	564,754
Flinders	113,375	23,263	54,231	72,889
George Town	803,224	164,811	384,205	516,390
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	494,492	101,463	236,530	317,907
Glenorchy	5,196,080	1,066,166	2,485,434	3,340,540
Hobart	5,464,770	1,121,298	2,613,956	3,513,279
Huon Valley	1,605,501	329,427	767,957	1,032,171
Kentish	650,991	133,575	311,388	418,520
King Island	212,061	43,512	101,435	136,333
Kingborough	3,347,006	686,761	1,600,969	2,151,777
Latrobe	948,705	194,662	453,793	609,919
Launceston	7,451,388	1,528,925	3,564,212	4,790,469
Meander Valley	2,070,258	424,789	990,264	1,330,961
Northern Midlands	1,395,336	286,304	667,429	897,056
Sorell	1,294,518	265,618	619,205	832,241
Southern Midlands	664,615	136,370	317,904	427,278
Tasman	267,386	54,864	127,898	171,901
Waratah/Wynyard	1,645,188	337,571	786,941	1,057,685
West Coast	674,685	138,436	322,721	433,752
West Tamar	2,360,864	484,418	1,129,269	1,517,790
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>55,711,672</b>	<b>11,431,290</b>	<b>26,648,490</b>	<b>35,816,821</b>



**STANDARD EXPENDITURE, 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS continued**

<i>Planning &amp; Community Amenities</i>	<i>Public Safety</i>	<i>Sewerage</i>	<i>Water</i>	<i>Other</i>
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
265,347	21,039	308,444	538,736	122,644
590,908	46,852	686,883	1,199,726	273,119
893,355	70,832	1,038,454	1,813,788	412,911
965,722	76,570	1,122,575	1,960,716	446,360
115,017	9,119	133,698	233,521	53,161
390,499	30,962	453,924	792,834	180,490
2,242,147	177,775	2,606,317	4,552,254	1,036,327
449,934	35,674	523,012	913,505	207,961
1,121,830	88,947	1,304,038	2,277,663	518,513
340,053	26,962	395,284	690,413	157,173
43,888	3,480	51,016	89,107	20,285
310,932	24,653	361,433	631,288	143,714
191,420	15,177	222,511	388,642	88,475
2,011,425	159,481	2,338,121	4,083,817	929,687
2,115,436	167,728	2,459,025	4,294,991	977,761
621,496	49,277	722,440	1,261,830	287,258
252,001	19,981	292,931	511,641	116,476
82,090	6,509	95,423	166,667	37,942
1,295,640	102,728	1,506,078	2,630,551	598,849
367,248	29,118	426,896	745,627	169,743
2,884,464	228,703	3,352,959	5,856,357	1,333,208
801,406	63,542	931,570	1,627,102	370,412
540,141	42,827	627,870	1,096,653	249,655
501,114	39,732	582,504	1,017,416	231,616
257,275	20,399	299,062	522,349	118,913
103,506	8,207	120,318	210,150	47,841
636,860	50,495	740,298	1,293,022	294,358
261,173	20,708	303,593	530,263	120,715
913,901	72,461	1,062,336	1,855,502	422,408
21,566,227	1,709,937	25,069,014	43,786,130	9,967,976

## APPENDIX 11

### STANDARDISED EXPENDITURE, 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS\*

<i>Council</i>	<i>General Administration</i>	<i>Health Housing &amp; Welfare</i>	<i>Sanitation and the Environment</i>	<i>Recreation &amp; Culture</i>	<i>Planning &amp; Community Amenities</i>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Break O'Day	1,495,358	254,379	537,249	803,253	483,659
Brighton	2,122,376	413,304	877,124	1,199,146	722,036
Burnie	3,435,008	600,848	1,349,835	2,146,001	1,131,359
Central Coast	3,178,052	637,702	1,396,859	1,986,742	1,196,268
Central Highlands	879,988	137,630	305,496	443,032	266,761
Circular Head	1,871,455	326,293	711,563	1,059,977	638,240
Clarence	6,248,095	1,292,783	2,938,576	4,644,334	2,572,258
Derwent Valley	1,900,406	343,865	748,567	1,091,380	657,148
Devonport	3,764,833	700,497	1,527,817	2,379,024	1,342,725
Dorset	1,662,633	289,074	623,749	918,654	553,145
Flinders	624,786	81,763	176,068	256,830	154,644
George Town	1,502,748	263,950	557,210	805,757	485,167
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	1,232,353	186,124	452,429	646,485	389,265
Glenorchy	5,446,559	1,148,333	2,593,095	3,895,332	2,144,337
Hobart	8,511,069	1,202,346	3,613,624	4,245,868	2,641,163
Huon Valley	2,435,457	469,115	1,021,581	1,455,234	876,234
Kentish	1,302,595	216,561	477,932	681,557	410,383
King Island	681,189	100,993	203,511	324,889	195,624
Kingborough	3,760,911	768,699	1,786,197	2,523,559	1,519,499
Latrobe	1,650,994	287,843	647,496	912,886	549,672
Launceston	9,043,815	1,758,991	3,961,551	6,353,303	3,594,729
Meander Valley	2,943,358	564,149	1,264,199	1,792,231	1,079,149
Northern Midlands	2,176,563	399,375	889,969	1,285,344	773,939
Sorell	2,058,573	380,553	841,141	1,172,469	705,974
Southern Midlands	1,336,890	228,423	483,590	698,773	420,749
Tasman	781,403	117,544	266,213	398,388	239,880
Waratah/Wynyard	2,406,453	446,369	993,140	1,410,461	849,275
West Coast	1,587,132	262,255	559,130	878,123	528,740
West Tamar	3,085,050	596,266	1,331,442	1,887,153	1,136,303
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>77,630,741</b>	<b>14,221,649</b>	<b>32,599,102</b>	<b>47,492,932</b>	<b>27,774,666</b>

\* These are the values for the latest year only. The grant calculations use an average of the most recent three years' values.

**STANDARDISED EXPENDITURE, 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS\* continued**

<i>Public Safety</i>	<i>Sewerage</i>	<i>Water</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Roads</i>	<i>Total</i>
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
26,409	379,859	663,448	122,644	3,444,745	8,209,101
48,915	700,969	1,225,497	273,119	1,800,381	9,378,632
78,519	1,251,458	2,184,635	412,911	4,561,254	17,145,423
86,057	1,221,532	2,145,324	446,360	5,880,136	18,168,110
12,424	201,030	351,123	53,161	3,309,250	5,959,070
38,778	537,883	940,530	180,490	4,340,624	10,643,033
188,354	2,825,332	4,982,378	1,036,327	5,644,544	32,356,907
40,360	582,681	1,017,808	207,961	1,798,820	8,385,771
95,488	1,436,327	2,514,391	518,513	4,313,895	18,585,469
32,753	457,548	800,034	157,173	4,416,150	9,908,475
4,913	62,875	109,951	101,426	1,855,889	3,427,572
28,213	399,784	698,800	143,714	2,223,003	7,106,117
17,828	309,906	542,709	88,475	2,133,737	5,997,938
166,038	2,575,858	4,464,997	929,687	5,374,468	28,724,288
176,544	3,928,299	6,845,201	977,761	5,524,260	37,650,970
56,890	837,346	1,468,718	287,258	3,649,573	12,552,951
22,121	328,307	572,937	116,476	3,033,091	7,160,152
9,318	112,306	196,175	113,826	2,174,420	4,110,487
111,464	1,656,219	2,898,436	598,849	4,127,661	19,742,205
32,477	474,342	829,480	169,743	1,996,457	7,548,758
254,430	4,178,209	7,293,460	1,333,208	10,449,426	48,200,445
75,626	1,087,649	1,903,378	370,412	6,013,132	17,087,539
49,090	707,682	1,237,970	249,655	6,715,184	14,480,899
44,289	661,921	1,156,460	231,616	2,184,717	9,434,121
24,006	332,477	580,702	118,913	4,479,448	8,702,127
9,808	158,753	277,283	47,841	980,747	3,277,117
56,647	819,206	1,431,328	294,358	3,906,389	12,609,060
28,594	434,058	757,993	120,715	1,880,837	7,035,706
81,759	1,154,335	2,018,831	422,408	3,414,358	15,121,353
1,871,701	29,434,288	51,446,531	10,002,357	108,181,853	408,709,799

## APPENDIX 12

### DISABILITY FACTORS, 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS

<i>Council</i>	<i>Absentee Population</i>	<i>Unemp- loyment</i>	<i>Age Profile</i>	<i>Worker Influx</i>	<i>Climate</i>	<i>Day- tripper</i>	<i>Dispersion</i>	<i>Isolation</i>	<i>Popu- lation Decline</i>
Break O'Day	1.07	1.10	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.08	1.16	1.00
Brighton	1.00	1.11	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.02	1.00
Burnie	1.01	1.09	1.02	1.06	1.00	1.04	1.03	1.03	1.03
Central Coast	1.00	1.07	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.02	1.05	1.05	1.00
Central Highlands	1.12	1.08	1.00	1.00	1.02	1.03	1.22	1.08	1.06
Circular Head	1.02	1.03	1.02	1.00	1.02	1.02	1.10	1.13	1.00
Clarence	1.01	1.04	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.08	1.03	1.00	1.01
Derwent Valley	1.01	1.07	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.06	1.07	1.03	1.02
Devonport	1.00	1.08	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.01	1.02	1.02
Dorset	1.03	1.05	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.09	1.09	1.02
Flinders	1.05	1.06	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.12	1.28	1.00
George Town	1.04	1.09	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.02	1.03	1.07	1.02
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	1.08	1.09	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.07	1.09	1.00
Glenorchy	1.00	1.06	1.03	1.00	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00
Hobart	1.01	1.05	1.04	1.30	1.00	1.03	1.00	1.00	1.01
Huon Valley	1.03	1.09	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.05	1.11	1.03	1.00
Kentish	1.01	1.09	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.04	1.05	1.06	1.00
King Island	1.04	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.05	1.35	1.02
Kingborough	1.01	1.02	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.05	1.07	1.00	1.00
Latrobe	1.02	1.06	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.04	1.03	1.03	1.00
Launceston	1.01	1.07	1.04	1.01	1.00	1.03	1.04	1.01	1.02
Meander Valley	1.01	1.03	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.02	1.09	1.05	1.00
Northern Midlands	1.01	1.05	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.06	1.09	1.04	1.00
Sorell	1.04	1.06	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.04	1.02	1.00
Southern Midlands	1.02	1.08	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.09	1.09	1.00
Tasman	1.10	1.12	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.13	1.04	1.11	1.00
Waratah/Wynyard	1.02	1.04	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.02	1.05	1.04	1.01
West Coast	1.04	1.07	1.00	1.00	1.05	1.02	1.11	1.18	1.09
West Tamar	1.02	1.02	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.06	1.06	1.00

**DISABILITY FACTORS, 2000-01 ASSESSMENTS continued**

<i>Council</i>	<i>Popu- lation Growth</i>	<i>Tourism</i>	<i>Regional Responsibility</i>			<i>Scale</i>			<i>Equivalent Tenements</i>	
			<i>General Admin</i>	<i>Comm. &amp; Region. Devel.</i>	<i>Recreat. &amp; Culture</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Sewerage</i>	<i>Water</i>
Break O'Day	1.00	1.07	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.79	1.40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Brighton	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.36	1.18	1.00	1.01	1.01
Burnie	1.00	1.01	1.14	1.01	1.19	1.17	1.09	1.00	1.06	1.06
Central Coast	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.14	1.07	1.00	1.01	1.01
Central Highlands	1.00	1.08	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.40	1.70	1.00	1.00	1.00
Circular Head	1.00	1.03	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.57	1.28	1.00	1.01	1.01
Clarence	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.00	1.10	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.04	1.05
Derwent Valley	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.49	1.25	1.00	1.00	1.00
Devonport	1.00	1.02	1.14	1.02	1.10	1.08	1.04	1.00	1.05	1.05
Dorset	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.64	1.32	1.00	1.00	1.00
Flinders	1.00	1.06	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
George Town	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.70	1.35	1.00	1.00	1.00
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	1.00	1.24	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.01	1.51	1.00	1.00	1.01
Glenorchy	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.00	1.10	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.09	1.08
Hobart	1.00	1.04	1.20	1.12	1.08	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.24	1.24
Huon Valley	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.33	1.17	1.00	1.01	1.01
Kentish	1.00	1.06	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.83	1.41	1.00	1.00	1.00
King Island	1.00	1.04	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.70	1.85	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kingborough	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.02	1.00	1.01	1.01
Latrobe	1.03	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.60	1.30	1.00	1.00	1.01
Launceston	1.00	1.02	1.11	1.08	1.16	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.16	1.16
Meander Valley	1.04	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.22	1.11	1.00	1.01	1.02
Northern Midlands	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.40	1.20	1.00	1.01	1.01
Sorell	1.05	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.44	1.22	1.00	1.00	1.00
Southern Midlands	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.81	1.41	1.00	1.00	1.00
Tasman	1.03	1.15	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.49	1.75	1.00	1.00	1.00
Waratah/Wynyard	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.32	1.16	1.00	1.01	1.01
West Coast	1.00	1.13	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.80	1.40	1.00	1.01	1.01
West Tamar	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.16	1.08	1.00	1.00	1.00

**APPENDIX 13**

**MULHOLLAND MODEL DISABILITY FACTORS**

<i>Municipality</i>	<i>Urban Sealed Roads</i>						<i>Urban Unsealed</i>	
	<i>Climate</i>	<i>Drainage</i>	<i>Material</i>	<i>Soil</i>	<i>Terrain</i>	<i>Traffic</i>	<i>Climate</i>	<i>Traffic</i>
Break O'Day	0.98	0.99	1.01	0.93	1.05	0.99	0.98	0.99
Brighton	0.94	1.01	1.05	1.01	1.06	0.98	0.94	0.96
Burnie	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.97	1.09	1.02	1.00	0.96
Central Coast	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.94	1.05	1.01	1.00	0.97
Central Highlands	0.95	1.00	1.06	1.05	1.02	0.96	0.95	0.96
Circular Head	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.76	1.04	0.99	1.00	0.96
Clarence	0.94	1.00	0.96	1.01	1.09	0.98	0.94	0.96
Derwent Valley	0.95	1.00	1.02	0.94	1.01	0.97	0.95	0.96
Devonport	1.00	0.98	1.00	1.05	1.05	1.02	1.00	0.96
Dorset	0.99	0.99	1.04	0.97	1.07	0.99	0.99	0.96
Flinders	0.96	1.01	0.99	0.73	1.02	0.99	0.96	1.00
George Town	1.00	0.99	1.10	1.15	1.03	0.98	1.00	0.96
Glamorgan/Spring Bay	0.96	0.99	1.03	0.95	1.07	0.97	0.96	0.96
Glenorchy	0.94	1.00	0.92	1.00	1.11	1.03	0.94	0.99
Hobart	0.94	0.99	0.91	1.01	1.11	0.98	1.01	0.96
Huon Valley	0.98	1.03	0.97	0.99	1.01	0.96	0.99	0.96
Kentish	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.00	1.00	0.96
King Island	1.04	0.98	1.00	0.94	1.07	0.99	1.04	0.97
Kingborough	1.00	1.00	0.90	1.08	1.07	0.98	1.00	1.00
Latrobe	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.01	1.01	1.00	0.97
Launceston	0.97	1.00	1.00	1.12	1.10	0.99	0.97	0.99
Meander Valley	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.84	1.05	0.98	1.00	0.96
Northern Midlands	0.95	1.02	1.02	1.04	1.01	0.99	0.95	0.96
Sorell	0.95	0.99	1.02	1.07	1.06	1.00	0.95	0.97
Southern Midlands	0.95	1.01	1.03	1.06	1.07	0.98	0.95	0.97
Tasman	0.95	0.99	1.07	1.02	1.10	0.96	0.95	0.96
Waratah/Wynyard	1.01	1.02	1.00	0.93	1.03	1.01	1.00	0.96
West Coast	1.07	0.99	1.00	1.06	1.04	0.98	1.07	0.97
West Tamar	1.00	0.98	1.01	0.98	1.08	0.98	1.00	0.98

**MULHOLLAND MODEL DISABILITY FACTORS continued**

<i>Rural Sealed roads</i>						<i>Rural Unsealed</i>			
<i>Climate</i>	<i>Drainage</i>	<i>Material</i>	<i>Soil</i>	<i>Terrain</i>	<i>Traffic</i>	<i>Climate</i>	<i>Traffic</i>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Remoteness</i>
0.98	0.99	1.01	1.03	1.04	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.99	1.00
0.94	1.00	1.05	1.07	1.05	0.98	0.94	0.98	1.01	1.00
1.02	0.99	1.00	1.06	1.08	1.04	1.01	1.00	1.05	1.00
1.01	0.99	1.00	0.99	1.12	1.00	1.01	0.98	1.00	1.00
0.98	1.00	1.06	1.02	1.12	0.97	1.00	0.97	0.98	1.00
1.04	0.99	1.00	0.99	1.12	1.01	1.04	0.99	0.99	1.00
0.94	1.00	0.95	0.96	1.09	0.98	0.94	0.96	1.03	1.00
0.95	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.05	0.96	0.95	0.96	1.00	1.00
1.00	0.99	1.00	1.04	1.07	1.01	1.00	0.99	1.03	1.00
1.00	0.99	1.02	1.02	1.10	1.01	1.00	0.99	0.99	1.00
0.96	0.99	0.99	1.00	1.05	1.00	0.96	0.99	0.98	1.09
1.00	0.97	1.10	1.12	1.08	0.98	1.00	0.97	1.00	1.00
0.96	0.99	1.03	1.02	1.06	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.99	1.00
0.95	0.99	0.95	1.00	1.16	1.01	0.95	0.99	1.05	1.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.09	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.00
1.01	1.00	0.97	1.01	1.06	0.97	1.01	0.97	0.99	1.00
1.03	0.99	1.00	0.95	1.15	1.01	1.01	0.98	0.98	1.00
1.03	1.02	1.00	1.04	1.00	0.99	1.03	0.97	0.99	1.12
1.01	0.99	0.90	1.03	1.14	0.98	1.00	0.96	1.02	1.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	0.92	1.05	1.01	1.00	0.98	1.00	1.00
0.99	1.00	1.04	1.04	1.10	1.00	0.99	0.99	1.04	1.00
1.01	1.00	0.99	1.02	1.09	0.99	1.01	0.97	0.99	1.00
0.95	1.02	1.03	1.07	1.05	1.01	0.95	0.98	0.99	1.00
0.95	1.00	1.04	1.12	1.07	1.00	0.95	0.98	1.01	1.00
0.95	1.00	1.07	1.04	1.13	1.03	0.95	1.00	0.98	1.00
1.00	1.00	1.07	1.04	1.10	0.97	0.98	0.97	0.99	1.00
1.03	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.12	1.01	1.03	1.00	0.99	1.00
1.07	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.09	0.97	1.07	0.99	1.00	1.00
1.00	0.99	1.01	1.02	1.05	0.98	1.00	0.97	1.01	1.00

## **APPENDIX 14**

### **REPRESENTATION AT COMMISSION DISCUSSIONS IN 2000**

#### **Tuesday 7 March 2000**

##### **George Town Council**

Clr D Cameron, Deputy Mayor  
Clr D Mackrill  
Mr J Ayres, Acting General Manager

##### **West Tamar**

Clr M Burr, Mayor  
Mr I Pearce, General Manager  
Mr R Wright, Technical Services Manager  
Mr G Stagg, Corporate Services Manager

#### **Wednesday 8 March 2000**

##### **Latrobe Council**

Clr B Campbell, Mayor  
Mr G Atkins, General Manager  
Mr L Edsall, Director Development Services  
Ms C Stubbs, Accountant  
Ms J Feebey, Director Corporate Services

##### **Kentish**

Clr J Deverell  
Ms C Fraser, General Manager  
Mr K Winduss, Manager Technical Services  
Mr D Fraser, IT Consultant

#### **Thursday 9 March 2000**

##### **Launceston City Council**

Mr R Campbell, General Manager  
Mr M Tidey, Corporate Services Manager  
Mr G Brayford, Technical Services Manager  
Mr I Abernathy, Strategic Development Manager



### **Dorset Council**

Clr Y Thorne, Mayor  
Mr G Preece, General Manager  
Mr J Martin, Corporate Services Manager  
Mr L Smith, Works and Infrastructure Manager

### **Flinders Council**

Clr L Mason, Mayor  
Mr L Connors, General Manager  
Mr A Bickford, Finance and Administration Manager

### **Break O'Day Council**

Clr R Legge, Mayor  
Mr J Brown, General Manager  
Mr D Morcom, Finance and Administration Manager

### **Northern Midlands Council**

Clr K Von Bibra, Mayor  
Mr G Monson, General Manager  
Mr H Galea, Technical Services Manager

### **Wednesday 15 March 2000**

### **Devonport City Council**

Ald M Binks, Mayor  
Mr D Sales, General Manager  
Mr D Sheargold, Manager Technical Services

### **Waratah/Wynyard Council**

Clr A Beswick, Deputy Mayor  
Mr J Gibson, General Manager  
Mr J Riddiford, Director of Engineering

### **West Coast Council**

Clr M Waller, Mayor  
Clr A Drake, Deputy Mayor  
Mr P West, General Manager

**Thursday, 16 March, 2000**

**King Island Council**

Clr D Brewster, Mayor  
Clr G Barrett, Deputy Mayor  
Clr J Payne  
Clr V Philbey  
Clr W Stellmaker  
Clr M Tait  
Mr J White, General Manager  
Mr G Conley, Director Works & Engineering Services  
Mr M Williams, Director of Health, Building and Planning Services  
Mr D Wilson, Acting Administrative Officer  
Mr D Luck, Council Consulting Engineer

**Friday, 17 March 2000**

**Circular Head Council**

Clr M Weldon, Deputy Mayor  
Mr P Arnold, General Manager  
Mr M Goldstone, General Manager elect  
Ms R Gardiner, Administrative Services Manager

**Tuesday 4 April 2000**

**Clarence City Council**

Ald C Edwards, Mayor  
Ald J Campbell, Deputy Mayor  
Mr F Barta, Acting General Manager  
Mr J Stevens, Group Manager Asset Management

**Hobart City Council**

Clr P Bonham, Deputy Mayor  
Clr E Ruzicka  
Mr B Armstrong, General Manager  
Mr T Horacek, Financial Services Manager  
Mr L Parker, Director Transportation Services

**Wednesday 5 April 2000**

**Glenorchy City Council**

Mr D Lovell, General Manager  
Ms C Bell, Manager Financial Services  
Mr A Lawrence, Manager Engineering  
Ms L Mackey, Manager Community Participation  
Mr D Hunn, Council Business Consultant

**Derwent Valley Council**

Clr T Morris, Mayor  
Clr N Cracknell, Deputy Mayor  
Clr A Nicholson  
Clr J Bromfield  
Clr R Williams  
Clr R Wall  
Mr S Mackey, General Manager  
Mr J Bradley, Accountant  
Mr M Clark, Manager Technical Services  
Mr R McCrossen, Manager Corporate and Family Services  
Mr K Wall, Works Manager

**Thursday, 6 April 2000**

**Brighton Council**

Mr G Dodge, General Manager  
Mr R Sanderson, Deputy General Manager, Manager Corporate and Physical Services  
Mr G Davoren, Manager Financial Services

**Southern Midlands Council**

Clr C Howlett, Mayor  
Clr D Manning, Deputy Mayor  
Mr T Kirkwood, General Manager  
Mr N Marstrand, Engineering/Building Surveyor

**Central Highlands Council**

Clr G Ashton-Jones, Mayor  
Mr T Berriman, General Manager

### **Glamorgan/Spring Bay Council**

Clr C Arnol, Mayor

Mr G Reid, General Manager

Mr D Ewington, Technical Services Manager

### **Tasman Council**

Mr G Burgess, General Manager

Mr B Chandler, Administration & Finance Manager

### **Sorell Council**

Clr K Degrassi, Mayor

Mr B Inches, General Manager

Mr M Melton, Council Engineer

Mr A Hocking, Consultant

## NOTES

## NOTES

## NOTES

## NOTES