

Towong Shire Council

Response to Request for Information – Essential Services Commission

1.1 185E(3)(a) – Proposed higher cap

Towong Shire Council confirms that it is applying for a higher cap of 6.34%.

We note that the budget baseline information template calculated a higher cap of 6.41%. We have reviewed this and identified that we had incorrectly included supplementary assessments. We have clarified this with Liam Jackson from the Essential Services Commission and confirm that we seek a higher cap of 6.34%.

1.2 185E(3)(b) – Reasons

Towong Shire Council's Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) requires a number of assumptions to be made about what will occur in the future. Where possible these assumptions are based on available supporting evidence or data to ensure that the LTFP is based on the best information available. The following responses aim to clarify particular assumptions used in the LTFP.

VGC grants indexation from 2017/18

In preparing its annual budget and LTFP Council includes revenue that:

- has been approved with a signed funding agreement
- has been confirmed by formal notification from the relevant government department or agency
- is expected as ongoing operational funding, such as Financial Assistance Grants. Where expected ongoing operational funding is significant, an estimate is calculated and any future year increases are based on actual historical indexation.

Financial Assistance Grants are a significant revenue source for Council. In the three years prior to the indexation freeze, Council's Financial Assistance Grant (General) allocation increased by an average 1.0% per annum and the Financial Assistance Grant (Roads) allocation increased by an average 2.1% per annum. Since the indexation freeze was implemented the funding provided to Council has reduced by 0.2% and 1.5% respectively. Council has not received any correspondence confirming the re-instatement of the historical indexation on the Financial Assistance Grants. For these reasons Financial Assistance Grants have not been indexed in future years.

Expenditure on asset renewal

Council recognises the importance of road and related infrastructure to our communities and accordingly has committed to renew 100% of assets that fall below the intervention level. The intervention levels have been set based on community expectations and expert advice on when assets need replacing.

Further information provide by our independent asset expert on intervention levels is included at Appendix 1.

Expenditure on asset renewal in Council's current LTFP is derived directly from asset renewal recommendations from the Moloney asset management system. The recommendations are based on current day replacement dollars. Recognising that much of this asset renewal expenditure will be incurred in future years, the asset renewal expenditure is indexed by 3% per annum to better reflect the full financial impact on Council into the future. This system makes recommendations on when assets are actually expected to need renewing which can result in fluctuating asset renewal expenditure over the short to medium term.

Depreciation is also based on the asset management system and is influenced by the replacement cost at the date of assessment and the remaining useful life of the asset. The depreciated replacement cost (fair value) and depreciation reflect current day dollars. Depreciation is not indexed in the LTFP. On a cyclical basis most assets will be revalued in accordance with Australian Accounting Standards. Assuming asset replacement costs continue to rise, as revaluations are undertaken the calculated depreciation will also increase for the duration of the LTFP. This results in the calculated depreciation in the short term drawing closer to the recommended asset renewal expenditure at the asset revaluation date. In addition plant, machinery and equipment is valued at cost and depreciated over the life of the asset, whereas associated asset renewal will be indexed to expected replacement cost.

So in summary it is intended that asset renewal into the future keeps increasing in line with expert asset renewal recommendations (in both the higher cap and no higher cap scenario) and this is higher than calculated depreciation primarily due to the premise that depreciation is based on current day dollars and asset renewal expenditure has been indexed.

The table below outlines capital renewal expenditure over the next four years compared to depreciation.

\$'000	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
Capital Renewal	4,275	3,634	3,870	4,072
Depreciation	3,569	3,733	3,704	3,705
Variance	706	(99)	166	367

The significant variance in 2016/17 is due to the additional Roads to Recovery funding which will be expended on road asset renewal. Roads to Recovery funding will total \$2,214,000 in 2016/17 and will revert back to \$671,000 in 2017/18.

Additional Roads to Recovery grant allocations

Additional *Roads to Recovery* grant allocations have been incorporated into Council's LTFP as appended to the original submission. The amounts included are: 2015/16 - \$1,917,000, 2016/17 - \$2,214,000, 2017/18 - \$671,000 and 2018/19 - \$671,000.

1.3 185E(3)(C) – Engagement

Council conducted a series of community engagement workshops in February and March 2015 to discuss Council's financial sustainability challenges. In total 49 people attended four community workshops and 20 staff attended two employee workshops.

The workshops involved a presentation detailing:

- Key achievements of Council
- The journey taken over a five year period to address Council's sustainability challenges (including efforts undertaken to improve financial sustainability both now and into the future)
- A summary of the current fiscal environment and the associated new challenges, particularly:
 - The Financial Assistance Grants indexation freeze
 - The impending *Fair Go Rates System*
- The financial model used by Council to forecast the financial position of Council into the future (Council's Long Term Financial Plan)
- Current service levels and service quality
- Future opportunities

The financial model, and the key assumptions behind it, was explained at each workshop. The impact on Council's financial sustainability indicators, including the VAGO indicators, of varying rate increases, varying asset renewal levels and varying staffing cuts was demonstrated to workshop participants.

In particular the need for a 6% rate increase in each year of the Long Term Financial Plan to be financially sustainable was highlighted to participants. There was a general acceptance that the 6% rate increase is necessary to fund the modest level of service currently being provided to community members.

The feedback from participants is detailed in *Community Forums 2015* (Appendix 2).

In summary, community members suggested some services that could be reduced or ceased. Many of these are outside the control of Council, such as transferring responsibility for major roads to VicRoads, ceasing immunisations, ceasing emergency management support and not participating in the Electoral Representation Review.

Council implemented some of the service reduction suggestions in the 2015/16 budget, including ceasing the Towong Alliance contribution and ceasing the mobile library service, both effective from 1 July 2015.

Council is also further exploring other community suggestions. If implemented some will have a moderate financial impact, such as ceasing the SES contribution and ceasing membership of co-operative tourism bodies, however many others are likely to be items of less significant financial nature, such as a reduction in mowing of lawns and cleaning of BBQs and toilets.

Community members were consistent in their views that Council should continue its economic development activity, provide increased tourism support and increase its lobbying for improvements to telecommunication and internet coverage.

Other relevant consultations

In addition to community engagement evidenced in the original submission, Council has undertaken consultation on a number of specific issues in the municipality, including early childhood services, swimming pool operations and office / library operating hours. The following provides a summary of other specific consultation that has been undertaken:

Engagement exercise	Participation
Childrens Services Review (Appendix 3)	Consulted with residents across the Shire regarding their needs for early childhood services. 52 families represented at consultations 56 people completed community surveys 12 service provider organisations represented at consultations
Mobile library report (Appendix 4)	Consulted with residents in remote areas of the Shire regarding their access to library services. Three workshops conducted 24 people attended workshops
Corryong Swimming Pool (Appendix 5)	Consulted with residents in Corryong regarding swimming pool services. 7 community organisations represented at community workshop 32 people completed community surveys
Corryong Office / Library hours (Appendix 6)	Consulted with residents in Corryong who use the office / library on Saturdays regarding ceasing Saturday opening hours. 11 people completed community surveys

1.4 185E(3)(D) - Value and efficiency

No further information has been requested.

1.5 185E(3)(E) - Trade offs and alternative funding

Service reductions and consultation

To respond to the indexation freeze on Financial Assistance Grants and the introduction of rate capping Council has considered and implemented a range of opportunities to reduce expenditure. Amongst other initiatives Council has migrated banking services, reduced fuel cards, reduced road maintenance workforce and changed communication service providers. The CEO has elected to forgo a contractual CPI salary increase in recognising the sacrifice that all parties must make in the difficult financial climate.

A number of the savings implemented have resulted in an immediate reduction in service including:

- Cessation of the mobile library service
- Cessation of a financial contribution to the Towong Alliance partnership with the local health services
- Closed the Corryong Office / library on Saturday mornings
- Reduced the length of the swimming pool season by one week.

These reductions in service are in addition to those being considered by Council for the 2016/17 and future year budgets (as listed on page 18 of the application).

Council does not believe it is appropriate to drastically cut the modest level of service that is being provided to the local community however Council recognises its responsibility to manage financial risks faced by Council prudently (Local Government Act 1989 s136(1)). Council believes it has limited options in the face of a 2.5% rate cap and has commenced consultation on some service cuts. Council has communicated with the three SES units that operate within Towong Shire to advise that Council is unlikely to provide a financial contribution to their operation. A copy of one of the letters is attached at Appendix 7.

Council intends to consult more widely on further proposals after additional analysis has been completed on the potential impact of the service cuts.

Analysis tab list

The analysis sheet in the baseline template was used for preliminary review by management and Councillors when considering Council's LTFP at 6% compared to the 2.5% rate cap. Further analysis was undertaken and this table in the baseline template had not been updated to accommodate the

options for the 6.34% per the application. Please refer to page 18 of 'The Statement' that was part of the variation application for the most up to date listing.

1.6 185E(3)(F) – Long term planning

No further information has been requested.

1.7 Other information

Local Government Performance reporting Frameworks (LGPRF) – Financial Indicators

Please find following completed tables reporting LGPRF indicators that measure Council's financial position without the proposed higher cap and with the proposed higher cap.

Council's financial position *without* the proposed higher cap

LGPRF indicator	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Forecast	
	(Actual)	(Forecast Actual)	(Cap Year)	2017-18	2018-19
Operating position					
Adjusted underlying result (%) (measure 54)	26.57%	(13.29%)	(3.69%)	(7.06%)	(4.20%)
Liquidity					
Working capital ratio (measure 55)	633.48%	492.78%	518.60%	496.84%	480.14%
Unrestricted cash ratio (%) (measure 56)	281.66%	432.51%	457.67%	441.31%	423.30%
Obligations					
Loans and borrowings (%) (measure 57)	0.46%	0.43%	18.48%	16.48%	14.48%
Loans and borrowing repayments (%) (measure 58)	4.64%	0.11%	2.72%	2.64%	2.59%
Indebtedness (%) (measure 59)	5.97%	1.30%	16.38%	14.89%	13.13%
Asset renewal (%) (measure 60)	76.64%	88.26%	119.78%	97.35%	104.48%

Council's financial position *with* the proposed higher cap

LGPRF indicator	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Forecast	
	(Actual)	(Forecast Actual)	(Cap Year)	2017-18	2018-19
Operating position					
Adjusted underlying result (%) (measure 54)	26.57%	(13.29%)	(3.13%)	(5.03%)	(0.79%)
Liquidity					
Working capital ratio (measure 55)	633.48%	492.78%	515.99%	504.50%	508.68%
Unrestricted cash ratio (%) (measure 56)	281.66%	432.51%	455.25%	448.65%	450.97%
Obligations					
Loans and borrowings (%) (measure 57)	0.46%	0.43%	17.91%	15.48%	13.18%
Loans and borrowing repayments (%) (measure 58)	4.64%	0.11%	2.64%	2.48%	2.36%
Indebtedness (%) (measure 59)	5.97%	1.30%	16.05%	14.21%	12.24%
Asset renewal (%) (measure 60)	76.64%	88.26%	119.78%	97.35%	104.48%

Note: the liquidity measure of unrestricted cash ratio in the above two tables is based on the assumption that 100% of Councils capital works program is completed each year, there are no unexpended grants and there are no funds held in trust or as deposits.

Council Profile

Council officers have reviewed the information collected by the Commission for the Council profile.

The Council Profile information matches Council records except for the following inconsistencies:

- Budgeted Income Statement 2015/16
- VAGO Indicators
- Annual Report Income Statement / Expenditure on services

Further detail is provided below.

Budgeted Income Statement 2015/16

The Surplus/(deficit) is missing from the Council Forecast Actual column. The result should be \$835.

Financials		
Budgeted Income Statement 2015/16 (\$'000) - sourced from council budget [2015/16] and budget baseline information template		
	Council Budget	Council Forecast Actual
Rates & charges	7,477	7,479
Grants	6,366	5,326
Other income	1,237	1,232
Total income	15,080	14,037
Employee costs	5,774	5,244
Materials & services	4,308	4,010
Depreciation & amortisation	3,530	3,595
Other expenses	407	353
Total expenses	14,019	13,202
Surplus/(deficit)	1,061	

VAGO Indicators

There is a discrepancy in relation to the VAGO indicators, as highlighted in the table below. The figures highlighted by red box differ to those contained in Council's LTFP. We have also come across some inconsistency in two published VAGO Reports that contain different numbers to the below table. An email has been sent to Council's external auditors (VAGO representative) for clarification on the formula that should be used for these two indicators.

Indicators					
VAGO Indicators - sourced from Victorian Auditor General, 'Local Government Results of Audits' reports					
	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
Underlying result (%)	2.3	8.8	-4.2	28.5	5.7
Liquidity Ratio	2.3	3.2	4.8	4.7	4.0
Indebtedness (%)	10.6	9.4	24.2	8.4	4.1
Renewal gap (ratio)	0.8	0.6	1.1	2.5	1.5

Annual Report Income Statement / Expenditure on services

There is a discrepancy between the Total Expenses in the Annual Report Income Statement and the Expenditure on services from the VGC for 2010/11 and 2011/12. The Annual Report Income Statement matches Council's records.

Income Statement					
Annual Report Income Statement (\$'000) - sourced from council annual reports					
	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Rates & charges	5,486	5,858	6,268	6,597	7,042
Statutory fees & fines	161	166	156	171	176
User fees	622	403	418	439	623
Grants - operating	4,579	6,994	6,073	4,094	7,111
Grants - capital	2,622	3,956	4,352	2,947	3,555
Contributions - monetary	0	0	0	0	0
Contributions - non monetary	0	0	0	0	0
Net gain/(loss) on disposal of prope..	-190	-6	-130	97	8
Fair value adjustments for investme..	0	0	0	0	0
Share of net profits/(losses) of asso..	0	0	0	0	0
Other income	330	603	657	1,273	978
Total income	13,610	17,974	17,794	15,618	19,493
Employee costs	4,455	6,137	4,792	4,846	5,009
Materials & services	3,952	5,653	3,782	5,816	4,622
Depreciation & amortisation	3,305	3,454	3,479	3,561	3,287
Borrowing costs	47	43	44	37	17
Bad & doubtful debts	0	0	0	0	0
Other expenses	634	3,433	569	466	316
Total expenses	12,393	18,720	12,666	14,726	13,251
Surplus/(deficit) for the year	1,217	-746	5,128	892	6,242

Expenditure on services (\$'000) - sourced from the Victorian Grants Commission					
	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Aged & Disabled Services	27	0	12	4	2
Business & Economic Services	1,273	1,431	1,531	1,299	1,525
Environment	362	321	273	1,222	138
Family & Community Services	842	847	924	919	827
Governance	976	6,615	2,721	4,497	3,254
Local Roads & Bridges	4,247	4,427	4,623	3,336	4,093
Recreation & Culture	1,472	1,215	1,588	2,244	2,503
Traffic & Street Management	170	67	157	86	102
Waste Management	982	737	838	1,119	809
Other (Main Roads & Other)	2,127	0	0	0	0
Total	12,478	15,660	12,666	14,726	13,251

Budget Baseline Information

Asset information in the Baseline Information Template

This information has now been updated in the Baseline Information Template.

Net result variance between the higher cap scenario and the no higher cap scenario

The increase in revenue of \$242,000 is exclusively related to the higher cap application, which would involve no service level or expenditure cuts.

If the variation is rejected and the cap remains at 2.5% then Council has nominated (still to be agreed by Council) it will cut \$173,305 of expenses. These cuts include ceasing the SES contributions, negotiating a wage freeze for all employees for the next Enterprise Agreement, drastically reducing school crossing supervisors, slashing the training budget by 25%, ceasing co-operative memberships, ceasing the local government / tertiary scholarship and electing not to participate in the state-wide community satisfaction survey. In this scenario Council would reduce its operating surplus and cash reserves by \$68,695.

Inconsistency between application and Baseline Information Template – Rates increase

The rates increase of \$242,000 as stated in the application is the correct rates increase for this submission.

Capital Improved Valuation data had been erroneously updated in the Baseline Information Template and resulted in an incorrect increase in rates of \$247,746.

The Baseline Information Template has been updated to reflect the correct figure and results in an increase in rates of \$242,000.

Documents supporting this response are attached in the appendices as detailed below:

Appendix	Description
1	Peter Moloney
2	Community Forums 2015
3	Childrens Services Review
4	Mobile Library Report
5	Corryong Swimming Pool
6	Corryong Office / library hours
7	SES Mitta Mitta letter

Summary of my thoughts on the extent of over intervention assets for full Road networks

By Peter Moloney of Moloney Asset Management Systems

These findings are based on having undertaken over 200 road network condition surveys over the last 21 years.

Some initial thoughts

1. The acceptable extent of over intervention assets for any single road asset sub set does vary. It is really linked to the service life of the particular asset. For example if you had 12% of spray seals (Service life 16 years) over the selected intervention level this would represent around 2-years average renewal program and while that would not be a strong position it could be argued that it was an acceptable position. If you had the same extent of sealed road pavements (service life of 100-years) over the intervention level it would represent 12-years of average renewal program and would be an absolute disaster.
2. The acceptable extent of over intervention assets will vary based on whether the road is urban or rural. Because travel speed is much lower in the urban area a poorer condition pavement can be tolerated more than the same condition pavement on a rural road that will be subject to much higher speed.
3. A general rule of thumb that has arisen out of our work over the last 21-years is that it is reasonable to have one year's worth of average renewal demand as the extent of over intervention assets.
4. While the acceptable extent of over intervention assets does vary between the road sub asset classes from say 1% for sealed road pavements to around 6% for spray seals we have found that on average across the whole of the roads network the one year average renewal demand backlog equates to around 2% of the total value of the full road network.
5. The range of over intervention assets across the whole of Council road networks that we have measured over the last 21-years ranges from 0.0% up to around 5.0%. This is not (as you would probably expect a large range), but at 5.0% a Council is heading for serious long term problems.
6. The table below provides a summary of my suggested overall classifications for the total extent of over intervention assets on a whole of road network system. It is based on the assessment of over 200 full condition assessments of full road networks over a 21-year period and is intended as a guide rather than a definitive statement of fact.

Moloney suggested classification of the total extent of over intervention assets for a Local Government road network

Extent of over intervention assets as a % of total asset Value	Single description of overall asset condition
0.0 - 0.5%	Could be considered as over servicing
0.5 - 1.0%	Excellent overall condition
1.0 - 1.5%	Very good overall condition
1.5 - 2.0%	Good condition assets remaining within an overall acceptable range
2.0 - 2.5%	Acceptable but at the upper limit of the acceptable range
2.5 - 3.0%	Beginning to move into the problem area range where generally renewal funding needs to be increased
3.0 - 3.5%	Poor condition assets that need additional renewal attention
3.5 - 4.0%	Very poor condition assets that have generally been under funded for a long period
4.0 - 4.5%	Very poor condition assets that would be causing the users distress
Above 4.5%	Extremely poor condition assets that are now beyond normal management and require drastic action

NOTE: Our work has largely been associated with rural and mixed rural with some small towns. For straight urban municipalities it is felt that the above ranges could be extended a little. Perhaps by 0.2 to 0.5% but we really don't have sufficient data to be definitive here

Community Forums 2015

In the lead up to the development of Council's 2015/16 Budget, Council undertook a number of community meetings to discuss the delivery of services and service levels for the 2015/16 year.

Community Engagement

Specific community engagement was conducted in February / March 2015 for the purpose of discussing Council's current financial challenges with the freezing of indexation on Financial Assistance Grants and the impending introduction of rate capping, and the resultant impact on the 2015/16 Budget and Long Term Financial Plan.

Community Workshops

Community workshops were conducted in four key locations throughout the Shire in February and March 2015.

Each workshop was attended by a range of enthusiastic community members, each of whom also represent at least one community organisation/agency. In total, forty nine people attended the workshops.

The workshops were also attended by available Councillors.

The workshops comprised a presentation detailing:

- Key achievements of Council
- The journey taken over a five year period to address Council's sustainability challenges (including efforts already undertaken to improve financial sustainability)
- A summary of the current fiscal environment and the associated new challenges, particularly:
 - The freezing of indexation on the Financial Assistance Grant
 - Impending rate capping framework

- The financial model used by Council to forecast the financial position of Council into the future (Council’s Long Term Financial Plan)
- Current service levels
- Future opportunities

Feedback

A diverse range of feedback was received from community members at these workshops and this is summarised in the following table:

Date	Location	Feedback and opportunities
17 February 2015	Tallangatta	<p>Additional revenue opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate on public land; roads through public land • Long term leasing of land that Council is maintaining/road easement?/plots of land • Increase rating base/encourage young families • Assets that could be leased out (JP – swimming pool, SES building) <p>Services / costs that could be cut:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handing major roads to VicRoads • Kinder privatisation • Foreshore lawn mowing – cutback area • Volunteers providing services (Indigo ratepayer) • Immunisations • Mobile library services/bus people to library/kindles • Non essential services • TNE membership - \$35K • Cleaning of BBQs • Toilet on Akuna Avenue <p>Services that could be increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for pool to be open longer hours/pool rostering <p>Other specific local issues / comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council influence on GMW; ie: water levels • Caravan park – Council ownership • Rotary/life education van • Jurgies Track • Georges Creek

Date	Location	Feedback and opportunities
24 February 2015	Bethanga	<p>Services / costs that could be cut:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don't get many services so you can't cut what we have <p>Services that could be increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kurrajong Gap – needs more work • Wastewater solutions in Bethanga • Telecommunications need improvement • Increased road maintenance <p>Other specific local issues / comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Septic tanks/creeks/ground saturation mine in Corryong (Richard) • Road xxxx (Lake Road), Springdale and Tallangatta (complete asphaltting) – Council priority Georges Creek Road (Ron) • Bethanga – bridesmaid but never the bride – how can community work in with Council to support development, priority, access funding. • Merit in bringing community together to work through community priorities • What is protocol for road maintenance? Some potholes being filled over and over again, no rolling just pat down by shovels and 10 minutes later someone drives over and flicks off stones, asphalt roads eg: Lake Road • Kurrajong Gap Road – when hot road is weeping. Contractors pulled down trees, laying over ground without being cleared • Bus shelters locations – has a decision been made where they will be placed, design- slats? Or upwards design like Bellbridge • Does Council inspect contractor works before payment • Bamboo – is Council going to remove?

Date	Location	Feedback and opportunities
3 March 2015	Mitta Valley	<p>Additional revenue opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shire should go to the Government and tap into grant funding to promote the highway (was originally promised but has been a change of government) <p>Services / costs that could be cut:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has Council considered shared services in the LGA <p>Services that need to be maintained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the future for mobile library services – postal service or partnering with schools to help oldies / Dartmouth Community Library (Cynthia) • EDM work in with tourism group and OVOF • Now two days of childcare and two days kinder in the valley – fantastic <p>Services that could be increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telecommunications – lobbying ministers for mobile coverage @ Dartmouth. Mitta no ADSL, NBN not on schedule. Need to pull together support from GMW and AGL / Mt Benambra tower cannot carry any more weight – would not be suitable as covers too much area • No internet at Mitta • Omeo Highway needs signposting • Community needs support to take advantage of increased traffic through the Shire – land available for subdivision (issues in Mitta trying to address water supply and others) • Mitta needs reticulated water <p>Other specific local issues / comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste truck delay • Since highway opened garbage up 700% at Mitta, Parks have taken bins out of wayside stops from 6 bins, 32 bins • Customise marketing for different users of highway – caravan, bikes, shooters and campers • MFSR want to produce shire map to sell

Date	Location	Feedback and opportunities
10 March 2015	Corryong	<p>Additional revenue opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grow rating base • Composting – sell back to market gardeners • Bring some income into the Shire – revenue raising • Tourists accessing area (staying at reserves) – is there a way to get them to contribute financially <p>Services / costs that could be cut:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency Management (particularly vulnerable people) - VicRoads co-ordination NOT a role for local government • SES funding • Electoral Representation Review • Towong Alliance • Staff levels →actual to budgeted levels 72.8 → consultancy • Community newsletters (not essential – may be electronic) seen as a propaganda item. The Corryong Courier services the community with information • Handballs from State Govt to Local Govt (cost shifting) eg: Native Vegetation legislation • Concessions audit • Increase recycling rates (if people do it properly) ie contaminate waste, laziness or lack of awareness, greenwaste, organics (major current deposits into landfill) • Does Council consider using tyres in road structure <p>Services that need to be maintained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Murray 2030 initiatives <p>Services that could be increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corryong tennis courts • Cost of NOT maintaining roads (fences) will come back to bite • Recycling for MFSRBF event – blue bins being replaced with waste/recycling bins <p>Other specific local issues / other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the general community find it understand figures – simple financial summary in the Courier? • Politicians make popular promises prior to elections

Date	Location	Feedback and opportunities
		<p>then there's no way out</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Childrens Services Review • Are staff aware of the financial issues • Regulations a lot to bear – heavy governance • Missed opportunity to share with a wider community group • Promotion of fact that Council landfill takes batteries • Tumbarumba/Nariel Valley – study completed length of stay means visitors have to obtain supplies (eg: groceries) • CCCPark – years to repair damage • Ask employees for ideas, engage/show what's in it for them

Staff Workshops

Staff workshops were also conducted at the Corryong and Tallangatta offices in March 2015.

The presentation from the community workshops was delivered to available staff. In total, twenty staff attended the workshops.

Feedback

Feedback received from staff is summarised in the following table:

Date	Location	Feedback
17 March 2015	Tallangatta	<p>Additional revenue opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to increase the residential rate base • Attract industrial estate / manufacturing • Undertake development at the Horse Paddocks <p>Services / costs that could be cut:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider 48/52 leave arrangements • SES contributions – is Council obligated to match the department of justice funds? • Consider reducing the tip hours • Consider reducing the office hours • Consider closing the Corryong Office on Saturday mornings • Review procurement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ recurring contracts for resealing and black patching ○ town maintenance contract s- maybe reduce the frequency
24 March 2015	Corryong	<p>Additional revenue opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do more private works (after hours) <p>Services / costs that could be cut:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmental savings, who else other than Tech Services is making significant savings? • Condense hours, but that would condense the time in delivering services • Purchase second hand plant – not just vehicles • Catering costs – for meetings other than Council – BYO lunch?

Date	Location	Feedback
		<p>Services that could be increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Swimming Pool hours – with solar heating the pool being successful, open it up to outside hours usage (eg: UMHCS and physio sessions at the Pool) <p>Other specific local issues / comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TICC – will it replicate services like at Corryong