Adelaide Hills
COUNCIL

PO Box 44
Woodside SA 5244
Phone: 08 8408 0400
Fax: 08 8389 7440
mail@ahc.sa.gov.au
www.ahc.sa.gov.au

Direct line: 8408 0438
File Ref: 10.85.3

25 October 2019

Dr Matthew Butlin
Chair and Chief Executive Officer
South Australian Productivity Commission
GPO Box 2343
ADELAIDE SA 5001
E: sapc@sa.gov.au

Dear Dr Butlin

SAPC Inquiry into Local Government – Adelaide Hills Council Feedback on Draft Report

The Adelaide Hills Council (AHC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft report and thanks the Commission for enabling our Council to participate in the inquiry, having been involved previously with the inquiry as a case study council. We believe the outcomes from the inquiry will have the potential to address the significant misconceptions regarding what drives council costs and rates.

The inquiry also provides an opportunity to shed some light on the level of cost shifting that occurs between the tiers of government and the financial impact this continues to have on councils. A recent and topical example is the Solid Waste Levy. This levy now accounts for approximately 3% of our Council's rate income, and with substantial increases occurring at times of low inflation, the community sees these increases as rate related. If the funds were being applied to measures that significantly reduce the volume of waste going to landfill and supported the establishment of a sustainable circular economy in this State, our support for the increases, and indeed the communities, would be considerably higher.

Whilst AHC has considered and is supportive of most of the matters raised within the inquiry, we felt it important to provide commentary on a number of key elements as detailed in the following sections.

Funding and Financial Management

FAGs funding

With AHC as the lead council, considerable work has been progressed by the Southern & Hills Local Government Association (S&HLGA) in relation to reviewing the current South Australian Local Government Grants Commission (SALGGC) Methodology. We believe the lack of equity in the formula, primarily related to our dispersed operations, disadvantages our Council by well over $1m a year (i.e. equivalent to a further 3% of rate income).

This work followed on from a briefing of AHC late last year by the SALGGC at which time a number of elements within the methodology were seen as inequitable and requiring review. An initial assessment was subsequently undertaken by senior AHC staff and a local resident who is a former council CEO. This assessment highlighted that the inequities were relevant to most member councils of the S&HLGA and, as such, a working group was brought together by the S&HLGA Executive Officer to progress as a collaborative initiative.

While this can be a fairly complex matter, the working group formed a position that was subsequently put to the S&HLGA, and a letter was prepared by the S&HLGA Chair for submission to the SALGGC Chair (see attached). This letter highlighted the key issues and asked that consideration be given to a review of certain elements of the methodology. Support from the SA Productivity Commission for this review by the SALGGC on behalf of the sector would be greatly appreciated.

As can be seen from the attached letter, there are a number of aspects of the current methodology applied by the SALGGC that are of ongoing concern to AHC. We believe that these key areas are adversely impacting significantly on the total allocation to AHC and, as such, result in additional pressure being applied to either reductions in services or increases in rates. In particular:

a) Use of the SEIFA index on the revenue side
b) Dispersion or duplication of facilities
c) Function 50

This is a view that is also strongly supported by the S&HLGA.

External auditing process

Consistent with our Council's submission to the Local Government Reform process regarding external auditing, we believe the standard of existing council audits is generally high and improving and that no evidence has been made available indicating deficiencies in the conduct of local government external audits.

Our Council firmly believes that the outcomes from our external audits, among other benefits, enhances compliance with our legislated responsibilities to produce sound long term financial plans (LTFP) and asset management plans (AMP) as well as improved business practices. Incidentally, the increased resourcing in the development and implementation of both LTFPs and AMPs over the past 10 years following the local government sustainability review has been necessary, appropriate and beneficial.

Given the good outcomes being achieved and a lack of evidence of deficiencies in the current direct sourcing arrangement, our Council believes that oversight by the Auditor-General, as suggested in the Reforming Local Government in South Australia Discussion Paper, would add additional cost without any readily identifiable benefits. Further, the Auditor-General's legislative mandate currently provides for audits within the sector on an own-initiative basis and these are sufficient to explore any potentially systemic efficiency and/or effectiveness matters and to make recommendations for improvements.

Cost Drivers and Service Standards

As mentioned previously, our Council has already provided examples to the Commission by way of four case studies (attached) and we thank you again for the opportunity to do so. As can be seen from these examples, the net annual cost impact on AHC in providing the Kerbside Green Waste Collection (approx. $240k); issuing Burning Permits as a result of the *Environment Protection (Air Quality) Policy 2016* (approx. $26k); establishing a focus on Economic Development (approx. $140k) and economic development related activities (approx. $275k); and continuing the Digital Hub program (approx. $100k) is significant.

More widespread and common cost pressures arise from mandated fees and charges from the State Government (e.g. a range of planning application charges) which fall well short of full cost recovery. An assessment of the nature and extent of these charges would be most valuable to the sector and reduce the impact of fiscal pressure faced by the large majority of councils.

In a similar vein, a large number of councils, including AHC, hold substantial parcels of land that are owned by the State or Commonwealth government (including areas of national park). These land parcels are required to be treated as non-rateable properties resulting in additional rating pressures for the remaining rate payers. Importantly, significant costs remain in servicing these land parcels, and in councils such as ours, where fire prevention is of major concern, the unfunded costs are large. Greater transparency relating to the non-rateability impacts of these properties would be an outcome from the Commission's review that we would strongly support.

Each year our Council accommodates significant savings/efficiencies as part of our budget setting process. To this end, we also recognise the opportunity to further examine procurement processes to gain even greater efficiencies. Enhancement in these processes has also been reported through our Audit Committee and we believe represent a key avenue for further gains into the future.

While already committed to reporting on a range of strategic, financial and operational performance measures, including those related to customer service standards, AHC welcomes the opportunity to have a sector-wide benchmarking approach implemented and overseen by the Local Government Association (LGA). The current model that exists in Victoria could potentially be adapted for our Local Government sector.

Fundamental to any benchmarking approach is its sustained focus on improvement opportunities and not simply its outcomes. A comparative model that encourages collaboration and partnering with other councils and State Government will no doubt improve the efficiency and performance of councils. It may also assist local communities understand how approaches to the delivery of similar services differ across councils and why their council places a greater emphasis on prioritising and resourcing certain services compared with other councils. It can provide an avenue to learn from others and produce more efficient pathways as a result.

Our Council has a long and successful history in partnering and collaborating with other councils and stakeholders and we see constructive benchmarking as a means to strengthen our commitment in this space.

Enterprise Bargaining Agreements (EBA) and Workforce Issues

We recognise that there has been a noticeable difference in the capability and capacity of councils to negotiate EBAs over the past 20 years, but we also believe this gap is closing. Further, while recognising the transactional costs and resourcing associated with these negotiations, ultimately there can also be sustained cultural benefits if agreements are negotiated well.

In practical terms, anecdotal feedback from a range of councils suggests there is now little left to 'bargain' as part of these negotiations. Therefore, the timing may be right to consider regional clusters of councils to establish more consistent EBAs across the sector. However, this should be investigated carefully, given there will be noticeable differences in most councils' agreements and consolidating elements from a range of councils into one regional agreement may be extremely resource intensive in itself, not to mention challenging and even problematic.

Associated with the above is that the awards underpinning our industrial landscape are very out of date and don't reflect the greater levels of sophistication that modern workforces operate in today, including local government workforces. Similarly, the classification structure is becoming increasingly obsolete. A robust review of these awards and classification structure is likely to bring noticeable benefits to local government's industrial landscape.

While our Council rarely experiences skills shortages and difficulties in recruiting positions, we recognise that this isn't the case for many other councils, including regional councils. Compounding this situation is the increasing need for more skilled/technically proficient workers, including people with performance measurement, business analytic, ICT, project management, asset management, communications and community engagement capabilities. Attracting and retaining such skilled workers from inside and outside the sector will be enhanced by an even greater focus on creating more flexible workplaces (e.g. job sharing, becoming more accommodating of employees returning from parental or carers leave, etc.).

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Commission's draft report and for enabling us to participate in associated roundtable discussions in recent weeks. This gave us a greater understanding of elements of the draft report and assisted in preparing this response.

Overall, our Council echoes the sentiments of the LGA in that we remain committed to working collaboratively with the South Australian Government on sensible reforms that will deliver lasting benefits to communities and drive downward pressure on council rates.

Please contact me on 8408 0438 should you wish to discuss any element of this correspondence.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Aitken
Chief Executive Officer
enc

Southern & Hills Local Government Association

13 Ringmer Drv, Burnside SA 5066 | T: 0418 502 311 |
Email: graeme@shlga.sa.gov.au | www.shlga.sa.gov.au |

Adelaide Hills Council | Alexandrina Council | Mount Barker District Council | Kangaroo Island Council
| City of Victor Harbor | District Council of Yankalilla |

22 March 2019

The Chair
SA Local Government Grants Commission
Department Planning, Transport & Infrastructure
GPO Box 1533
ADELAIDE SA 5001

Ref: Grants Commission methodology review

I am writing to you on behalf of the Southern and Hills Local Government Association (SHLGA) seeking the Commission's consideration of placing a range of matters, outlined below, on your agenda for examination and further consideration.

As you may be aware, our Association is a joint subsidiary of six South Australian Councils formed under the relevant provisions of the Local Government Act. Member Councils include Mount Barker District Council, Adelaide Hills Council, Alexandrina Council, District Council of Yankalilla, City of Victor Harbour and Kangaroo Island Council. We are a regional body formed to represent and advocate on behalf of its member Councils on matters of mutual concern.

Recently we have held discussions at senior officer level on specific aspects of the State's Grants Commission methodology. In December, a joint workshop was held at Strathalbyn attended by Council CEOs and senior staff. As a result of that workshop three aspects of the current methodology were identified as potential cause for ongoing concern:

a) Use of the SEIFA index on the revenue side
b) Dispersion or duplication of facilities
c) Function 50

<u>SEIFA Index</u>

The SHLGA understands that the Grants Commission uses the SEIFA index in the revenue calculations as an indicator of capacity to raise revenue and in the expenditure calculations as an indicator of the cost differences associated with delivering Community Services. We particularly question the continued use of SEIFA to notionally expand or shrink a Council's substantive capital value rate base in the calculation of general purpose grants in SA.

The Socio Economic Index of Areas (SEIFA) is a product developed by the ABS to rank areas in Australia according to their relative socio-economic advantage and disadvantage.

The four indexes in SEIFA are:

- index of Relative Socio - economic Disadvantage
- index of Relative Socio - economic Advantage and Disadvantage
- index of Economic Resources

- Index of Education and Occupation.

The calculated Revenue Relativity Index (RRI) is based on the SEIFA index of Economic Resources. It is our understanding that the LGGC's approach to calculating each Council's RRI's is to compare each Council's SEIFA index with the average of all Councils' SEIFA index.

Accordingly

RRI of Council A = Council A's SEIFA index /Average State SEIFA Index.

where:

Average State SEIFA Index = Sum of all Council's SEIFA Indexes /Number of Councils.

The net effect is that Councils with a RRI greater than 1 (interpreted by the LGGC as indicating a higher capacity to raise land rates) will have their revenue assessment for residential and rural classes of property notionally surcharged.

Mount Barker scores 1.056 or a 5.6% surcharge - to its substantive capital property values, Adelaide Hills scores 1.103 or a 10% surcharge, Alexandrina scores 1.019 or a 2% surcharge. Yankalilla scores 1.008 or 1% surcharge, KI scores exactly 1. Victor Harbour scores 0.993 or a 0.7% reduction in their overall substantive capital property value.

The fundamental argument made for using the SEIFA index is that property values do not adequately reflect the resident's capacity to pay. Within this context it is important to note the following:

1. That the State legislation under which the Commission operates refers to the capacity of local government to raise revenue, not the capacity of taxpayers to pay. It is an important distinction.

2. That to use measures other than the actual tax base available to local government is implicitly to make a judgement that it is inappropriate to allocate tax burden by reference to property values, despite the State Government determination that this is the revenue source to be used by Councils.

3. The Commission's current approach is to separate ratepayers into five classes - residential, commercial, industrial, rural and other - with the average differential rate for each class applied. The extent to which Councils take into account the capacity to pay between these classes of ratepayers is therefore already being accounted for through the average effective rate of tax applied.

4. As measures of socio-economic conditions, the indexes are best interpreted as ordinal measures on an arbitrary scale. They can be used to rank areas, and are also useful for understanding the distribution of socio-economic conditions across different areas. However the scores do not represent some quantity of advantage and disadvantage. It is therefore not appropriate to use the SEIFA index to infer that an area with an index value 1000 is twice as advantaged as an area with an index of 500, as is currently done through the Grant's Commission mathematical treatment of the index.

5. SEIFA is an amalgam measure which draws together a number of different variables measuring disadvantage in an area. The spatial distribution of disadvantage in an area is demonstrated very well, but important variations within a given area can and do get masked. For example, an area

with a very disadvantaged public housing area next to a well off area may well show up having an average SEIFA score - masking two very different populations.

6. Importantly, SEIFA cannot be directly compared over time. The scores are only relevant for geographic areas for the 2016 census and cannot be compared to earlier Censuses.

7. SEIFA is based on Census data and does not measure aspects of advantage /disadvantage which are not covered by the Census. Examples are wealth and locational disadvantage.

8. No other State's Grants Commission currently uses the SEIFA index for their revenue assessments and the last review of the SA methodology undertaken by KPMG recommended that the use of SEIFA on the revenue side be discontinued - as it "amounts to duplication" given the index is already applied to relevant expenditure headings.

It is for these reasons that the SHLGA considers it worthwhile for the Grants Commission to revisit and review its use of the SEIFA index in its revenue assessment.

Dispersion and duplication of facilities

Dispersion and duplication of facilities in non-metropolitan councils has a significant impact, particularly where councils provide services to numerous towns and villages over large distances; towns and villages that vary markedly in size, have their own sense of identity and history, and require council services at a similar level to the main centre of the council.

We are concerned that the current methodology does not provide a reasonable weighting to this aspect in its methodology, further exacerbated by the recent removal of the duplication facilities allowance incorporated under function 50.

Typically all council recurrent expenditure headings are affected when a council is dispersed over a number of population centres. Examples of the potential duplication in costs include:

- Sporting facilities
- Parks and gardens
- Community and cultural facilities
- Health inspection
- Animal management
- Roads expenditure
- Footpaths
- Waste management
- Road side vegetation management
- Fire reduction costs
- Public consultation, administration and governance
- Cemeteries
- Visitor facilities
- Town planning and assessment costs
- Drainage and flood prevention
- Water supply systems
- Library services
- Aged, youth and community care
- Site remediation costs

Moreover, the hilly steep terrain, higher rainfall, in which many of our councils operate increases:

- Construction and maintenance costs
- Longer and more difficult haulage for material and machinery
- Labour travel time
- Levels of erosion, particularly road side
- Number of bridges (44 percent of the State's bridges are located in our 6 Councils areas), culverts, drains, retaining walls, embankments, cuttings, guards rail etc .
- Difficulty of development assessments

Other states have chosen a fairly measured approach to dispersion and duplication - treating the heading as a single "cost adjustor" across all headings of expenditure, recognising the impact on council expenditure of maintaining infrastructure and services to more than one main population centre. In Victoria for example, population dispersion is treated as one of a number of key cost adjustors, along with; economies of scale, environmental risk (fire and flood), aged pensioners, population growth, language, remoteness, socio economic, tourism, indigenous population and regional significance. Their population dispersion cost adjustor is applied across the board to eight of their nine expenditure functions:

- Governance
- Family and community services
- Aged and disabled services
- Recreation and culture
- Waste management
- Traffic and street management
- Environment
- Business and economic services.

Each Council or locality is taken into account when compiling the population dispersion cost adjustor by taking a measure of the road distance between the council and each separate town/locality, factoring in the number of dwellings and resident population as a product of the proportion of the councils total population.

We would be happy to work with the Grant's Commission to further explore the additional cost impediment associated with dispersion and the potential options for measuring the impost.

Function 50

Function 50 and other needs, as it is known in the SA methodology, is also peculiar to SA.

The function does not appear to be well understood by Councils, however, it remains a significant driver of redistribution in SA. The function is not a direct component of council expenditure and accordingly calls for judgements to be made on arbitrary sums that do not correlate with Council expenditure.

In part recognition of the 2013 KPMG recommendations we appreciate that the Commission has reduced the number of headings included under function 50 - with the integration of culture and tourist facilities and coastal protection into broader expenditure functions, and the removal of capital city status. However, the duplication of facilities/dispersion allowance we understand has been recently removed without any alternative approach to obtaining a measure of dispersion costs.

We understand a number of headings remain, including - non resident use, an isolation factor based on the distance from the Adelaide GPO, an allocation based on the percentage of unemployed, and a multiplier for designated aboriginal communities

Non resident use is a case in point where a discretionary low, medium, or high allocation is made of \$100,000, \$175,000 or \$250,000, respectively. There appears to be little or no science or rigour to this approach. The implication is that a council with a 'low' level of non resident impact spends roughly half as much as Kangaroo Island?

We appreciate that non-quantifiable factors will and can influence a Council's expenditure, however, we feel there is room for the Commission to move to place more science and rigour around function 50 and the dispensation of what amounts to large levels of discretionary funds.

In summary, the three matters raised above were very much highlighted as part of the 2013 KPMG report with well reasoned arguments and recommendations that the Commission change its approach. We would appreciate the Commission considering the above issues for further review during 2019 and would be happy to provide any assistance required during the assessment.

Yours Faithfully
Mayor Keith Parkes
Alexandrina Council
President/Chairperson
Southern and Hills Local Government Association

d:\onedrive\documents\shlga\projects\grants commission\final signed letter to chairman gc.docx

Adelaide Hills COUNCIL

SA Productivity Commission Inquiry into Local Government - July 2019

Questions for all cases:	**Waste management changes in service level**	**Change in fire prevention standards eg burning policy by State Gov**	**Introduction of Economic Development Officer**	**Continuing Australian Government digital hub program**
Nature & scope of change – What was the situation before the service change occurred?	The introduction of the State Government's *Environment Protection (Waste to Resources) Policy 2010* (the Policy) required waste generated from the Adelaide metropolitan area to undergo a resource recovery process prior to it being disposed of to landfill. In regards to kerbside waste, councils affected by the change were exempted from the relevant requirement of the Policy if they provided a three bin service that included waste, recycling and green organic bins. Prior to the Policy coming into effect Adelaide Hills Council provided a waste and recycling bin to properties, a kerbside green organic bin was not provided. If a three bin service was not provided to properties within the	Prior to the introduction of the Environmental Protection (Air Quality) Policy in 2016 by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), Council did not issue any permits for residents in townships and urban areas wishing to burn green waste or vegetation in preparation for the bushfire season.	Council has a long history of investing in economic development related associations, including: • Adelaide Hills Tourism • Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island RDA • Stirling Business Association Section 7 (g) of the *Local Government Act, 1999*, specifies that one of the functions of a council is: (g) To promote its area and to provide an attractive climate and location for the development of business, commerce, industry and tourism;	In 2012 the Council entered into a 3 year agreement with the Commonwealth to provide a 'digital hub' to showcase the potential of the NBN and provide direct assistance to community members seeking help connecting to and using online technology. The Commonwealth was the prominent funding partner, with the Council providing in-kind contributions through the provision of space, management and employment of the hub staff, IT support, etc. The Hub was essentially a 2 FTE function.

	Adelaide metropolitan area kerbside waste could not lawfully be disposed of to landfill unless it underwent some other resource recovery process.			At the end of the 3 year agreement, Commonwealth funding ended, yet there was a community expectation that people could still seek support from the Council for connecting to and using online technology. The Council subsequently reallocated approximately 0.5 FTE from other areas to enable ongoing provision of digital literacy and support services to the community, albeit limited in comparison to the former Hub. In response to continued community demand, the Council allocated an additional 0.5FTE resource in 2018-19 to expand digital literacy and support services to the community.

Why did the change occur? Who initiated change?	The Policy, a legislative framework under the *Environment Protection Act 1993*, provided the Environment Protection Authority with stronger powers to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill and increase reuse of valuable resources. The change was initiated by the South Australian Government and the Environment Protection Authority.	The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) introduced the Environmental Protection (Air Quality) Policy in 2016. The intent of this Policy was to improve air quality in the metropolitan areas and rural towns, with a primary focus on industrial emissions.	The last couple of decades have seen a distinctive shift in the approach to economic development towards bottom-up strategies that are locally designed and owned. This has provided an opportunity and encouraged local communities, local governments and local businesses to take a lead role in developing the vision and supporting strategies for their region. Indeed, Section 7 (g) of the Local Government Act, 1999, specifies that one of the functions of a council is: (g) To promote its area and to provide an attractive climate and location for the development of business, commerce, industry and tourism; As a result, during this time Council began investing and partnering with locally focussed economic	The Federal Government initiated the funding program in 2012. It was a three year funding agreement which ended in 2015.

			development related projects and programs, including: • Adelaide Hills Tourism • Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island RDA • Stirling Business Association • World Heritage Bid Project	

Questions for all cases:	Waste management - changes in service level	Change in fire prevention standards e.g. burning policy by State Government	Introduction of Economic Development Officer	Continuing Australian Government digital hub program
Why did Council decide to adopt this change? What was decision-making process involved?	Compliance with the *Environment Protection (Waste to Resources) Policy 2010* was mandatory therefore Council had to put in place a mechanism to ensure kerbside waste from relevant properties underwent a resource recovery process before being disposed of to landfill. In this case, the preferred option was to utilise the exemption provided in the Policy by providing a kerbside three bin service that included waste, recycling and green organic bins. In considering this matter Council undertook public consultation and several reports were provided to Council for consideration. As part of the decision making process Council applied for and received an exemption from the Environment Protection Authority to	Although Council had the choice to comply with the Policy, it was considered appropriate to put in place a pragmatic burning permit system to regulate the burning of green waste and vegetation in order to minimise the air quality impacts on the community in this instance.	Recognising the important and growing role of local government in economic development, the concept of economic development was first workshopped with Council in July 2012 (as part of the Strategic Directions Review), in May 2014 (as part of the Strategic Plan 2014-18) and in May 2015 to introduce the Economic Development Strategy. In late 2015 an Economic Development Strategy was adopted and an Economic Development Officer employed to improve communication and engagement between Council, the region's Business Community, other levels of government, key industry groups and regional development bodies.	The Council is not obliged to provide digital literacy and support services, however, more and more people are expected to go online to do everyday things, including accessing government services. When the digital hub funding ended in 2015, we experienced continued community demand for digital literacy and support. Council's administration reprioritised resource allocation to enable continuation of some level of community support in this space. In 2018, the Council adopted a budget containing additional allocation of funding for further resources to meet community demand.

	exclude rural properties within the Adelaide metropolitan area. This exemption was sought at the time as it was considered providing a kerbside green organic bin was of little value to properties located on acreages. In light of this outcome Council provided two free green organic disposal passes each year (if requested) to properties without a kerbside green organic bin. On 27 March 2012 Council formally resolved the following: *Council endorses the fortnightly green organics kerbside collection roll out for Urban Areas, Townships and other selected allotments.*			

Were other options considered? (such as facilitating services provided by other parties)	No other viable options to undertake the required resource recovery process were identified at the time. However, in considering the implementation of the mandatory Policy requirements for those properties within the Adelaide metropolitan area Council elected to also provide a green organics bin to urban areas, townships and a select number of other properties outside the metropolitan Adelaide area as well. This additional service was over and above mandatory requirements of the Policy and was implemented to provide equity in relation to other like properties outside the Adelaide metropolitan area and to obtain further environmental benefits through the reduced production of the potent landfill gas methane.	Due to resource constraints no other options were considered and this service has been accommodated within the activities of the Regulatory Services Team. However, in order to take on this additional function, other responsibilities of the Team (e.g. parking control) have had to be reprioritised.	No other options were considered. In the absence of an EDO approaches to economic development would continue to be uncoordinated, reactive and ad-hoc in nature	Consideration was given to directing customers to the local community run community centre for support, however, that centre does not provide drop-in support across a broad range of hours, and relies on volunteers who may not have specialist knowledge in training and technology. Thus, while some referral did, and continues to, occur, it was determined that some level of staffed resourcing was required to meet the expectations that were created during the period of the digital hub.

What are the longer-term financial implications of the change?	The green organic bin service is now a permanent feature of Council's service offering and therefore the cost to provide the service will continue to be incurred on an annual basis. For 2019/20 the cost to provide the service is $450,000 which equates to 1.3% of rates income.	Council has over the last 3 years issued between 450 to 495 burning permits per year. The direct costs associated with this amount to around $26,000 per year.	Manager Economic Development employment and on-costs - $124,000 Operations - $15,000	1.0FTE - $90,000 per year. Technology costs – nominally $8,000 per year. Space, employment support, etc.
What are the costs attached to the change?	At the time in 2012/13 the provision of the green organic service cost $265,000 to service 8,500 bins. This cost equates to $31 per bin. In addition, to the collection and disposal costs a once off bin purchase and rollout cost of $452,000 was incurred. In 2019/20 there are 10,200 green organic bins serviced with a budget provision for collection and disposal of $450,000 in 2019/20. This cost equates to $44 per bin. The above costs are partially offset by reduced green organic material no longer being put in the waste bin that	In the 2018/19 Financial Year: • 493 permits issued • Approx. 1.5hr per permit at an average on $35.00 per hour • 740hrs on permits per year • 93 days per year • 18.6 weeks per year = $25,900.00 per annum	In 2019/20 the budget for Economic Development related funding includes: • RDA $64,600 • AHT $103,500 • World Heritage $15,000 • SBA $95,000	As above.

	would have otherwise been disposed of to landfill. For example, using 2018/19 costs and an allowance of 8 kilograms per bin of green organic material no longer going to landfill equates to a landfill disposal cost saving of $213,000.			

Are there measurable outcomes? What are they?	Between 2012/13 and 2018/19 (inclusive) there has been 22,900 tonnes of green organic material collected through the green organic kerbside service. This amount averages 13 kilograms per bin per collection. Prior to the change, much of this green organic material would have previously been placed in the blue bin and disposed of to landfill. For example, allowing 8 kilograms of green organic material in the blue bin and using 2018/19 data equates to 2,100 tonnes of green organic material no longer going to landfill with the introduction of the green organic bin service. This example is based on the volume of green organic material placed in a green organic bin being higher than the volume of green organic material that would have been placed in the landfill bin if a green organic bin was not provided (as a blue bin has	No air quality testing has been done in any peri-urban or rural areas by the EPA and hence there are no measurable outcomes in this instance. Anecdotally, we believe reductions in burning have occurred since the introduction of the policy.	Open and click rates Hills Voice: Your Business quarterly e-newsletter Number of businesses in AHC area Number of local jobs in AHC area Visitor numbers Visitor expenditure May Business Month registrations	Participant numbers in formal programs are captured (594 in 2018-19). Currently there is no measurement of outcomes, however this is being developed.

	smaller capacity, contains other material (i.e. waste) and some organic material would have been composted, mulched or burnt on site).			

Questions if: Continuing an Australian Government program	Waste management - changes in service level	Change in fire prevention standards eg burning policy by State Gov	Introduction of Economic Development Officer	Continuing Australian Government digital hub program
Why did the Government withdraw funding?		No funding has been provided by Government to take on this regulatory responsibility	No funding has been provided for this role and function	The funding was for a 3 year period and at this time, the Federal Government confirmed that it would not extend the funding. Digital hubs were funded across many council areas in Australia for fixed periods to showcase and promote the potential of fast broadband (linked to the NBN rollout) to communities.
Were other options considered, such as not continuing the program or facilitating another party to provide the service?		No	No	As above.
Is the service level the same as when funded by the Government?		N/A	N/A	No. When funded, the digital hub was allocated a dedicated space in the Coventry Library, Stirling and had 2.0FTE staff. Services are now provided

				by 1.0FTE staff (mixed duties). There are fewer drop-in support opportunities and fewer group sessions than were possible under the funded program.
What are the costs of continuing the program?		Approximately $26,000 per annum	As specified above	Approximately $100,000 per year.
Is there a time-frame for this program to continue as it is?		Unless the EPA change the requirements in this regard, the issuing of burning permits will continue	Manager Economic Development contract expires 30 June 2023	Indefinite.