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1. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL OWNERS**

   *We acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we are meeting. We pay our respects to their Elders and to Elders from other communities who may be here today.*

2. **OPENING PRAYER**

   *Almighty God, we humbly ask thee to bless and guide this council in its deliberations so that we may truly preserve the welfare of the people whom we serve. Amen*

3. **PRESENT**

4. **ABSENT**

5. **ACCEPTANCE OF APOLOGIES & GRANTING OF LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

6. **CITIZENSHIP CEREMONY**

   Nil.

7. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

   **RECOMMENDATION:**

   *That Council read and confirm the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of 17 February 2015 as a true and accurate record of the proceedings of the meeting.*

8. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE**

   In accordance with sections 77A, 77B, 78 and 79 of the *Local Government Act 1989* Councillors are required to disclose a ‘conflict of interest’ in a decision if they would receive, or could reasonably be perceived as receiving, a direct or indirect financial or non-financial benefit or detriment (other than as a voter, resident or ratepayer) from the decision.

   Disclosure must occur immediately before the matter is considered or discussed.
9. RECESSION OF PETITIONS

10. HEARING OF DEPUTATIONS

11. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS

11.1 ADMINISTRATORS’ REPORTS

Nil.

11.2 OFFICER’S REPORTS

11.2.1 EXECUTIVE SERVICES

Nil.
11.2.2 CORPORATE SERVICES

11.2.2.1 AUDITOR GENERAL FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS

Meeting Type: Ordinary Council Meeting
Date of Meeting: 17 March 2015
Author: Manager Finance
File Name: Annual Audit
File No.: 51.020.001

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Council to provide details of the Financial Sustainability data produced by the Victorian Auditor General for Victorian local governments. This information was reported to the State Parliament on 26 February 2015. Wangaratta Rural City Council has been assessed as Low Risk in relation to Financial Sustainability however, the assessment does not take into consideration the impact of rate capping and the Commonwealth Government pausing indexation of financial assistance grants.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receive and note the report.

Background

The Victorian Auditor General prepares an annual report to Parliament on the outcome of the 2013-2014 audits of all Local Government entities. The report content is as follows:

- the results of financial audits, highlighting significant financial reporting issues
- commentary on the quality and timeliness of financial reporting
- commentary on performance reporting
- commentary on internal controls with focus on creditor management and grant management
- analysis and commentary on the financial positions of the local government entities based on sustainability indicators.

As part of the report, the Auditor General provides sustainability indicators for each Council. Wangaratta Rural City Council indicators are attached along with other Regional City Councils for comparison (refer attachment). Note that the forecast figures are as per the 2014/15 Budget adopted in June 2014 and did not take into consideration the impact of rate capping and the Commonwealth Government pausing indexation of financial assistance grants.
The Sustainability assessment considers six factors and scores each of those factors as High, Medium or Low risk.

Also attached are:

(a) the definitions of the six indicators; and
(b) the risk assessment criteria


Implications

Policy Considerations

There are no specific Council policies or strategies that relate to this report.

Financial Implications

The overall Financial Sustainability assessment for this Council is green, or ‘Low Risk’.

This assessment is arrived at after considering the Council’s performance across the six indicators.

1. Underlying Result: Is Council’s operating surplus divided by total revenue (both items are adjusted for non-cash and non-recurring items). Council’s average score of 1.89% is Low Risk. The 2013-14 score of minus 7.75% is medium risk. Key drivers of the 2013-14 year were delayed timing of financial assistance grants - $3m and additional governance costs incurred - $1.2m.

2. Liquidity: Compares cash and liquid assets to short-term liabilities. Council’s score of 1.52 in 2013/14 is Low Risk, however is forecast to move to Medium Risk as Council capital works program increases.

3. Indebtedness: Compares long term liabilities with Council generated revenue. Council’s Score of 56.91% is Medium Risk. This score includes all long-term liabilities such as Landfill Rehabilitation. Since June 2011 loan borrowings have been reduced from $9.1M to $8.5M however landfill rehabilitation provisions have increased from $3.6M to $11.8M largely as a result of increased rehabilitation standards being required.

   Council’s Long Term Financial Plan predicts that this indicator will remain within the Medium Risk range of 40% to 60%.

4. Self-Financing: Measures Council’s ability to finance asset replacement from its own revenue. The score of 13.98% is Medium Risk with the longer range average of average 22.01% a Low Risk.
5. **Capital Replacement**: Compares spending on infrastructure (including new assets) with depreciation. Ratios higher than 1:1 indicate that spending is faster than the depreciation rate. Council’s score of 0.90 is High Risk. A comparison of spending to depreciation is a crude measure. Council’s approach to asset renewal is based on reliable data and regular condition assessment to determine an optimum replacement plan.

6. **Renewal Gap**: Compares spending on existing assets through renewing, restoring and replacing existing assets, to depreciation. Council’s score of 0.54 falls within the medium risk range. Similar comments apply to those made in regard to Capital replacement.

**Analysis of results**

Wangaratta has maintained an overall Low Risk rating according to VAGO’s sustainability indicators since the Auditor General has been reporting these results. Council’s underlying results has trended down due to the 2013-14 financial year's result impacted by previously mentioned delayed timing of financial assistance grants $3m and additional governance costs incurred of $1.2m. Future forecasts are for an improvement in this measure. Liquidity remains flat at Low Risk. Indebtedness remains Medium Risk due to landfill rehabilitation provisions but has trended upwards. Self-financing is Low risk and trended down in 2014. Capital replacement and Renewal gap continues to be Medium Risk.

Sustainability measures over time for Wangaratta Council are provided in the following table.\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underlying result (per cent)</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>-7.75</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity (ratio)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness (per cent)</td>
<td>41.02</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>48.51</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>56.91</td>
<td>49.14</td>
<td>54.79</td>
<td>54.79</td>
<td>48.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financing (per cent)</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>26.07</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>28.29</td>
<td>27.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital replacement (ratio)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal gap (ratio)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten of the eleven Regional City Council’s overall sustainability assessments were considered Low Risk with only Wodonga City Council at Medium. Wodonga was assessed at high risk for Indebtedness (driven by its long term investment in LOGIC) and renewal gap. Only Renewal gap was assessed as Medium Risk across the whole of the Regional Cities category.

Wangaratta has kept an overall Low Risk rating according to VAGO’s sustainability indicators for the last 4 years. Underlying results has trended down due to the 2013-14’s result impacted by previously mentioned delayed timing of financial assistance grants $3m and additional governance costs incurred $1.2m. Liquidity remains flat at Low Risk. Indebtedness remains Medium Risk due to

---

\(^1\) Victorian Auditor-General’s Office
landfill rehabilitation provisions but has trended upwards. Self-financing is Low risk and trended down in 2014. Capital replacement and Renewal gap continues to be Medium Risk.

**Legal/Statutory**

There are no legal/statutory implications identified for the subject of this report.

**Social**

There are no social impacts identified for the subject of this report.

**Environmental/Sustainability Impacts**

There are no environmental/ sustainability impacts identified for this subject of this report.

**Economic Impacts**

There are no economic impacts identified for the subject of this report.

**Council Plan-Key Strategic Activity/Action**

Council’s 2013-2017 Council Plan contains a Key Strategic Activity to: Provide responsible financial practices ensuring Council’s annual financial viability.

**Strategic Links**

a) **Rural City of Wangaratta 2030 Community Vision**

N/A

b) **Other strategic links**

N/A

**Risk Management**

There are no risks associated with the subject of this report.

**Consultation/Communication**

Officers believe that appropriate consultation has occurred and the matter is now ready for Council consideration.

**Conclusion**

Council’s financial sustainability has been assessed by the Victorian Auditor General as, overall, Low Risk.
This is a result of past Budgets and major investment decisions being evaluated against the Long Term Financial Plan which includes forecasts of the impact on these financial sustainability indicators.

**Attachments**

1. Local Government: Results of the 2013–14 Audits (Extract)
11.2.2.2 SUBMISSION ON ELECTORAL REPRESENTATION REVIEW FOR RURAL CITY OF WANGARATTA

Meeting Type: Ordinary Council Meeting  
Date of Meeting: 17 March 2015  
Author: Manager Business and Governance  
File Name: Election 2014/2015  
File No.: 50.050.017

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Council to provide for a preliminary submission to the 2015 Wangaratta Rural City Council Electoral Representation Review currently being undertaken by the Victorian Electoral Commission.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council make a preliminary submission to the 2015 Wangaratta Rural City Council Electoral Representation Review supporting retention of the existing unsubdivided electoral structure represented by seven councillors.

Background

The Local Government Act 1989 requires the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) to conduct an electoral representation review of each municipality in Victoria at least every 12 years. These reviews are a key mechanism to ensure that all voters in the municipality have their concerns and interests fairly and equitably represented.

Wangaratta’s last review was in 2004. Consequently, the VEC is conducting a review of Wangaratta in 2015. The review commenced on 25 February 2015.

The VEC is an independent reviewer. The Electoral Commissioner has overall responsibility for conducting the review and sits as Chair of the Electoral Representation Review Panel advised by VEC officers (including policy and GIS specialists) and independent local government experts.

The review considers:

- the appropriate number of councillors for the municipality
- if it should be divided into wards and
- if divided into wards, the number of wards and councillors per ward, names of wards and positioning of ward boundaries.
To ensure an electoral structure that best represents the interests of the community, further considerations include:

- areas and physical features of terrain
- means of travel and traffic arteries
- communities and diversities of interest and
- the likelihood of changes in the number of voters in various localities.

When the review is complete, the VEC makes final recommendations to the Minister for Local Government. Any changes to the electoral structure of the municipality will apply at the next council general elections.

The process, steps and key dates are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public notice and call for preliminary submissions</td>
<td>25 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public information sessions</td>
<td>3 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary submissions close</td>
<td>25 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary report released</td>
<td>22 April 2015;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response submissions close</td>
<td>20 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearing of submissions</td>
<td>26 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report released</td>
<td>17 June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The VEC has published a Guide for Submissions 2015 Wangaratta Rural City Council Electoral Representation Review which outlines the review process and the opportunities for public input, and provides important information about the relevant issues that submissions may address.

Anyone, including councils, can make preliminary submissions to contribute views and local knowledge about the relevant issues.

It is proposed that the Council makes a preliminary submission to the VEC on the Electoral Representation Review for the Rural City of Wangaratta. The deadline for preliminary submissions is 5:00 pm, 25 March 2015.

**Implications**

In developing a preliminary submission, Council has considered each of the possible configurations allowable taking into account the principles of fair and equitable representation, communities of interest and sustainability over the twelve year period until the next review. The configurations considered included a subdivided structure with single member wards, a subdivided structure with a
mix of single member and multi member wards and the current unsubdivided structure.

**Electoral Structure**

Council recognises that the VEC is guided by comparative data for Regional Urban municipalities and that an unsubdivided structure is entirely consistent with the approach taken at six other regional urban municipalities in the State of Victoria. The current unsubdivided structure which was introduced at the 2005 Council elections is considered to best meet the criteria for fair and equitable representation in that all seven Councillors represent all voters rather than specific sections of the municipality under a ward structure. This model overcomes the splitting of communities of interest which would occur if the single ward configuration was introduced.

The seven single member ward option suggests that a voter to Councillor ratio of plus or minus variation of 10% required under Section 219D (c) of the Local Government Act 1989 can be met. However in doing so the option splits communities of interest with an estimated total of 1,171 voters from the urban fringe attached to rural wards in the north and south of the municipality. These areas include the Parfitt Road area in the north-east, the Wilson Road area in the south-east and Billabong Drive and Pelican Court subdivisions in the south. The leakage of urban areas to rural wards has occurred as a result of the difference in population and ward ratios. More specifically whilst the projected growth of the municipality is 0.5% it is likely that such growth will occur in these residential areas, thereby further increasing the numbers of urban voters included in a rural ward.

In representation terms the subdivided, single member structure would generate a four to three ward structure in favour of the urban component. The Council, whilst attracted to this model considers that it is likely to generate a greater emphasis on the urban to rural split and that the suggested boundaries simply meet the +/−10% variation requirement rather than identifying communities of interest and establishing fair and equitable representation.

As a matter of principle, Council does not support a subdivided multi member /single member wards model, primarily based on it failing the communities of interest test and the potential voter confusion that may arise where two voting systems are applied to each of the models (i.e. proportional representation and preferential voting).

**Number of Councillors**

Seven councillors is considered to be the appropriate number of councillors when compared with municipalities in the category Urban Regional councils. With an annual population growth rate of only 0.5% projected over the next twenty years it is unlikely that this number would need to increase.

Whilst there is no empirical data to validate whether seven provides for fair and equitable representation the comparative data suggests that the councillor to voter ratio is satisfactory.
Consideration was also given to the reduction of the number of Councillors to five; however, it was considered this would reduce access to Councillors and therefore reduce full and proper representation.

**Policy Considerations**

There are no specific Council policies or strategies that relate to this report.

**Financial Implications**

The number of councillors determined as a result of the review will impact the administrative costs of the Council.

**Legal/Statutory**

This report concerns Council’s initial submission to the legal process of review of the municipality’s electoral representation conducted by the VEC. A subsequent ‘response submission’ to the preliminary report may be made by Council at a future date.

**Social**

Council’s preliminary submission is configured to meet the community of interest principle and to provide an appropriate access to councillors for the community.

**Environmental/Sustainability Impacts**

There are no environmental/ sustainability impacts identified for this subject of this report.

**Economic Impacts**

There are no economic impacts identified for the subject of this report.

**Council Plan-Key Strategic Activity/Action**

Objective:
To ensure we consult and engage effectively with the community in our decision making.

Key Strategic Activity:
Engage the community in decision making for the development of the Rural City of Wangaratta.

Action:
Review the most appropriate electoral structure for the Rural City of Wangaratta.

**Consultation/Communication**

Officers believe that appropriate consultation has occurred and the matter is now ready for Council consideration.
Options for Consideration

Alternatives to the recommendation include favouring either of a subdivided single member ward structure or a subdivided mixed single member and multi member ward structure ahead of an unsubdivided structure. These options are not favoured for reasons given in the body of this report.

Conclusion

Given the reasons outlined in the body of this report and provided in the more detailed submission (refer attachment); Council should make a preliminary submission in support of an unsubdivided electoral structure with seven councillors.

Attachments

1. Wangaratta Rural City Council preliminary submission to the 2015 Wangaratta Rural City Council Electoral Representation Review

11.2.3 COMMUNITY WELLBEING

Nil.
11.2.4 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

11.2.4.1 NAMING PROPOSAL FOR THE SECTION OF ROAD AT THE RIVER END OF OVENS STREET

Meeting Type: Ordinary Council Meeting  
Date of Meeting: 17 March 2015  
Author: Secretary – Place Naming Committee  
File Name: Place/Road names  
File No: 73.020.014

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Council seeking consideration of a naming proposal received to name the section of road at the river end of Ovens Street as “Punt Place”.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council advertise its intention to name the section of road at the river end of Ovens Street as “Punt Place”.

Background

During the design and construction of the Ovens Riverside Precinct the section of road at the river end of Ovens Street was referred to as Bickerton Plaza. “Bickerton” is already used as the street name on the opposite side of the river and duplicate names are not permitted under the Guidelines for Geographic Names.

The section of road provides vehicle access to carparking and Sydney Beaches, and pedestrian and bicycle access to the shared path network including the 2 suspension bridges and the stockbridge to Apex Park.

A naming proposal was received by Council’s Place Naming Committee to consider naming the section of road “Punt Place” in recognition of the location that the Punt crossed the Ovens River prior to the stockbridge being built. Refer to the location map below:
Implications

Changing the name of the section of road will not impact on any landowners as there are no properties addressed off Ovens Street at this location.

The name “Punt” takes the history of the location into consideration and provides the enclosed roadway with a more appropriate road type. The road type “Place” is described appropriately in the standard AS/NZS 4819 as a short, sometimes narrow, enclosed roadway.

Policy Considerations

Clause 9 of Council’s Policy for Naming Roads, Streets and other Accessways states that “Preference will be given to names that refer to the history and development of the municipality in accordance with the Geographic Place Names Act 1998.”

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications identified for the subject of this report.

Legal/Statutory

The Geographic Place Names Act 1998 has been referenced in the preparation of this report.
Social

There are no social impacts identified for the subject of this report.

Environmental/Sustainability Impacts

There are no environmental/sustainability impacts identified for this subject of this report.

Economic Impacts

There are no economic impacts identified for the subject of this report.

Council Plan-Key Strategic Activity/Action

To plan for and provide infrastructure appropriate to the community’s needs.

Strategic Links

N/A

Risk Management

There are no risks associated with the subject of this report.

Consultation/Communication

The community will be asked to provide feedback on the proposal during the advertising period.

Conclusion

The naming of the section of road at the river end of Ovens Street as “Punt Place” connects the history of the Punt with the location and also provides a more appropriate road type.

Attachments

Nil.
11.2.4.2 MERRIWA AND KALUNA PARKS MASTERPLAN REVIEW

Meeting Type: Ordinary Council Meeting
Date of Meeting: 17 March 2015
Author: Executive Assistant – Infrastructure Services
File Name: Merriwa & Kaluna Parks Masterplan Review
File No: 71.020.017

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Council to provide information on the submissions received on the draft Merriwa and Kaluna Parks Masterplan following the resolution to seek community feedback at the 18 November 2014 Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council adopt the Merriwa and Kaluna Parks Masterplan.

Background

The draft Masterplan was developed by the Merriwa and Kaluna Parks Masterplan Working Group following a review of the original plan adopted by Council in 2005.

The draft Merriwa and Kaluna Parks Masterplan was placed on public exhibition following the 18 November 2014 Council meeting. Submissions were sought through the Wangaratta Chronicle, on Council’s website and Social Media with the submission period closing on 15 January 2015. Five submissions were received by the closing date.

The Working Group met on Tuesday 24 February 2015 to consider the submissions received.

Submitters were complimentary of the draft Masterplan. Some minor changes were required due to previously identified works already completed and changes to all ability access adjacent to the Comfort Station as part of the upcoming redevelopment.

Installation of traffic calming measures and reduction in carparking time limits to 2 or 3 hours, to allow more access to park users were common requests in the submissions.

The Working Group will continue to meet bi-monthly to prioritise actions in the Masterplan for consideration as part of Council’s yearly budget processes.
Available State or Federal government funding will also be sought for appropriate works within the Masterplan.

**Implications**

**Policy Considerations**

During the development of the Masterplan consideration was given to the following Strategies and Plans:

- Open Space Strategy
- Public Playground Facilities Consolidation Strategy
- Rural City of Wangaratta Recreation Strategy
- Wangaratta Recreation Parklands Masterplan
- Access and Inclusion Plan.

**Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications identified for the subject of this report, however as mentioned above individual projects will be prioritised for consideration in future Capital Works programs.

**Legal/Statutory**

There are no legal/statutory implications identified for the subject of this report.

**Social**

Social Impacts to be included

**Environmental/Sustainability Impacts**

Environment/Sustainability impact to be included.

**Economic Impacts**

There are no economic impacts identified for the subject of this report.

**Council Plan-Key Strategic Activity/Action**

Council plan reference to be included.

**Strategic Links**

a) Rural City of Wangaratta 2030 Community Vision

A Healthy Environment

- The community experiences, interacts and enjoys time in the natural environment; and
• Our community is active in the protection, enhancement and management of environmental assets

b) Other strategic links

N/A

**Risk Management**

There are no risks identified for the subject of this report.

**Consultation/Communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of public participation</th>
<th>Promises to the public/stakeholders</th>
<th>Tools/Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Feedback sought and received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officers believe that appropriate consultation has occurred and the matter is now ready for Council consideration.

**Conclusion**

Submissions received following the exhibition of the draft Merriwa and Kaluna Parks Masterplan were considered by the Working Group and minor changes made.

**Attachments**

1. Merriwa & Kaluna Parks Masterplan (February 2015)
11.2.4.3  CONTRACT C1414-029  SUPPLY OF LANDFILL GARBAGE COMPACTOR

Contract Details

Contract C1415-029 is for the supply of a garbage compactor. This vehicle is used by Council’s landfill staff for compacting the waste deposited onto the active landfill cell. Waste compaction is essential in landfill operations to ensure adequate life of the landfill cell.

The purchase is part of Council’s ongoing plant replacement program.

This acquisition program for the Landfill Garbage Compactor was conducted under the MAV Procurement Contracts for Earth Moving and Material Handling Equipment (Contract Name/Number: BUS213-0511), and on Tenderlink.

The MAV process is a group aggregation tender/contract which Council is qualified to use. This process fully complies with Council’s Procurement Policy and the tendering provisions of the Local Government Act 1989.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That Contract C1415-029 for the supply of a Landfill Garbage Compactor be awarded to GCM Enviro Pty Ltd for the supply of a Tana E320 Landfill Compactor.

2. That the trade-in offered by GCM Enviro Pty Ltd for the existing Caterpillar 816 B unit be accepted.

3. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to sign and seal all the relevant contract documents for Contract C1415/029 for the Landfill Compactor when available.

4. Disclose the contract price excluding GST for Contract C1415-029 for the supply of a Landfill Garbage Compactor and the trade-in offered for the Caterpillar 816 B Unit.

Advertised Contract Dates

Request for tenders was made to the full panel of vendors on the MAV approved list and was posted on 6 February 2015. The request for tenders was also posted on Tenderlink with the same relevant dates. The closing date for the tenders was 26 February 2015. The MAV reference for the request was VP000000026163.

There was no pre-tender meeting for this contract.
**Tender Evaluation Panel**

The tender evaluation panel comprised the following members:

**Mr P Somerville**  
Manager – Waste & Contracts  
Rural City of Wangaratta

**Mr P Woodberry**  
Plant and Depot Co-ordinator  
Rural City of Wangaratta

**Mr K Parker**  
Manager – Field Services  
Rural City of Wangaratta

**Tenders Received**

The following quotations were received by the due date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tender</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>RD Williams Machinery Pty Ltd - Caterpillar 836H Landfill Compactor (Year 2005, 6,500 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>RD Williams Machinery Pty Ltd - Caterpillar 816F II Landfill Compactor (Year 2009, 6,087 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>GCM Enviro Pty Ltd - Tana E320 Landfill Compactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>GCM Enviro Pty Ltd - Tana E380 Landfill Compactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>BT Equipment Pty Ltd - Bomag BC772RB-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Williams Adams - Caterpillar 816F II Land Fill Compactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Williams Adams - Caterpillar 826K Land Fill Compactor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As there is no registration applicable for the landfill compactor, there is no Stamp Duty payable on the purchase of the machine.

The existing Landfill Garbage Compactor was offered for trade-in. The details of the unit are listed below:

- Caterpillar 816B.
- Manufactured date: 10/1984
- Hours: 19,806

*Grays Online Auctions provided a starting bid of $20,000 with a final selling price estimate between $30,000 to $35,000 excluding GST. The offers for the Tana Compactors and the Caterpillar Compactors were higher than the top end of the estimated selling range from Grays Online. Conversely, the trade-in offer for the Bomag unit was lower that the bottom end of the estimate. Consequently, in evaluating the tender, the evaluation panel have used the offered trade-in prices for the Tana and Caterpillar units, and have used $30,000 which is the bottom end of the Grays Online estimate in the case of the Bomag unit.*
The two units offered for tender by RD Williams Machinery Pty Ltd were deemed to be non-conforming by the evaluation panel as the specification was for a new machine and not second hand. A new machine is expected to remain in operation for the estimated life of the Bowser Landfill.

The Caterpillar 816F II Land Fill Compactor unit offered for tender by Williams Adams was also deemed to be non-conforming by the evaluation panel as the machine weight was under the minimum weight specification asked for in the request for tender. The specification was for a minimum weight of 32,000 kgs. The tendered weight for the 816F unit is 23,748 kg.

Finally, in evaluating the tenders, the evaluation panel adjusted the price of the Bomag unit to take up the offer of an extended warranty on the Bomag unit. The Bomag unit came with a standard warranty of 1 year / 2,000 hours. The Tana and Caterpillar units come with standard warranties of 4 years on the drive line and 5 years on the cab chassis. To bring the Bomag unit in line with these units, the extended warranty of $34,118 to cover the first 5 years was taken into account. This brought the evaluated price of the Bomag unit to $585,798 excluding GST.

**Tender Evaluation**

The tender was evaluated in accordance with evaluation criteria set out in the Conditions of Tendering. The evaluation criteria are based upon a Weighted Attribution Method as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Maintenance</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranty</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features and OH&amp;S</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel efficiency and emissions standard</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel members assigned a score (maximum 100) to each criteria (as shown below) and then weighted the average score to produce a final Weighted Attribution Method Score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Evaluation Result</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Demonstrated capacity exceeds all required standards and innovations proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Demonstrated capacity exceeds all required standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Complies with all required standards and capacity demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Score | Evaluation Result | Criteria
--- | --- | ---
50 | Satisfactory | Complies with relevant standards without qualifications.
30 | Marginal | Complies with relevant standards with qualifications.
0 | Unsatisfactory | Fails to satisfy required standards.

Summary of the Weighted Attribution Method Score is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenderer</th>
<th>Score (without trade-in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Non-conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Non-conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Non-conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest value reflects the most favourable tender assessment.

**Conclusion**

GCM Enviro Pty Ltd - Tana E320 Landfill Compactor scored the highest in the evaluation. There was very little difference between this unit and the BT Equipment Pty Ltd - Bomag BC772RB-2 which had an evaluated price of $585,798 when the Grays Online price was factored into the price and the extended warranty purchased to make all the warranties roughly equivalent. The main factor where the Tana unit was deemed superior was in the maintenance and servicing. The arrangement of the engine bay made maintenance significantly easier and would pose less problems for dirt and dust ingress.

**Attachments**

EVALUATION PANEL

CONTRACT C1415-029

Supply of a Landfill Garbage Compactor

Mr P Somerville  
Manager - Waste & Contracts  
Rural City of Wangaratta

Mr P Woodberry  
Plant and Depot Services Co-ordinator  
Rural City of Wangaratta

Mr K Parker  
Manager - Field Services  
Rural City of Wangaratta

The above officers also declare that they have no conflict of interest in relation to this tender.
11.2.5 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

11.2.5.1 TOURISM SPECIAL EVENTS FUNDING PROGRAM- ROUND TWO 2014/2015

Date of and Type of Meeting: 17 March 2015
Author: Tourism Development Coordinator
File Name: Tourism Special Events Funding Program
File No: 25.040.032

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Council to provide a summary of the 2014/2015 Tourism Special Events Funding Program Round Two submissions received and to assist Council in making a decision on the allocation of funds based on the eligibility criteria.

A summary of the Tourism Special Events Funding applications and suggested funding allocations has been attached.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council make the following allocations from the Tourism Special Events Funding program:

- $2,000 ex GST to the 2015 Wines of the King Valley, Taste of Two Regions event in Wagga Wagga.
- $1,500 ex GST to the 2015 Wines of the King Valley, Taste of Two Regions event in Canberra.
- $4,000 ex GST to the 2015 Eldorado Business Tourism Group, ‘How Does your Garlic Grow’ event.
- $5,000 ex GST to the Wangaratta Textile Arts Association, Stitched Up Textiles Festival 2015.

Background

The objective of Council’s Special Event Funding Program is to:

- maximise the economic and community benefits
- provide significant branding and marketing opportunities for the region
- substantially build the profile of the events to attract visitors from outside the Rural City of Wangaratta
- promote the tourism product strengths of the Rural City of Wangaratta.
These Special Events are significant in terms of branding and marketing opportunities for the region and are reflective of the Rural City of Wangaratta’s identified tourism product strengths:

- Cycling
- Food/Wine/Beer
- Nature, Outdoor and Adventure
- Culture & Heritage:
  - Ned Kelly (Specific brand strength)
  - Jazz (Specific brand strength)

The first round of funding closed on 1 August 2014 with a second round subject to available funding, closing on 1 February 2015. At this point in time $21,000 has been expended, and this second round deals with the balance and allocation of $16,000.

**Implications**

**Policy Considerations**

There are no specific Council policies or strategies that relate to this report.

**Financial Implications**

Council has an allocation of $37,000 to fund the program in 2014/2015. Round one applications expended $21,000, leaving $16,000 for Round two in February 2015. The recommended grants total $12,500 leaving $3,500 unspent from the total Council allocation. The remaining unspent funds would return to Council revenue.

**Legal/Statutory**

There are no legal/statutory implications identified for the subject of this report.

**Social**

There are no social impacts identified for the subject of this report.

**Environmental/Sustainability Impacts**

There are no environmental/ sustainability impacts identified for this subject of this report.

**Economic Impacts**

This recommended funding allocation will assist in the delivery of four events which provide an estimated $2.148m direct economic benefit.

**Council Plan-Key Strategic Activity/Action**

Facilitate the promotion of visitor attraction:
Action: Develop product and experiences in line with the current brand strengths of:

- Cycling;
- Food/Wine/Beer;
- Nature, Outdoor and Adventure; and
- Culture & Heritage:
  - Ned Kelly (Specific brand strengths)
  - Jazz (Specific brand strengths)"

**Strategic Links**

**a) Rural City of Wangaratta 2030 Community Vision**

**Theme:** Thriving Regional Economy.

**Strategy:** Further enhance tourism development reviewing and implementing the key actions of the Rural City of Wangaratta Tourism Industry Strategic Plan.

**b) Other strategic links**

N/A

**Risk Management**

N/A

**Consultation/Communication**

The Tourism Event Funding Program was advertised to the Visitor Information Centre database via e-news in November, December and January industry newsletters. Print advertising of the program occurred in The Chronicle newspaper on:

- Friday 21 Nov 2014
- Friday 5 Dec 2014
- Friday 19 Dec 2014
- Friday 2 Jan 2015
- Friday 16 Jan 2015

Enquiries were received in relation to the funding program and meetings held with potential applicants. Many applicants were directed to Round 1 of the 2015 / 2016 Tourism Event Funding Program due to the timing of their event.

The program applications have been reviewed by Council officers and funding recommendations made in line with the Council Plan objective for tourism, the Tourism and Economic Development Strategic Plan key directions and the grant program assessment criteria.

Officers believe that appropriate consultation has occurred and the matter is now ready for Council consideration.
Options for Consideration

Council may now allocate the funding in accordance with the recommendations made in this report.

Conclusion

The attached funding applications align with the criteria for the Tourism Special Events Funding Program and will deliver a direct economic benefit to the community and act as a marketing activity in showcasing tourism products and experiences which drive repeat visitation.

Attachments

11.2.5.2 TOURISM VISITOR ATTRACTION FUNDING PROGRAM - ROUND TWO 2014/2015

Date of and Type of Meeting: 17 March 2015
Author: Tourism Development Coordinator
File Name: Tourism Visitor Attraction Events
Funding Program
File No: 25.040.032

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Council to provide a summary of the 2014/2015 Tourism Visitor Attraction Funding Program Round Two submissions received and to assist Council in making a decision on the allocation of funds based on the eligibility criteria.

One Tourism Visitor Attraction Funding application was received.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

_That Council allocate $2,000 ex GST to the 2014 Edi Upper Primary School Horse Trail Ride._

Background

Visitor Attraction events are generally annual events held throughout the Rural City of Wangaratta which provide significant economic impact, community and tourism significance for their region, but may not be recognised at a state level. They are complementary to the Rural City of Wangaratta’s strategic direction and are able to attract, or are likely to attract in the future, intrastate and interstate visitors.

The objective of the Visitor Attraction Event Funding Program is to:

- maximise the economic and community benefits
- substantially build the profile of the events to attract visitors from outside the Rural City of Wangaratta
- compliment the strategic direction of the Rural City of Wangaratta.

Grants are available for up to $2,500 from the total annual allocation of $7,000. The first round of funding closed on 1 August 2014 with a second round subject to available funding closing on 1 February 2015.

At this point in time $2,000 has been expended, and this second round deals with the balance and allocation of $5,000.
Council advertised the funding program and received only one submission from the Edi Upper Primary School requesting $2,500.

An assessment of the application was undertaken and it is recommended that an amount of $2,000 be provided to assist with the costs associated with advertising and marketing on the event.

This event has been held for four years and funding from RCoW has been previously provided for one of those years.

**Implications**

**Policy Considerations**

There are no specific Council policies or strategies that relate to this report.

**Financial Implications**

Council has an allocation of $7,000 to fund the program in 2014/2015. Round one applications expended $2,000, leaving $5,000 for Round two in February 2015. The recommended grants total $2,000 leaving $3,000 unspent from the total Council allocation in 2014/2015. The remaining unspent funds would return to Council revenue.

**Legal/Statutory**

There are no legal/statutory implications identified for the subject of this report.

**Social**

The event is proposed to run for three days from 30 October 2015 to 2 November 2015 with an estimated participant number of ninety.

**Environmental/Sustainability Impacts**

There are no environmental/ sustainability impacts identified for the subject of this report.

**Economic Impacts**

This recommended funding allocation of $2,000 will assist in the delivery of one small event which provides an estimated $17,000 direct economic benefit.

**Council Plan-Key Strategic Activity/Action**

Facilitate the promotion of visitor attraction:
Action: Develop product and experiences in line with the current brand strengths of:

- Cycling;
- Food/Wine/Beer;
- Nature, Outdoor and Adventure; and
- Culture & Heritage:
  - Ned Kelly (Specific brand strengths)
  - Jazz (Specific brand strengths)

**Strategic Links**

a) Rural City of Wangaratta 2030 Community Vision

Theme: Thriving Regional Economy.
**Strategy:** Further enhance tourism development reviewing and implementing the key actions of the Rural City of Wangaratta Tourism Industry Strategic Plan.

b) Other strategic links

N/A

**Risk Management**

N/A

**Consultation/Communication**

The Tourism Event Funding Program was advertised to the Visitor Information Centre database via e-news in November, December and January industry newsletters. Print advertising of the program occurred in The Chronicle newspaper on:

- Friday 21 Nov 2014
- Friday 5 Dec 2014
- Friday 19 Dec 2014
- Friday 2 Jan 2015
- Friday 16 Jan 2015

Enquiries were received in relation to the funding program and meetings held with potential applicants. Many applicants were directed to Round 1 of the 2015 / 2016 Tourism Event Funding Program due to the timing of their event.

The program applications have been reviewed by Council officers and funding recommendations made in line with the Council Plan objective for tourism, the Tourism and Economic Development Strategic Plan key directions and the grant program assessment criteria.

Officers believe that appropriate consultation has occurred and the matter is now ready for Council consideration.
Options for Consideration

Council may now allocate the funding in accordance with the recommendations made in this report.

Conclusion

This application aligns with the criteria for the Visitor Attraction Events Funding Program and will deliver a direct economic benefit to the community and act as a marketing activity in showcasing tourism products and experiences which drive repeat visitation.

The proposed event is considered to have the potential to grow and be conduit in promoting the nature based outdoor and adventure offer in the King Valley. It is noted from previous events that participants are from outside of the region.

Attachments

Nil.

11.3 SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Nil.
11.4 ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS

11.4.1.1 YOUTH COUNCIL MEETING

Date of Meeting:  17/03/2015
Author:   Youth Development Officer
File Name:    Youth Advisory Committee
File No:   63.010.002

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Executive Summary

The Youth Council held a meeting with special guests on 16 February 2015.

Youth Council Attendees: Ella Thomas Youth Mayor, Corinne Antonoff Deputy Youth Mayor, Eloise Lane, Lara O’Brien, Brianna Archer, Simone Kealy, Michael Groves, Marcel Tonini, Meg Walch, Chloe Hancock and Youth Development Officer Laura McKenna.

The following items from the meeting are reported to Administrators for information:

There were a number of special guests in attendance at the Youth Council meeting. Special guests included His Excellency General the Honourable Sir Peter Cosgrove AK MC (Retd) Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia and Her Excellency Lady Cosgrove, Cathy McGowan AO MP. Rural City of Wangaratta Chief Executive Officer Brendan McGrath, Director of Community and Wellbeing Jaime Carroll, Acting Manager Community Services Leonie Painter, Chair of Administrators Ailsa Fox and Administrators Irene Grant and Rodney Roschollor. Also in attendance were young people from Indigo Shire, Laura Costenaro the Wangaratta Young Citizen of the Year 2015 and a number of interested local young people.

The meeting provided an opportunity for local young people to meet with Sir Peter and Lady Cosgrove in an informal setting to discuss issues of importance. The Youth Councillors spoke about raising awareness of issues such as youth homelessness. Additionally, the Youth Councillors discussed their role as representatives of young people in the Rural City of Wangaratta and the application process for Youth Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council note the report.
11.4.1.2  AUDIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT

Date of Meeting:    17 March 2015
Meeting Type:   Ordinary Council Meeting
Author:    Executive Assistant Corporate Services
Report Title:   Audit Advisory Committee Meeting Report
File Name:     Audit Advisory Committee
File No:    51.020.004

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Council to provide a summary of items discussed at the Meeting of Council’s Audit Advisory Committee held on 9 February 2015.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council note the report.

Attendees: Peter McNeill (Chair); Ailsa Fox, Chair Administrator; Anthony Grieves (via teleconference); Alison Lee, Crowe Horwath, Gayle Lee (observer).

Council officers: Donald Mace, Manager Finance; Tony Raven, Manager Business and Governance; Brendan McGrath, Chief Executive Officer; Andrew Chuck, Acting Director Corporate Services; Rebecca Golia, Executive Assistant Corporate Services (Minute Secretary).

Apologies: Martin Thompson, Crowe Horwath; Ruth Kneebone, Director Corporate Services.

No conflicts of interest were declared.

The following items were discussed at the meeting:

- Finance report
- Scope of internal audit plan
- Review of resources allocated to internal audit
- Internal audit reports
- Status of internal and external audit recommendations
- Risk management processes
- Risk mitigation actions
- Procurement practices
- Compliance matters
- Audit advisory committee charter
- Audit advisory committee biennial agenda
The following items addressed at the meeting are reported to the Administrators for information:

**Review of resources allocated to internal audit**

The committee recommended that council be advised to allocate a total of $35,875 to the internal audit function for the 2015/2016 financial year.

**Risk Management Processes and Risk Mitigation Actions**

Council is continuing to progress towards an enterprise risk management and reporting framework.

**Procurement practices**

Council adopted a Procurement Policy in 2009, in compliance with section 186(A) of the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act). Council is required to review the policy and adopt any changes arising from that review.

**Protected Disclosures**

Recently Council’s protected disclosure procedures were reviewed by the independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC) as one of 114 organisations. As a result of this review Wangaratta Council was one of 15 organisations given a ‘gold star’ rating for their procedures.

**Compliance Matters**

There are a number of legal proceedings currently in progress that could impact Council.
12. RECORDS OF ASSEMBLIES OF ADMINISTRATORS

An “Assembly of Administrators” is a meeting at which matters are considered that are intended or likely to be the subject of a Council decision and is either of the following:
- a meeting of an advisory committee where at least one Administrator is present or
- a planned or scheduled meeting that includes at least half the Administrators and at least one Council officer.

At an assembly of Administrators, a written record is kept of:
- the names of all Administrators and members of the Council staff attending
- the matters considered
- any conflict of interest disclosures made by an Administrator attending
- whether an Administrator who has disclosed a conflict of interest leaves the assembly.

The written record of an assembly of Administrators is, as soon as practicable:
- reported at an ordinary meeting of the Council
- incorporated in the Minutes of that Council meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting details</th>
<th>Refer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/03/2015</td>
<td>Electoral Representation Review Workshop</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/2015</td>
<td>Youth Council meeting</td>
<td>Council report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/03/2015</td>
<td>Administrators Briefing Forum</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/2015</td>
<td>Administrators Briefing Forum</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2015</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss stage 2 consultation Draft Township Development Plans for Glenrowan, Oxley, and Milawa</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/2015</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss Gateway Health</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/2015</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss history of drainage in Morgan Road</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/2015</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss Community Grants program review</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/01/2015</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss the Saleyards</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/01/2015</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss Flood overlays</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/01/2015</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss Aquatics Strategy</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/12/2014</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss Bruck</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/12/2014</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss Saleyards</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/2014</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss planning and property issues</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2014</td>
<td>Bruck Amendment Meeting</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECOMMENDATION:

*That Council receive the reports of Assemblies of Administrators.*

13. NOTICE OF MOTION

14. URGENT BUSINESS

15. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Public Question Time

16. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

17. CLOSURE OF MEETING
18. ATTACHMENTS

18.1.1.1 (11.2.2.1) LOCAL GOVERNMENT: RESULTS OF THE 2013–14 AUDITS (EXTRACT)
### Regional city councils and associated entity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Audit types</th>
<th>Financial statements(a)</th>
<th>Timeliness of audited financial statement completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LG Act</td>
<td>Non-LG</td>
<td>Clear opinion issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED AUDITS WITH 30 JUNE 2014 BALANCE DATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Airport Pty Ltd</td>
<td>● C</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City Council</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–14 Total number of entities = 12</td>
<td>11 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2012–13 Total number of entities = 12 | 11 1 |                          |                      |                            | 12 0              |

(a) Councils – includes financial, standard and performance statements.
Source: Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.
Appendix E.

Financial sustainability

Indicators used reflect short- and long-term sustainability, and are measured by:

- **underlying result**—generate enough revenue to cover operating costs, including the cost of replacing assets reflected in depreciation expense
- **liquidity**—have sufficient working capital to meet short-term commitments
- **self-financing**—generate sufficient operating cash flows to invest in asset renewal and repay any debt it may have incurred in the past
- **indebtedness**—are not overly reliant on debt to fund capital programs
- **capital replacement**—have been replacing assets at a rate consistent with their consumption
- **renewal gap**—have been maintaining existing assets at a consistent rate.
### Figure E1

**Financial sustainability indicators for councils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underlying result (per cent)</td>
<td>Adjusted net surplus/total underlying revenue</td>
<td>A positive result indicates a surplus. The larger the percentage, the stronger the result. A negative result indicates a deficit. Operating deficits cannot be sustained in the long term. Underlying revenue does not take into account non-cash developer contributions and other one-off (non-recurring) adjustments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>Current assets/current liabilities</td>
<td>Measures the ability to pay existing liabilities in the next 12 months. A ratio higher than 1:1 means there is more cash and liquid assets than short-term liabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financing (per cent)</td>
<td>Net operating cash flows/underlying revenue</td>
<td>Measures the ability to replace assets using cash generated by the entity’s operations. The higher the percentage, the more effectively this can be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness (per cent)</td>
<td>Non-current liabilities/own-sourced revenue</td>
<td>Comparison of non-current liabilities (mainly comprised of borrowings) to own-sourced revenue. The higher the percentage, the less able to cover non-current liabilities from the revenues the entity generates itself. Own-sourced revenue is used—rather than total revenue—because it does not include capital grants, which are usually tied to specific projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital replacement</td>
<td>Capital expenditure/depreciation</td>
<td>Comparison of the rate of spending on infrastructure with its depreciation. Ratios higher than 1:1 indicate that spending is faster than the depreciation rate. This is a long-term indicator, as capital expenditure can be deferred in the short term if there are insufficient funds available from operations, and borrowing is not an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal gap</td>
<td>Renewal and upgrade expenditure/depreciation</td>
<td>Comparison of the rate of spending on existing assets through renewing, restoring, and replacing existing assets with depreciation. Ratios higher than 1:1 indicate that spending on existing assets is greater than the depreciation rate. Similar to the investment gap, this is a long-term indicator, as capital expenditure can be deferred in the short term if there are insufficient funds available from operations, and borrowing is not an option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.*
## Figure E2
Risk assessment criteria for financial sustainability indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Underlying result</th>
<th>Liquidity</th>
<th>Indebtedness</th>
<th>Self-financing</th>
<th>Capital replacement</th>
<th>Renewal gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Less than negative 10% Insufficient revenue is being generated to fund operations and asset renewal.</td>
<td>Less than 1.0</td>
<td>More than 60%</td>
<td>Less than 10% Insufficient cash from operations to fund new assets and asset renewal.</td>
<td>Less than 1.0</td>
<td>Less than 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A risk of long-term run down to cash reserves and inability to fund asset renewals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spending on capital works has not kept pace with consumption of assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negative 10% to zero A risk of long-term run down to cash reserves and inability to fund asset renewals.</td>
<td>1.0–1.5</td>
<td>40–60%</td>
<td>10–20%</td>
<td>1.0–1.5</td>
<td>0.5–1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for caution with cash flow, as issues could arise with meeting obligations as they fall due.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May not be generating sufficient cash from operations to fund new assets.</td>
<td>May indicate spending on asset renewal is insufficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some concern over the ability to repay debt from own-source revenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>More than zero Generating surpluses consistently.</td>
<td>More than 1.5</td>
<td>40% or less</td>
<td>20% or more Generating enough cash from operations to fund assets.</td>
<td>More than 1.5</td>
<td>More than 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No immediate issues with repaying short-term liabilities as they fall due.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low risk of insufficient spending on asset renewal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No concern over the ability to repay debt from own-source revenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low risk of insufficient spending on asset base.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.*
The overall financial sustainability risk assessment is calculated using the ratings determined for each indicator as shown in Figure E3.

**Figure E3**

**Overall financial sustainability risk assessment**

- High risk of short-term sustainability concerns indicated by either:
  - **red** underlying result indicator or
  - **red** liquidity indicator.

- Medium risk of longer-term sustainability concerns indicated by either:
  - **red** self-financing indicator or
  - **red** indebtedness indicator or
  - **red** capital replacement indicator or
  - **red** renewal gap indicator.

- Low risk of financial sustainability concerns—there are no high-risk indicators.

Source: Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.

A trend analysis uses actual figures for the previous five years and a trend analysis using forecast figures for the following three years. The sustainability indicators are colour coded in line with the risk assessment criteria. The legend in Figure E4 is used in presenting the results of our assessments.

**Figure E4**

**Legend for financial sustainability tables**

- ▲ An improving trend.
- – No substantial trend.
- ▼ A deteriorating trend.

Source: Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.
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Figure E18
Renewal gap (ratio) 2010–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outer metropolitan councils</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Actual trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimbank City Council</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinia Shire Council</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey City Council</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston City Council</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Dandenong City Council</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume City Council</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox City Council</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manningham City Council</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton City Council</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington Peninsula Shire Council</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nillumbik Shire Council</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittlesea City Council</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham City Council</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarra Ranges Shire Council</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average renewal gap 1.00 0.98 1.03 0.90 0.97 0.98

Source: Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.

Regional city councils

Figure E19
Financial sustainability risk assessment results 2013–14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional city councils</th>
<th>Average underlying result (%)</th>
<th>Liquidity</th>
<th>Indebtedness (%)</th>
<th>Self-financing (%)</th>
<th>Capital replacement</th>
<th>Renewal gap</th>
<th>Sustainability assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City Council</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo City Council</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>26.65</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City Council</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City Council</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City Council</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>32.46</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City Council</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City Council</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>42.98</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>56.91</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City Council</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>73.80</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category average 6.18 1.84 32.34 22.25 1.57 1.00

Category risk assessment Low Low Low Low Low Medium Low

Source: Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.
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### Figure E20
**Underlying result (per cent) 2010–2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional city councils</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City Council</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo City Council</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City Council</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City Council</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City Council</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City Council</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City Council</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City Council</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>-7.75</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City Council</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average underlying result (%)</strong></td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.

### Figure E21
**Liquidity (ratio) 2010–2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional city councils</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City Council</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo City Council</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City Council</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City Council</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City Council</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City Council</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City Council</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average liquidity</strong></td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.

### Figure E22
**Indebtedness (per cent) 2010–2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional city councils</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo City Council</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td>33.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City Council</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>27.89</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.44</td>
<td>27.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City Council</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>19.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City Council</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.27</td>
<td>37.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City Council</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>43.32</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>32.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City Council</td>
<td>32.77</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>32.44</td>
<td>41.97</td>
<td>42.98</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>33.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>23.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City Council</td>
<td>41.02</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>48.51</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>56.91</td>
<td>49.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.94</td>
<td>54.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>24.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City Council</td>
<td>92.95</td>
<td>93.07</td>
<td>72.72</td>
<td>80.68</td>
<td>73.90</td>
<td>82.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.77</td>
<td>58.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average indebtedness (%)</strong></td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>31.73</td>
<td>34.05</td>
<td>31.05</td>
<td>32.34</td>
<td>32.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>33.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.
Appendix E. Financial sustainability

Figure E23
Self-financing (per cent) 2010–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional city councils</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City Council</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>33.15</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>24.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City Council</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>17.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City Council</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>▲ 23.46</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>21.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City Council</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td>37.08</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>32.46</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>▼ 29.70</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City Council</td>
<td>28.62</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>▼ 20.32</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>30.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City Council</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>▼ 32.85</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>27.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>▲ 27.06</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>23.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City Council</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>▲ 24.83</td>
<td>28.29</td>
<td>27.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>▼ 23.84</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>22.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City Council</td>
<td>19.79</td>
<td>19.79</td>
<td>35.02</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>▼ 23.59</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>19.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average self-financing (%) 23.90 25.03 30.27 22.63 22.25 24.81 24.80 23.54 24.46

Source: Victorian Auditor-General's Office.

Figure E24
Capital replacement (ratio) 2010–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional city councils</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City Council</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo City Council</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City Council</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City Council</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City Council</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City Council</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average capital replacement 1.44 1.42 1.93 1.63 1.42 1.57 1.85 1.33 1.33

Source: Victorian Auditor-General's Office.

Figure E25
Renewal gap (ratio) 2010–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional city councils</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Actual trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City Council</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo City Council</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City Council</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City Council</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City Council</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City Council</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City Council</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool City Council</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City Council</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average renewal gap 0.98 0.92 1.10 1.05 0.95 1.00

Source: Victorian Auditor-General's Office.
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1. Introduction

This preliminary submission is in response to the Electoral Representation Review presently being undertaken by the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) in accordance with the provisions of Section 219 of the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act). The last such review was undertaken by the VEC in 2004 and the elected Council at that time resolved to support the reduction of Councillors from eight to seven and the introduction of an unsubdivided municipality instead of a new ward structure.

Council elections were first held under the new structure in 2005 and have continued in the same form since that time. The last election was held in 2012.

In 2013 the Council of the Wangaratta Rural City Council was dismissed and three Administrators were appointed to the Council until the next scheduled municipal elections which will be held in 2016.

This submission addresses each of the criteria established by the Commission. It contains a preliminary view based on those criteria as well as offering comment on its deliberations on an alternative structure, which in part contains some similarities to one of the options canvassed by the Council in 2004.

The Administrators are mindful of the present circumstances where they are required to resolve on such matters in the absence of an elected Council.

2. Characteristics of Rural City of Wangaratta

The VEC on 25 February 2015 issued a publication “The Guide for Submissions 2015 Wangaratta Rural City Council Electoral Representation Review”. This document provides amongst other things specific statistical data about the Rural City of Wangaratta which is publicly available from the VEC and its website. Some of the more relevant information sourced from this publication is summarised below to establish the context for this submission:

- Estimated population (2013) 27,197
- Total area 3,645 square kilometres
- Adjoins the municipalities of Alpine, Benalla, Indigo, Moira and Wellington in north eastern Victoria
The following table informs of the population distribution across the municipality. In approximate terms it identifies a one third rural and two thirds urban population distribution.

Wangaratta 65.7%
Oxley-Milawa and Ovens Valley 1.7%
Glenrowan and district 10.4%
Moyhu and King Valley 6.8%
Springhurst-Eldorado and district 5.9%

3. Council Classification

The VEC has categorised RCOW as a “Regional Urban” municipality to enable analysis of councils of similar size when undertaking the state wide reviews. Specific details are provided in the guide. There are seven municipalities in this category including the RCOW that presently have seven Councillors and are all currently unsubdivided. A summary is set out below *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Population (2011 census)</th>
<th>Current estimate of Voters</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>Voters per Councillor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>60,449</td>
<td>44,309</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>35,519</td>
<td>28,574</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>32,029</td>
<td>25,850</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>26,815</td>
<td>22,122</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>4,267</td>
<td>19,279</td>
<td>15,863</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benalla</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>13,647</td>
<td>11,558</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat</td>
<td>4,211</td>
<td>11,183</td>
<td>9,103</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the VEC guide for submissions includes a more comprehensive table of all of the municipalities in the category of Regional Urban where there are more than seven councillors. This is an abbreviated table for the purpose of this submission.

4. Number of Councillors and Voter Representation

Seven is considered to be the appropriate number of Councillors when compared with municipalities in the category Urban Regional Councils. With an annual population growth rate of only 0.5% projected over the next twenty years it is unlikely that this number would need to increase.

Whilst there is no empirical data to validate whether the number seven provides for fair and equitable representation the comparative data suggests that the Councillor to voter ratio is
satisfactory i.e. one Councillor per 3,160 voters sits just below the average for each of the six other municipalities in this category the highest being the City of Greater Shepparton (6,330) and lowest Ararat (1,300).

More broadly there are considerably higher ratios in larger municipalities where seven Councillors are elected.

Consideration was also given to the reduction of the number of Councillors to five, however it was considered this would reduce access to Councillors and would therefore reduce full and proper representation. Such a proposal would also significantly increase the workload and therefore the effectiveness of Councillors and the Council.

5. Electoral Structure

The Council considered each of the possible configurations allowable taking into account the principles of fair and equitable representation, communities of interest and sustainability over the twelve year period until the next review. This was reduced to two possibilities.


The Council considered seven single wards to assess whether it would meet the criteria and provide for fair and equitable representation. In doing so a number of configurations were prepared and a map showing the boundaries is attached (Appendix A). This option suggests that voter to Councillor ratio of plus or minus variation of 10% required under Section 219D (c) of the Act can be met.

However in doing so the option splits communities of interest with an estimated total of 1,171 voters from the urban fringe attached to rural wards in the north and south of the municipality.

These areas include the Parfitt Road area in the north-east, the Wilson Road area in the south-east and Billabong Drive and Pelican Court subdivisions in the south. The leakage of urban areas to rural wards has occurred as a result of the difference in population and ward ratios.

More specifically whilst the projected growth of the municipality is 0.5% it is likely that such growth will occur in these residential areas, thereby further increasing the numbers of urban voters included in a rural ward.

In its guide for submissions the VEC makes the following comment:

“Boundaries should always take into account communities of interest and should follow major roads, rivers, significant landmarks and existing locality boundaries where possible”
The reality in the case of the RCOW is that unlike some other Councils, it has a singular urban centre with 65.7% of its population located within Wangaratta where the communities of interest are concentrated to the exclusion of the rural communities.

In representation terms this model would generate a four to three ward structure in favour of the urban component.

The Council, whilst attracted to this model, considers that it is likely to generate a greater emphasis on the urban to rural split and that the suggested boundaries simply meet the +/-10% variation requirement rather than identifying communities of interest and establishing fair and equitable representation.

Appendix A contains a map of the municipality – subdivided indicating proposed ward boundaries.

7. Subdivided Multi Member /Single Wards

The Council considered the option of multi member and single member wards but as a matter of principle does not support such a model primarily based on the communities of interest test and the potential voter confusion that may arise where two voting systems are applied to each of the models (i.e. proportional representation and preferential voting).

8. Unsubdivided

The Council recognises that the Commission is guided by comparative data for Regional Urban municipalities which suggests that not only seven councillors is an appropriate number but also consistency of unsubdivided electoral boundary structures.

The current unsubdivided structure which was introduced at the 2005 Council elections is considered to best meet the criteria of fair and equitable representation in that all seven Councillors represent all voters rather than specific sections of the municipality under a ward structure.

It also provides the best opportunity for the Council to take a broader perspective of the infrastructure and service requirements of the community as well as more general advocacy role on a whole of Council approach.

In the case of Rural City of Wangaratta this model overcomes the splitting of communities of interest which would occur if the single ward configuration was introduced.

Voters also have a choice of councillors who can represent them on matters which directly affect them.
In addition the application of proportional representation in an unsubdivided structure provides a better opportunity for individuals or representatives of smaller community organisations to be elected.

Appendix B contains a map of the municipality - unsubdivided

9. Conclusion

The preliminary view of the Council is that an unsubdivided structure for the Rural City of Wangaratta meets all of the criteria established by the VEC and will provide fair and equitable representation for the voters and community of the Municipality.
WANGARATTA
RURAL CITY
Councillors: 7
Total Voters: 22,094
18.1.1.3 (11.2.4.2) MERRIWA & KALUNA PARKS MASTERPLAN (FEBRUARY 2015)
**REVISED PLAN**

**Car parking**
- Rationalise carparking.
- Retain access loop for current uses.
- Restructure and formalise through marked parking bays. Allow for approximately 80 carparks (including 5 disabled) and drop off zone.
- 3 hour parking restriction at Tennis Club.
- 2 hours elsewhere in Park to stop camping and all day parking and discourage non-recreational use.

**Pedestrian Access**
- Provide safe, signed path network into and around park for all abilities.
- Prevent vehicle access.
- Develop: points of interest along path network as feature nodes with interpretation signage and landscape feature elements, ie: observation deck, sculpture, seating (locations as marked on plan).
- Construct new bridge to continue pedestrian loop from Fern Garden toward Kinder.
- Feature nodes to be based on heritage and environmental themes.
- Provide all ability access from shared path to tennis club and tennis bank for maintenance and emergency vehicles.

**Feature Node**
- Introduce environmental education opportunities.
- Develop points of interest along path network as feature nodes with interpretation signage, seating, landscape feature elements, ie: observation deck, sculpture, seating (locations as marked on plan).
- Encourage children to participate in activity areas.
- Establish views into park from Ryley Street.
- Promote all public entrances to Merriwa Park.

**BBQ Facilities**
- Retain and upgrade.
- Upgrade both picnic precincts including shelters, cooking facilities and more seating. Facilitate access for all abilities.
- Investigate new covered BBQ in conjunction with new playground.

**Amphitheatre (Sound Shell)**
- Refurbish facility and establish comprehensive user program.
- Undertake complete assessment to improve operational use of the facility.
- Following the assessment the Soundshell surrounds are to be reviewed.

**Bicycle Station/ viewing deck**
- Replace and redevelop precinct with bicycle station and viewing deck.
- Upgrade appearance to a design sympathetic to park.
- Ensure upgrade complies with Australian Standard for all abilities access, info and around facility.
- Do not replace native trees in this area.

**Tennis Court**
- Tennis Club to remain in its current configuration.
- Renovate fencing to be sympathetic to its setting.
- Handrails to be installed to steps. (ramp?) and improved access from top of levee to Kindergarten.
- Pedestrian safety devices installed.
- Weeds removed and indigenous species planted to accentuate priority to Kaluna Park and provide a more sympathetic and attractive entry.
- Erosion control adjacent to Kaluna Park from Ely Street stormwater outfall.

**Lagoon**
- Improve water quality.
- Investigate means to create water throughout the lagoon system to maintain levels within the lagoons and that excess water is discharged appropriately into the King River.
- Investigate reliable access to water from the King River to keep water at agreed level within Merriwa Park.
- Remove hard edging around eastern and northern lagoons.

**Link/Apex Park/Ovens Riverside via a shared path**
- Investigate opportunities to link Merriwa Park to be replaced 13
- Continue revegetation strategy.
- Introduce environmental education opportunities.
- Nature trails in Kaluna Park to be available to pedestrians only (consideration to be given to All Abilities Access compliance).

**Fern Garden**
- Maintain as a special precinct within the park structure.
- Establish a management plan and responsibilities.

**Lagoon Precinct**
- Upgrade area to encourage use. Add appropriate mix of garden features, aesthetic/native species and embankment treatment.

**Red Gum Picnic Lawn**
- Maintain qualities of existing precinct.
- Twigs annual assessment of Red Gum health and public safety.
- A new replanting program to be implemented using locally indigenous Red Gums.

**KALUNA PARK**
- Maintain access across park and for decorative purposes.
- Lighting to be improved along tennis bank and riverside footpath.
- Surrounding re-aligned carpark, BBQ, picnic and playground areas.
- Investigate the need for amenities of highlighting lighting elsewhere.
- Investigate use of CCTV/Motion cameras to manage littering and vandalism within Merriwa and Kaluna Parks.

**Kaluna Park**
- Council to establish long term management plan.
- Continue revegetation strategy.
- Investigate opportunities to link Merriwa Park to Ovens River Link/Apex Park/Ovens Riverside via a shared path.
- Introduce environmental education opportunities.
- Nature trails in Kaluna Park to be available to pedestrians only (consideration to be given to All Abilities Access compliance).

**Amphitheatre**
- Replace and redevelop precinct with bicycle station and viewing deck.
- Public toilets facilities to be retained and upgraded in any new development proposal (to Australian Standard for Disability Access).

**Merriwa and Kaluna Parks Masterplan Study**

February 2015
18.1.1.4 (11.2.4.3) CONFIDENTIAL ATTACHMENT - CONTRACT C1414-029
SUPPLY OF LANDFILL GARBAGE COMPACTOR – EVALUATION PANEL REPORT
18.1.1.5 (11.2.5.1) TOURISM SPECIAL EVENTS FUNDING PROGRAM 2014/2015 – ROUND 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Event Date</th>
<th>No. Years Event Held</th>
<th>No. of Years Event funded by RCOW - based on records from 05/06 until now.</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Suggested</th>
<th>Intended use of funding</th>
<th>Duration Day/s</th>
<th>Est. Participants</th>
<th>Economic Impact (direct)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wines of the King Valley        | Taste of Two Regions – Wagga Wagga                                    | 6 Sept 2015| New event in Wagga Wagga. | 0 years.                                                                 | $5,000           | $2,000           | Assist with marketing activities.                                                          | 1              | 350               | $-                       | Supports Wine Industry Restructure Strategy. A unique and targeted marketing activity directly into the Wagga Wagga market. Council Officers have suggested to organisers to hold this event in Wagga Wagga to target this key market. 
As the event is not held within the region it is hard to gauge economic impact. 
Suggest that a condition be applied to application funding: that the applicant must include within surveys to La Dolce Vita and Weekend Fit for a King festival attendees, a question in relation to their postcode to ascertain if growth in visitation is seen from Wagga Wagga. |
|                                 | Taste of Two Regions - Canberra                                       | 5 July 2015| 6 years.             | 5 years.                                                                  | $5,000           | $1,500           | Assist with marketing activities.                                                          | 1              | 420               | $-                       | An event in Canberra in partnership with Destination Rutherglen to promote the two regions directly to this key market. Supports Wine Industry Restructure Strategy. A unique and targeted marketing activity directly into the ACT market. As the event is not held within the region it is hard to gauge economic impact. 
Suggest that a condition be applied to application funding: that the applicant must include within surveys to La Dolce Vita and Weekend Fit for a King festival attendees, a question in relation to their postcode to ascertain if growth in visitation is seen from Canberra. |
| El Dorado Tourism Business Group | How does your garden grow? (Garlic planting and maximising your harvest) | 23 & 34 May 2015| New event. | 0 years.                                                                  | $5,000           | $4,000           | Assist with marketing, PR and event development.                                         | 2              | 30                | $10,000                  | Council Officers have provided significant mentoring to the organisers. Limited economic impact with low numbers but has high potential to be developed into an ongoing product. Leverages from High Country Harvest. 
Alignment with Council Plan Objective to develop product and experiences in line with brand strengths. |
| Wangaratta Textile Arts Association | Stitched Up Textiles Festival                                      | 3 July 2015 – 12 July 2015| Bi-Annual event running for 11 years. | 2 years.                                                                  | $5,000           | $5,000           | Assist with marketing activities.                                                          | 2 weeks        | 6000              | $1.318m                  | Significant economic impact. Alignment with Council Plan Objective to develop product and experiences in line with brand strengths. |
| **TOTAL**                       |                                                                        |             |                      |                                                                            | $20,000          | $12,500          |                                                                                           |                |                   |                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
18.1.1.6 (12) ASSEMBLIES OF ADMINISTRATORS
ASSEMBLY OF ADMINISTRATORS
Date: 23 February 2015
Meeting: Electoral Review
Commenced 9.00am

Present:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Brendan McGrath, CEO; Ruth Kneebone, DCS; Barry Green, DDS; Jaime Carroll, DCW; Alan Clark, DI.

Apologies: nil.

In attendance: Terry Maher

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

Nil.

Matters Considered:

The following items were discussed:

1. Electoral Review.

Meeting Closed:

The meeting closed at 10.30am.
ASSEMBLY OF ADMINISTRATORS
Date: 10February 2015
Meeting to discuss Township Development Plans
Commenced 9.00am

Present:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Barry Green, DDS.

Apologies: Nil.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

Nil.

Matters Considered:

The following items were discussed:
1. Township Development Plans.

Meeting Closed:
The meeting closed at 11.30am.
Present:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Brendan McGrath, CEO.

Apologies: Nil.

In attendance: Leonard Peady.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

Nil.

Matters Considered:

The following items were discussed:

1. Gateway Health.

Meeting Closed:

The meeting closed at 12.30pm.
ASSEMBLY OF ADMINISTRATORS
Date: 27 January 2015
Meeting to discuss the Saleyards
Commenced 1.00pm

Present:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Jaime Carroll, DCW.

Apologies: Nil.

In attendance: Karina Bonnitcha.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

Nil.

Matters Considered:

The following items were discussed:

1. Community Grants Program Review.

Meeting Closed:

The meeting closed at 2.00pm.
ASSEMBLY OF ADMINISTRATORS  
Date: 20 January 2015  
Meeting to discuss the Saleyards  
Commenced 11.00am

Present:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Brendan McGrath, CEO; Alan Clark, DIS.

Apologies: Nil.

In attendance: Paul Brown, General Manager RLX Operating Company partnering with RIPL developers and operators of Regional Livestock Exchange.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

Nil.

Matters Considered:

The following items were discussed:

1. Saleyards

Meeting Closed:

The meeting closed at 12.00pm.
ASSEMBLY OF ADMINISTRATORS
Date: 19 January 2015
Meeting to discuss the Aquatic Strategy
Commenced 2.00pm

Present:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Jaime Carroll, DCW.

Apologies: Nil.

In attendance: Hugh Maguire.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

Nil.

Matters Considered:

The following items were discussed:

Meeting Closed:
The meeting closed at 3.00pm.
ASSEMBLY OF ADMINISTRATORS
Date: 22 December 2014
Meeting to discuss the Bruck Textiles Wangaratta
Commenced 9.00am

Present:
Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.
Officers: Brendan McGrath, CEO.
Apologies: Nil.
In attendance: Clare Kiely, EPA.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:
Nil.

Matters Considered:
The following items were discussed:
1. Bruck Textiles Wangaratta.

Meeting Closed:
The meeting closed at 10.00am.
ASSEMBLY OF ADMINISTRATORS
Date: 17 December 2014
Meeting to discuss the Saleyards
Commenced 3.00pm

Present:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Brendan McGrath, CEO; Alan Clarke, DIS.

Apologies: Nil.

In attendance: Chairman Allan McGuffie, Dan Ivone, Director and Kerry Murphy (TAFCO Rural Supplies).

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

Nil.

Matters Considered:

The following items were discussed:
1. Saleyards.

Meeting Closed:
The meeting closed at 4.00pm
Present:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Barry Green, DDS.

Apologies: Nil.

In attendance: Chris Heath.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

Nil.

Matters Considered:

The following items were discussed:

1. Planning / Property issues.

Meeting Closed:

The meeting closed at 12.00pm
PRESENT:

Administrator: Ailsa Fox, Chair; Irene Grant; Rodney Roscholler.

Officers: Brendan McGrath, CEO; Barry Green, DDS.

Apologies: Nil.

In attendance: Phillip Bart, Australian Textiles.

Matter Considered:

The following items were discussed:

1. Bruck Amendment

Meeting Closed:

The meeting closed at 4.00pm