

[Redacted]

From: Maurice Battilana [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 25 October 2018 10:58 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Grants & ratio calculations

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: Maurice Battilana [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 23 October 2018 3:51 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Grants & ratio calculations

Hi Darrelle

Thanks so much for getting back to me so promptly. It is very much appreciated and portrays a feeling to me you (and the Dept) are genuinely interested. Cheers 😊

The actual Ratio at the time escaped my memory. However; the feeling is all the relevant ratios should incorporate grant revenue when required. The removal of the FAG (and Direct Road Grants) is not appropriate. FAGS must be considered an as-of-right revenue source for the local government to provide services to its constituents. The concept of a LGA being grant reliant is refuted strongly by those of us who are required to provide services from our own resource revenue only. This is not reflected with the funding the State & Commonwealth provide Departments under their control for them to provide services (e.g. Health, Education, Main Roads, Agriculture, Environments, etc. etc.). If the government funding was taken away from the State & Commonwealth Departments and they were asked to provide services from their own resources then they simply could not provide these services. Why should local government authorities be treated any differently?

If you follow Grants Commission methodology on what grants are required to provide a minimum service to constituents in local governments then you will notice we are provided funding far less then the minimum funds required for such services. This even after the rating capacity of an LGA is taken into account.

The ratios are distorted if grant funds (FAGS in particular which should be re-badged as ***“As-Of-Right Service Delivery Revenue”*** and not ***“Grants”***) are not considered own resource revenue.

In regards to the Elected Member numbers, my comments where:

1. The ability to run with 80% of the total number of Elected Members (EM) should be in place irrespective of whether an LGA has Wards or not.
2. If an EM vacancy is not filled at an Ordinary Election and this results in there still being a total of EM in place being no less than 80% (irrespective of is there are Wards or not) then the LGA should have the discretionary power to resolve to run with 80% EMs for the next two years until the next Ordinary Election. This will do one of two things:
 - Prove the Council could probably run quite well with the lesser number (obviously an LGA should not be able to run with numbers below the minimum threshold);
 - Trigger more interest from the electors to nominate at the next Ordinary Election.

I heard the counter-argument of this perhaps leaving a Ward under-represented. I do not see this as a problem because the Ward Electors should then get their act together and ensure there is a nominated candidate for the next ordinary election and they should be representing the whole of the Shire anyway, not just the Ward.

I hope this clarifies my comments.

Please do not hesitate to call me is you feel the need for more information.

Kindest regards

[Redacted signature line]

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted signature block]