

**South East Avon
Voluntary Regional
Organisation of Councils
(S E A V R O C)**

MINUTES

Executive Committee Meeting
held at the
Shire of Tammin - Lesser Hall
Tuesday, 8 July 2014



SEAVROC

(SOUTH EAST AVON VOLUNTARY REGIONAL ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS)

MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

SHIRE OF TAMMIN – LESSER HALL
10:17AM TUESDAY, 8 JULY 2014

Following Cr R Carter's welcome, attendees were requested to introduce themselves to the meeting.

The Executive Officer then drew attention to the need to elect a Chairperson for the SEAVROC Group, given Cr G Cooper's resignation as Chair effective from 18 October 2013, and that no meeting had been held since that date in order to elect a new Chair.

The Notice Paper before the meeting detailed requirements in this regard, shown below:

The "Preparation of Agendas and Minutes – a Guide for Western Australian Local Governments", sets the order of business that meets the legislative requirements of the Local Government Act 1995, as well as best practice, and accordingly, the order of business set for this Agenda follows that guide.

For voting purposes, Member Councils are requested to nominate two voting representatives of whom one must be an Elected Member of the Member Local Government.

Election of Chairperson

Ex Councillor Graham Cooper on 19 September 2013 tendered his resignation of the South East Avon Voluntary Regional Organisation of Councils (SEAVROC), to be effective from 5:00pm on 18 October 2013.

Item 4.5 of the Minutes of the South East Avon Voluntary Regional Organisation of Councils, held on Wednesday, 6 August 2008, states:

"4.5 Chairperson

Motion: That the Member Councils vote on the following:

1. That a Chairperson be elected for a twelve month period; and
2. That if the elected person is unavailable, then the host Council provide the Chairperson for that meeting."

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Member Local Governments of SEAVROC states:

"Chairperson – There will be a rotation of Chairperson who will be an Elected Member of the host Local Government."

The Proposed Charter of Operations of SEAVROC states the following:

"17(d) Elect the President who shall hold Office for a one year term, but shall be eligible for re-election."

Accordingly, Member Local Government Delegates are requested to give consideration to Part (1) of the motion detailed above, to appoint a Chairperson to preside at meetings and carry out other functions.

The Executive Officer called for nominations.

Cr D Ridgway suggested that the Group operate with a rotational Chair until the future of SEAVROC was known, with today's Chair being Cr R Carter, retired SEARTG Chair, or the President of the host Council.

Cr R Carter then sought comment from the Group.

Cr D Richards acknowledged Cr D Ridgway's suggestion, however spoke against the proposal, stating that the Group had operated better with an elected Chair with a Term of Office of twelve months. In addition, advising that other Regional Organisation of Council (ROC) groups remain in operation. Further, that he believed the SEAVROC Group would be in operation for at least a period of two years until the metropolitan reform process is finalised.

Cr D Ridgway responded by stating that SEAVROC had commenced under a Memorandum of Understanding with a rotational Chair, then the Group had elected a Chairperson to represent the SEAVROC Group. Further, a SEAVROC meeting had not been held since 2012, and that the dynamic had changed for the Group. Cr D Ridgway then suggested that there was a need to return to basics and recommence the process, with the Beverley preference being for a rotational Chair until the way forward was determined.

Mr G Fardon sought clarification between the SEAVROC Minutes of 6 August 2008 stating a twelve month Term of Office, and the MOU stating that there be a rotational Chair.

The Executive Officer advised that the Group had adopted a Charter of Operations detailing that the elected Chair would retain Office for a period of twelve months.

The Executive Officer then drew attention to the need to determine voting Members for each Member Local Government prior to electing a Chair.

Following Cr R Carter confirming that each Member Local Government was to have two voting Members, with each Chief Executive Officer in an advisory role, the following determinations were made:

Quairading - Cr D Richards
- Cr B Caporn

Brookton - Cr K Mills
- Cr L Allington

Beverley - Cr D Ridgway
- Cr D White

Cr York - Cr M Reid
- Nomination yet to be made for second voting Member.

Tammin - Cr S Uppill
- Cr C Crane

Cunderdin - Cr R Carter
- Cr C Gibsone

Ms J Burges entered the Lesser Hall at 10:23am, with Cr R Carter extending a welcome on behalf of the Group.

Following the determination of voting Members, Cr R Carter drew attention to the election of a Chair, detailing Cr D Ridgway's suggestion and Cr D Richards' speaking against the proposal. Further, that Cunderdin endorse the comments of Cr D Richards suggesting that continuance of the Chair is more productive and provides stability.

Cr D Ridgway then suggested that the Group put forward nominations, and that these be returned to the respective Councils in the manner that the Central Country Zones do. In this way, the nominations for Chair are known in the first instance rather than the Chair being chosen by the Group on the day.

Cr D Richards spoke against the proposal, stating his belief that each Council had provided adequate direction for the vote to be taken at this meeting. Further, electing a Chair for a twelve month period was better for the Executive Officer as it provided a liaison point for reporting which is lost when utilising a rotational Chair. Quairading's preference is for the Chair to be elected by the Group rather than return this matter to respective Councils.

Cr D Ridgway responded by providing comment on the following:

- Does not wish to start on a negative note.
- Believes there is a need to move forward as a Group.
- Regionally all will be better off.
- There is a need to remember that Beverley and Brookton have not been involved in the SEARTG meetings for eighteen months.
- It has been eighteen months since a SEAVROC meeting has been held.
- Beverley does not believe that the SEAVROC Group can move directly into the suggested process of an elected Chair for a period of twelve months.
- Beverley does however wish to move forward on a regional basis, and to look at bringing others on board such as Pingelly.

Cr R Carter took on board Cr D Ridgway's comments, however advised that the democratic process would prevail, with a vote taken on any motion put forward.

Cr S Uppill sought Brookton's input in relation to the election of a Chair.

Mr K O'Connor advised that Brookton had no particular preference, with comment on Cr Ridgway's request being for a temporary position until the future of SEAVROC was known. Further, stating that the twelve month period is a more effective way of dealing with business, whilst providing continuity and stability. Brookton would support a rotational Chair for an interim period but not as a permanent position.

Cr D Ridgway stated that she agreed with a level of permanency for the Chair in time, reiterating that her proposal was for an interim period.

Cr R Carter stated that whether permanent or otherwise, Delegates would have the option of voting against any proposal put forward. Further, drawing attention to the time it takes to achieve items of significance, and anything that holds up the push forward in regard to local government reform would be detrimental to the Group.

Cr D White then queried whether the intent was reform and coming together for a common end, or amalgamation, cautioning that the Group needed to be clear on this.

Cr R Carter advised that the intent was for local government reform, as discussed with the Minister and minuted accordingly. The point being made that although the SEARTG Group would not continue, the SEAVROC group would be keen to pursue reform in whatever direction is taken.

Cr Ridgway responded, providing comment on the following points:

- Appreciated the comments made.
- Agreed that local government is a slow, long and drawn out process, with a need to move forward.
- It is important to get the foundations set up properly in the first instance.
- Proposal is to re-establish the foundations for the Group.
- New faces around the table from when Beverley had last participated.
- Brookton's President and Deputy were not in attendance.
- Reinitiate the process with a fresh approach.
- Is mindful that the four SEARTG Participating Local Governments had been working well together and have a close association as a result.
- Beverley also had a close association prior to withdrawing from the process.

Cr D Richards then provided comment:

- Acknowledged Cr D Ridgway's comments.
- There is a need to "hit the ground running".

- The Group has a lot of experience.
- Spoke in favour of a Term of Office of twelve months for the Chair of the Group.
- This will allow the Group to re-establish themselves, and for a review in twelve months.

Mr K O'Connor reaffirmed Brookton's position of no particular preference.

Cr R Carter suggested that the Group move forward with election of a Chair, reiterating that Members have the opportunity of voting for or against any motion put forward. Further, stating his belief that the Chair should be for a period of twelve months to provide the needed continuity. In addition, Cr R Carter advised that SEAVROC had not changed since its last meeting, and that there were positives to be had, for example in compatible information technology and other areas.

Cr D Ridgway provided additional comment, detailing:

- Matters such as information technology are considered to be regional collaboration projects.
- Reform has changed slightly, given formation of the Country Local Government Reform Policy Forum, with SEAVROC well represented on this.
- In terms of reform, not sure that SEAVROC should be going down the path of lobbying until the Policy Forum gets underway.
- Would hope that the Group is talking about collaboration rather than reform type projects.

Cr S Uppill then provided comment on:

- To work in collaboration with the SEAVROC Group will require lobbying.
- Local Governments are competing for the same small amount of funding.
- The Wheatbelt East Regional Organisation of Councils (WEROC) have advised being able to tap into funding whilst this Group have been involved in the amalgamation process.

- This Group has lost time as part of that process and need to regroup and move forward.
- There is a need for lobbying as part of the collaboration process.

Cr R Carter sought a motion in relation to electing a Chair.

It was then:

MOVED Cr D Ridgway, Seconded Cr M Reid, that for the next two meetings of the South East Avon Voluntary Regional Organisation of Councils that the Chair be on a rotational basis.

Following Cr R Carter clarifying that Members understood that the motion was for the Chair to be on a rotational basis for two meetings, the motion was then put.

Given that the vote was five for, and five against, the Executive Officer suggested that the Group may wish to elect a Chair for this meeting, then return the matter for consideration at the next SEAVROC meeting, otherwise the meeting cannot progress.

Cr D Richards then nominated Cr R Carter as Chair for this meeting, with Cr R Carter accepting the nomination.

It was then:

MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr S Uppill, that Cr R Carter be elected as Chair of the South East Avon Voluntary Regional Organisation of Councils for the Meeting of 8 July 2014.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Following comment by the Chair, Mr G Fardon drew attention to Cr D Ridgway's suggestion of the Chair rotating for two meetings and returning nominations to each respective Member Local Government for consideration.

The Executive Officer advised that as agreed by Members, the matter of electing a Chair will be relisted for consideration at the next SEAVROC meeting, and that there was no nomination process to be returned to each respective Council at this point in time.

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS**1.1 Opening**

The Chairman formally declared the meeting open, and drew attention to the Notice Paper before the meeting.

1.2 Announcement of Visitors

Invitations were extended to:

- Ms Caroline Tuthill Senior Project Officer – Department of Local Government
- Mr Tony Brown Executive Manager – Governance and Strategy – Western Australian Local Government Association
- Ms Joanne Burges Regional Cooperation Manager – Western Australian Local Government Association.

2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE**2.1 Present**

- | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Shire of Beverley | - Cr Dee Ridgway | - Shire President |
| Shire of Beverley | - Cr David White | - Councillor – South Ward |
| Shire of Beverley | - Mr Steve Gollan | - Chief Executive Officer |
| Shire of Brookton | - Cr Louise Allington | - Councillor |
| Shire of Brookton | - Cr Kim Mills | - Councillor |
| Shire of Brookton | - Mr Kevin O'Connor | - Chief Executive Officer |
| Shire of Cunderdin | - Cr Rod Carter | - Shire President (Chair) |
| Shire of Cunderdin | - Cr Clive Gibsone | - Deputy Shire President |
| Shire of Cunderdin | - Mr Peter Naylor | - Chief Executive Officer |

Shire of Quairading	- Cr Darryl Richards	- Shire President
Shire of Quairading	- Cr Brian Caporn	- Deputy Shire President
Shire of Quairading	- Mr Graeme Fardon	- Chief Executive Officer
Shire of Tammin	- Cr Scott Uppill	- Shire President
Shire of Tammin	- Mr Brian Jones	- Chief Executive Officer
Shire of York	- Cr Matthew Reid	- Shire President
Shire of York	- Mr Michael Keeble	- Chief Executive Officer
Western Australian Local Government Association	- Ms Joanne Burges	- Regional Cooperation Manager
Dominic Carbone and Associates (DCA)	- Mr D Carbone	- Executive Officer

2.2 Apologies

Shire of Beverley	- Cr Chris Pepper	- Deputy Shire President
Shire of Brookton	- Cr Kym Wilkinson	- Shire President
Shire of Brookton	- Cr Katrina Crute	- Deputy Shire President
Shire of Quairading	- Cr Gillian McRae	- Councillor
Department of Local Government	- Ms Caroline Tuthill	- Senior Project Officer
Western Australian Local Government Association	- Mr Tony Brown	- Executive Manager, Governance and Strategy

2.3 Leave of Absence

Nil.

3. DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**3.1 Deputations**

Nil.

3.2 Presentations

Nil.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**Executive Committee Meeting of SEAVROC held on Tuesday, 11 December 2012**

Mr G Fardon requested that page 7 of the Minutes be amended to read "Ausplow" rather than "Auspower" as shown.

Following a query by Cr D Ridgway, the Executive Officer confirmed that correspondence had been forwarded to the Shire of Brookton in relation to their continued involvement with the SEAVROC Group, with Brookton confirming that they wished to continue their membership.

With the above correction, it was then:

MOVED Cr S Uppill, Seconded Cr D Richards, that the Minutes of the South East Avon Voluntary Regional Organisation of Councils (SEAVROC) Executive Committee Meeting, held on Tuesday, 11 December 2012, be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION

Nil.

6. REPORTS OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SE-001-14	STATUS REPORT – OUTSTANDING BUSINESS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS (File: serpt001-14)
------------------	--

The Executive Officer drew attention to this item of business, providing comment on the following:

- Asset Management Plans are complete.
- Local Law Reviews – Brookton’s are complete; York’s are complete apart from Waste and Health.
- Problems encountered in relation to Head of Power, with WALGA assisting in this regard.
- Head of Power needs to be determined before the Local Laws can be drafted.
- Local Laws have been drafted – awaiting feedback to Mr D Long prior to presenting to Member Councils for consideration.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Asset Management plans	Asset Management Plans for Roads, and Building and Structures, have been completed for the Shire's of Beverley, Cunderdin, Quairading, Tammin and York.
Local Laws Review	<p>Local Laws for the Shire of Brookton have been completed.</p> <p>The Consultant met with the Chief Executive Officers of the Shires of Beverley, Cunderdin, Quairading and York in March 2014 to progress the review.</p> <p>For the Shire of York, all Local Laws completed with the exception of Waste and Health. Awaiting the determination of Head of Power.</p> <p>The Shires of Beverley, Cunderdin and Quairading Local Laws have been drafted. Consultant is awaiting feedback in relation to any amendments. The Shire of Cunderdin has now confirmed the content of the Draft Local Laws. Consultant is drafting Council Reports for the adoption of the Local Laws.</p>

Following a query by Cr D Ridgway, the Executive Officer confirmed that the Shire of Cunderdin had confirmed the content of their Draft Local Laws.

There being no further discussion, it was:

MOVED Cr M Reid, Seconded Cr S Uppill, that Report No SE-001-14 – Status Report – Outstanding Business from Executive Committee Meetings, be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SE-002-14 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 26 JUNE 2014 (File: serpt002-14)

The Chair drew attention to this item of business, with comment provided by the Executive Officer as follows:

- Finances have been detailed from SEAVROC's inception.
- There is a need to review the naming of the "Connecting Local Governments and Structural Reform Implementation Grant" account, as the Grant funds have been expended, albeit that there is a balance of \$60,229.34.

Cr D Ridgway and Cr D White queried the balance of \$60,229.34, and \$4,490.22 being detailed for the LGMA challenge in 2009/2010, suggesting there may be other errors.

The Executive Officer advised that the small print of the Notice Paper did not clearly show the minus figure of \$4,454.77, or the expenditure of \$4,490.22 being incorrectly allocated to the account and subsequently reallocated. Further, that the financial statements were prepared based on the Shire of York's financial records.

The Chairman suggested that if Beverley were unsure of the figures detailed, that this could be taken up with the Executive Officer following the meeting. Confirmation was then sought from the Executive Officer that the balance of \$60,229.34 was correct.

Cr D Ridgway then queried Local Government contributions for 2012/2013, namely that Beverley had contributed \$2,500 and Brookton had not contributed, yet other Local Governments were shown to have contributed \$5,000. Cr D Ridgway further queried if SEAVROC had been operating without Beverley and Brookton's participation.

The Executive Officer advised that Member Local Governments were asked to contribute additional funds for completion of projects, as allocated funding had been exhausted. (*Whilst the Executive Officer stated Asset Management Plans – this information is currently being verified and Member Local Governments will be informed accordingly.*) Approval was sought from the Department to utilise funds from "Connecting Local Governments and Structural Reform Implementation Grant", hence additional contributions have only been shown for Participants of the SEARTG Group.

Following a further query from Cr D Ridgway, the Executive Officer clarified that Beverley do not owe any additional contribution in this regard, and confirmed that Beverley were involved in the decision to complete the projects from the funding as detailed.

There being no further debate, it was:

MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr S Uppill, that the Statement of Receipts and payments for the period ended 26 June 2014, be received for:

- ***Connecting Local Governments and Structural Reform Implementation Grant.***

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SE-003-14 FUTURE DIRECTION – SOUTH EAST AVON VOLUNTARY REGIONAL ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS (SEAVROC) PROJECTS AND INITIATIVES
(File: serpt003-14)

The Chairman drew attention to this item of business, providing comment on the meeting with the Minister, as follows:

- Advice to the Minister was that the Group would be keen to pursue reform.
- The Minister responded by advising that the Group could still amalgamate by boundary changes.
- It was suggested that a boundary change would need to come from the Minister as it would not be readily accepted by the community and ratepayers.
- The key message was that the Group, having worked together in excess of six years, was keen to pursue local government reform in the area, and that there was a need to discuss in what direction this would take the Group.
- There may be a number of options and ideas as to what direction the Group will take.

General discussion followed, summarised as:

- Cr D Richards
- Given the SEAVROC Group have not been active for some time, would like feedback on where other ROC Groups are at, and what they have been doing.
 - The focus was on the SEARTG Group, and that opportunities may be been missed by SEAVROC.
 - Need to get back to basics in this sense, and ascertain current processes with the State Government.

- Mr M Keeble
- As the Group would be aware; York has recently lost a lot of corporate knowledge.
 - York would like to be briefed on projects referred to in today's discussions.
 - York cannot make informed comment at this point in time.
 - Suggested that York is not the only local government in this position.
 - Difficulties in participating intelligently when the knowledge base is not there.
- Executive Officer
- Current projects include the Local Law review, and Asset Management Plans which have been completed.
 - SEAVROC has no other projects on its books.
- Chairman
- Future projects are open to suggestions from the Group.
- Cr D Ridgway
- Sought clarification from Mr M Keeble if he was referring to historical information.
- Mr K Keeble
- Confirmed that he was seeking a briefing on historical SEAVROC information.
- Mr G Fardon
- Provided a brief background on SEAVROC.
 - The key focus of SEAVROC commenced with the Shire of York Commissioner bringing Shire Presidents and Chief Executive Officers together to explore regional cooperation in the South East Avon.
 - This was primarily to look at what could be gained from shared services, uniform policies, and more importantly, an avenue or body to lobby both State and Federal Parliament for a better deal for the South East Avon.
 - Success was achieved in the regional delivery of services, such as Natural Resource Management, Health, Building, and Ranger Services.

- The Group were not successful in bringing together a works construction team for larger contracts, in house or Main Roads (grain freight projects).
 - A lot of cross boundary collaboration for tree mulching, hiring of trucks and drivers, was occurring prior to the amalgamation agenda.
 - A lot of good will was gained through this.
 - The grouping was simply a coming together of like minds in the South East Avon to see what advantages there were in shared services or what could be done smarter.
 - Common operating platforms were explored amongst other matters.
 - Workshops were facilitated to see where there may be advantages.
 - SEAVROC was strong in lobbying to get higher exposure through representatives from the Shire of York; attendance in Canberra, speaking with Ministers, and the holding of a Cabinet Meeting in York.
 - The aims have not changed greatly.
- Executive Officer
- A number of plans were developed, such as the E Waste Plan; an operating platform such as Regional Subsidiary or Regional Council were explored, which took a number of years to resolve.
 - Costs of all options were investigated, with a different operating model required in order to reduce costs through operating efficiencies, whilst also offering the best services possible to the community.
- Chair
- Chief Executive Officers were also meeting regularly in relation to resource sharing.
- Mr G Fardon
- Chief Executives were meeting in relation to resource sharing and shared projects.
 - A Regional Subsidiary study was undertaken, including visits to South Australia as part of that study.

Ms J Burges

- Provided a brief update on other ROC's.
- Advised that the regional waste project undertaken enabled the Group to attract funding that could not be possible as individual Councils.
- Suggested that the Group not focus on what is perceived as "lost time" while engaged in the SEARTG process.
- A lot of work the Group has undertaken aligns with that done by other ROC's.
- The focus of other ROC's has primarily been on Country Local Government Fund activities, in particular the "4WDL Alliance" (consisting of the Shires of Wagin, West Arthur, Williams, Woodanilling, Dumbleyung, Lake Grace and Kent).
- A key focus area has been on shared age facilities, attracting funding from the Country Local Government Fund, Regional Development Australia, and Royalties for Regions.
- One of the most high profile resource sharing groups is the Mid West Group, who were undertaking some great activities, however experienced challenges along the way.
- The Mid West Group were affected by the same issues that SEAVROC were, in particular overhead running costs of a Regional Council, hence the need to look at the Subsidiary Model.
- It is positive that SEAVROC are taking another look to see what is possible.
- The Mid West Group also sought funding for training of Officers, whilst working with TAFE's to provide certificate training on a regional basis.
- The Mid West Group were also able to work with Main Roads WA to achieve a contract as a group; this was undertaken by a two fold approach, engaging and working as a Regional Council, yet contracting individual Councils.
- Looking to the future, Geraldton have indicated they are willing to look at services they can provide as a bigger entity.

- The Mid West Group retains a willingness to participate as a regional alliance, however will need to regroup in order to do so.
 - Neighbouring groups such as the Wheatbelt East Regional Organisation of Councils (WEROC) have been concentrating on the Country Local Government Fund, with their Natural Resource Management (NRM) Officers morphing into tourism/trail type Officers to align them with where they are heading with the Country Local Government Fund.
 - Regional waste has been approached by many local governments, in particular the Southern Link Voluntary Regional Organisation of Councils (Broomehill, Tambellup, Plantagenet, Cranbrook and Kojonup).
 - The Southern Link Group has also been looking at Chief Executive Officer Manuals (handover manuals) which will detail the core business of the local government and provide for continuity.
 - A regional council under the Act is considered too heavy on compliance and is seen as another level of local government.
 - There is a big push for the Subsidiary Bill to get up and allow things to move forward without having the full onus sitting with one local government.
 - It is understood that the Bill has been presented by the Nationals but has not been read at this point in time.
 - The Nationals have been working with WALGA.
 - The background of a model charter has been independently developed.
- Chair
- Suggested that the Group will not make a decision at this meeting as to what will become the priority, however can develop a list which each Member Local Government can discuss.
 - Preference that compatible information technology is included on the list and given priority.

- Compatible information technology is considered imperative to have successful reform, and will open up many areas of saving into the future.
- In reality, small councils are not sustainable in their current form.
- The SEARTG Regional Business Plan has already costed compatible information technology, and this could be expanded for Beverley and Brookton.
- Reminded Members that the Minister's door is open to seek funding for such projects.
- Information technology compatibility should be considered sooner rather than later.

Cr D White

- Stated that it appears the feeling of the meeting is for a reinvigoration of SEAVROC.
- Believed it to be a good exercise to go back to each Member Council and invite their input on what they would like to see from SEAVROC.
- It appears that the Group are "chasing shadows", wanting to come up with something but not sure what.
- Agreed that information technology is a positive project.
- Would like his fellow Councillors to hear suggestions from the SEAVROC Committee and to receive an invitation to put back into the Committee, and where SEAVROC might go.
- There is a need to remember that SEAVROC is a collection of Councils; there is danger in having an organisation such as SEAVROC having an Executive Committee which becomes of its own volition, autonomous, and starts to become a body working to its own end and not that of the collective of Councils.
- To ignore this point is at SEAVROC's peril.
- Need to ensure that all Councils are "singing from the same hymn sheet".

- Cr D Richards
- Spoke in support of the Chairman and Cr D White's comments.
 - Believed that the Group should go back to their respective Councils, as a lot has changed, and will change into the future.
 - Cannot underestimate the changes to come.
 - Works super crews should be discussed in depth, in particular with Tier 3 closures, as this would present opportunities for the Group.
- Chair
- Suggested that the Group compile a list of suggestions for presentation to each Member Councils.
- Cr S Uppill
- Drew attention to comment on other ROC's focusing on aged and other housing, suggesting that this is pertinent for this Group.
- Mr G Fardon
- There is a need for determination on how this Group aligns itself with the Regional Wheatbelt Blueprint, which leads into infrastructure funding.
 - Drew attention to other ROC's focusing on the Country Local Government Fund individually and regionally, suggesting that this Group seek more detail in this regard and access funding where possible.
 - Provided comment on the Chief Executive Officers' work on the risk management framework in accordance with Local Government Regulation 17.
 - This embeds risk management throughout each Member Local Government, not just financial risk, but occupational health and safety and more.
 - The Chief Executive Officers developed a proposal for LGIS to offer a joint Council proposal, largely funded from the "good performance bonus" of each Council.
 - This could continue as a SEAVROC project, and would not require any significant funding.
 - This proposal is set for September 2014 with some work underway already.

- Chair
- Queried how the LGIS proposal would work.
- Mr G Fardon
- All Councils and Chief Executive Officers have to comply with Regulation 17, which is embedded in risk management, not just financial, but risk management reviews.
 - From a collaborative standpoint, Councils can be encouraged and supported to be compliant given LGIS framework, staff and expertise.
- Ms J Burges
- Queried if Member Councils understood the "experience account".
 - Bonuses are accumulated from the lack of insurance claims, which is returned to the Council for their own use.
 - This becomes an opportunity to utilise LGIS services at little or no cost.
- Mr G Fardon
- Understands that four of the six Member Councils are fully covered with their "experience account", with only a marginal cost to the remaining two.
 - This was considered a cost effective approach when there is an existing requirement to comply with Regulation 17.
- Chair
- Clarifies the details of accessing the "experience account".
- Mr G Fardon
- Advised that if the Member Councils did not take up this option, there would be a need to engage an external risk consultant.
 - There is a preference to remain with the Group's own insurance scheme.
- Mr K O'Connor
- Queried if the SEARTG business cases or plans identified projects that were viable or feasible for the Group.

- Executive Officer
- Service Delivery Plans have been completed for every element of operations.
 - A total of 24 Service Delivery Plans were developed.
 - These would need to be tailored to the six Member Local Governments.
 - The Service Delivery Plans detail Member Local Governments participating in resource sharing.
 - Member Local Governments have the ability to opt into or out of respective resource sharing areas.
 - Believed that the Group needed those Service Delivery Plans in amalgamation in order to measure the current and future services before and after amalgamation.
 - The Member Local Governments may wish to introduce the Plans in building their long term financial plans and budgets.
 - Everything is documented in the Plans, including position descriptions.
 - Each Member Local Government can take a Service Delivery Plan, modify it, and take it on board as their own.
 - The SEARTG Regional Business Plan – Future State contains all of the Service Delivery Plans.
- Cr B Caporn
- Queried the Executive Officer and Mr D Long aligning Policies and Local Laws for the Member Local Governments.
- Executive Officer
- Advised that the aim was to align all Participating Local Governments, providing uniformity, and to bring their respective documents up to date.
 - Minor differences of peculiarity have been allowed for.
 - This project could be completed in a short period of time.

- Cr K Mills
- Led to believe there is an exorbitant cost associated with development and adoption of Policies and Local Laws.
 - Queried if adoption of the Policies and Local Laws can be done in-house without the need for legal representation or other involvement.
 - Made reference to the "Sea Container" Policy.
- Executive Officer
- Drew attention to the early SEAVROC project of developing a uniform Cropping Policy for the Group of five Councils.
 - Advised on the development of another uniform Policy related to the Common Seal, where the Policy was developed through SEAVROC and returned to each respective Member Local Government for consideration and adoption.
 - Such matters were a normal part of SEAVROC operation.
- Mr P Naylor
- Advised that Cunderdin had been working with York for a number of years in relation to the provision of services for Rangers, Health, Building and Planning Services.
 - Required assurance from York on those services and how they are going to continue.
 - Need to address this service provision in the first instance, particularly given work on the 2014/2015 Budget, prior to addressing other matters.
- Mr M Keeble
- Advised that York was currently undertaking its Budget processes and could not provide any assurance.
- Mr G Fardon
- Sought clarification on services continuing.
- Mr M Keeble
- York can not provide any assurance at this point in time.
- Chair
- Queried if this would be a short term situation.

- Mr M Keeble
- Advised that the matter would be resolved in the coming few days.
- Cr S Uppill
- Suggested that when the matter is resolved in the coming days that a memorandum is distributed to all affected Chief Executive Officers.
 - The services provided are well utilised.
- Chair
- Confirmed that this matter is to be resolved in the next few days, with advice to be provided to affected Chief Executive Officers.
 - Confirmed the list of suggested projects, which are not in any order of preference, namely:
 - Resource sharing, staff and equipment.
 - Aged care funding.
 - Staff training.
 - Regional waste.
 - Compatible information technology.
 - Works super crews (road building teams).
 - Risk management implementation.
 - Uniformity of Delegations and Local Laws.
- Executive Officer
- In accordance with SEAVROC's earlier practices, queried if lobbying, political or otherwise, should be included on the list.
- Chair
- Believed this to be a key point, with one of the motivations for amalgamation being the increased lobbying capacity that an amalgamated Regional Council would have.
 - Suggested that this be listed for further consideration.
- Executive Officer
- Suggested that the compiled list form part (a) of a motion, with part (b) that each Member Local Government be informed of (a) above, and be requested to consider any other areas where SEAVROC might need to be involved in relation to the Group.

- Cr D Richards
- Would like to see the Group consider a focus on youth.
- Chair
- Youth retention in the district is reliant on businesses.
 - Suggested that business development/youth be listed.
 - Youth is an area that has been addressed in various ways over the years without the desired success.
 - The Wheatbelt Development Commission is addressing youth matters within the district.
- Ms J Burges
- Suggested that the comments made were timely, in particular with the Group looking at aligning with the Regional Blueprint and associated projects and funding streams.
 - The Commonwealth Government focus is on economic development at the micro level in relation to funding opportunities.
 - These matters are all aligned and should be looked at by the Group.

There being no further debate, the Chairman sought clarification from the Executive Officer on the suggested motion, namely:

- (a) The following list be referred to each Member Local Government of the South East Avon Regional Organisation of Councils (SEAVROC) for consideration:
- Resource sharing, staff and equipment.
 - Aged care funding.
 - Staff training.
 - Regional waste.
 - Compatible information technology.
 - Works super crews (road building teams).
 - Risk management implementation.
 - Uniformity of Delegations and Local Laws.
 - Lobbying, political and otherwise.
 - Business development/youth.
- (b) Each Member Local Government of the South East Avon Regional Organisation of Councils (SEAVROC) be informed of (a) above, and be requested to consider any other matters they may wish the SEAVROC Executive Committee to address.

Following the Chairman's comment in relation to rating the listed items, the Executive Officer drew attention to workshops facilitated by Ms J Burges where projects were prioritised by the Group.

The Executive Officer suggested that when feedback is received from the Member Local Governments, that this be collated and presented to the next Executive Committee meeting for discussion and prioritisation.

Following the Chairman's query, the Executive Officer advised that each Member Local Government could prioritise as they see fit, however the matter will require presentation to the Executive Committee to finalise prioritisation.

General discussion centred on the following points:

- Differences in prioritisation.
- If the majority of Member Local Governments see a particular item as a major priority, then this should be accepted accordingly.
- Suggestion for Councils to rate (a), (b) or (c) priority for each item, (a) being the highest.
- Suggestion that a workshop be facilitated to finalise priorities.

Mr M Keeble advised that York would like the Chief Executive Officers to meet as soon as possible to discuss shared services, suggesting that this form part (c) of the proposed motion. Further, stating that it was important for this discussion to take place prior to prioritisation of the listed matters.

Mr G Fardon spoke in favour of the Chief Executive Officers meeting to discuss shared services prior to finalising priorities, and sought a motion endorsing that the Chief Executive Officers meet regularly. The Chairman then advised that the matter of Chief Executive Officers' meetings could be done as a separate motion.

The Chairman then drew attention to the proposed resolution, seeking a motion in this regard.

It was then:

MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr M Reid, that:

- (a) The following list be referred to each Member Local Government of the South East Avon Regional Organisation of Councils (SEAVROC) for consideration:***

- *Resource sharing, staff and equipment.*
- *Aged care funding.*
- *Staff training.*
- *Regional waste.*
- *Compatible information technology.*
- *Works super crews (road building teams).*
- *Risk management implementation.*
- *Uniformity of Delegations and Local Laws.*
- *Lobbying, political and otherwise.*
- *Business development/youth.*

(b) Each Member Local Government of the South East Avon Regional Organisation of Councils (SEAVROC) be informed of (a) above, and be requested to consider any other matters they may wish the SEAVROC Executive Committee to address.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The Chairman then called for a motion in relation to the Chief Executive Officers' meeting as discussed, and following general comment, it was:

MOVED Cr M Reid, Seconded Cr S Uppill, that the South East Avon Voluntary Regional Organisation of Councils (SEAVROC) Chief Executive Officers meet within the next ten days to discuss shared services, and further, continue to meet on a regular basis.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Following a query from Mr G Fardon, the Chair confirmed that Brookton Members were participating in the voting.

The Chairman drew attention to funding arrangements for the Group, with \$60,229.34 being currently available, querying original arrangements.

The Executive Officer advised that past practice determined that each Member Local Government contributed an amount of \$5,000 per year, and additional funds as required.

The Chairman sought agreement from Member Local Governments that they were happy to continue this practice, suggesting that the next contribution should be detailed in the 2014/2015 Budget.

Following Cr M Reid's suggestion that a SEAVROC Budget is developed for 2014/2015 with the setting of fees accordingly, the Chairman advised that this should be done, however was not possible until a determination was made on possible projects, priorities of these, and the way forward for SEAVROC.

The Executive Officer advised that past practice had been that each Member Local Government allocated \$5,000 in their Budget, and if this was required it would be contributed, if not it would remain with the Member Council.

Cr D Ridgway queried the need for a motion in this regard.

It was then:

MOVED Cr D Ridgway, Seconded Cr D Richards , that Member Local Governments of the South East Avon Regional Organisation of Councils allocate an amount of \$5,000 in their 2014/2015 Budget, to be contributed to the Executive Committee as required.

Cr D Ridgway spoke in support of Cr M Reid's request for a SEAVROC Budget and the setting of fees, suggesting that this may take some months, with the allocation possibly not being required.

Cr M Reid stated that he considered the outgoings for 2014 for a Group of this size is quite significant. Further, that Australia is in a difficult financial position, and there is a sense of prudence required at all levels of government. Looking at consultancy fees and administration charges, the Group needs to ensure they are progressing as cost effectively as possible.

Cr Ridgway suggested that some of those fees and charges were aligned with Government grant funding originally, and were part of the lobbying process in relation to subsidiary legislation.

Cr M Reid stated that he was not suggesting the costs were not justified, York was looking at rate rises and there was a great deal of scrutiny of financial management.

The Executive Officer advised that the expenditure for 2013/2014 was a total \$12,000.

Following a query from Cr D Ridgway, the Executive Officer advised that the final column was a grand total of expenditure since the inception of SEAVROC, it was not a total for the 2013/2014 period.

Cr M Reid then questioned the expenditure of \$12,000 if the Group had not met and not undertaken any projects, querying costs if the Group were to meet on a monthly basis.

The Executive Officer took exception to Cr M Reid's comments, advising that \$11,000 of the total was transferred to meet some of the SEARTG commitments.

Cr M Reid advised that he will be looking for austerity in this tight budgetary environment.

Cr D Ridgway spoke in support of Cr M Reid's comments.

The Chairman took on board Cr M Reid's comments, advising that a more detailed budget will be provided in the future, however could not be provided until decisions were made in relation to projects, priorities and the way forward.

The Executive Officer reiterated the Chairman's comments on the inability to provide a detailed budget when the Group do not know if SEAVROC is to continue, and if so, what projects may be undertaken.

Cr D Ridgway then suggested that the Group would work towards an audit.

Mr G Fardon confirmed that the figures, balances and funds are acquitted and audited through York's auditors.

Executive Officer Position and Provision of Secretariat Services

Mr G Fardon then raised the matter of the Executive Officer and Secretariat Services, querying if this is to be taken from the balance of \$60,229.34, or whether these funds were reserved for projects only.

The Executive Officer confirmed that the existing funds of \$60,229.34 could be used for such services. However cautioned that as projects are essentially completed, funds may be expended on the basis that grant funding has been fully spent, otherwise Departmental approval may be required.

Mr G Fardon confirmed that the Executive Committee did not need to call on Member Local Governments for contributions at this point in time.

Cr D Richards stated that the \$5,000 allocation by each Member Local Government is still required in order that the Group did not place limits on its operations.

The Chairman raised the matter of employment of the Executive Officer, seeking agreement that he speak with the Executive Officer privately following the meeting, and report back to the next SEAVROC meeting.

Cr D Ridgway drew attention to the need for a vote on the motion moved.

The Chairman then put the motion.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Cr D Ridgway then returned attention to the matter of the Executive Officer, advising agreement that the Chairman undertake the private discussion and report back, however reserved Beverley's right to discuss what the Group does in relation to the Executive Officer position and support role to the SEAVROC Group going forward. Further, this matter should be discussed at the next Chief Executive Officers' meeting.

The Chairman advised that he believed the initial discussion with the Executive Officer should be private before it is presented to the SEAVROC meeting.

Cr M Reid suggested that the SEAVROC Group should also have a discussion without the Executive Officer being present.

The Chairman sought agreement from the Group, that:

1. The Chairman meets with the Executive Officer privately, and reports to the next SEAVROC Executive Committee Meeting.
2. Beverley had reserved its right to discuss the Executive Officer and support role for SEAVROC going forward.
3. Beverley requested that this matter be discussed at the next Chief Executive Officers' meeting.
4. York requested that the Executive Committee discuss the Executive Officer and support role for SEAVROC without the Executive Officer present.

Local Government Week

Cr D Richards drew attention to the forthcoming Local Government Week, suggesting that as per past practice, the Group get together during this time on a social basis with partners, and sought a Member Local Government to organise this function accordingly.

Cr D Ridgway pre-empted that Beverley may not be available for the suggested function given other commitments, however suggested that a get together of all at some stage would be beneficial.

Following the Chairman's query, Cr D Ridgway confirmed that it may not be possible for Beverley to participate given other commitments, however with input by Mr S Gollan, suggested that the Group may meet at a Sundowner during Local Government Week.

Mr G Fardon drew attention to this year's Local Government Week being shorter than usual, suggesting that a separate function may not be possible at that time. Further, that perhaps meeting at one of the Sundowners may be the best option.

The Chairman advised that he and Cr D Richards would determine the most suitable Sundowner at which the Group could meet and advise everyone accordingly.

LGS Software

Cr D Ridgway sought clarification on the LGS Software matter, advising that this was a business proposal through SEAVROC, with Cunderdin using the software, and Beverley waiting to see how this progressed. Further, querying if this needed to be removed from the books, as it did not appear to have the earning capacity anticipated.

The Executive Officer advised that:

- The aim was that Member Local Governments have the rights to market this product in Western Australia.
- A discount was offered in relation to the software purchase.
- A figure of \$4,000 is to be returned from LGS if any of the Councils take on the system.
- As yet there has been no movement in introducing LGS to Western Australia, apart from Cunderdin.

- It is understood that LGS representatives visited Cunderdin and resolved reported issues.
- Development of the system is continuing.
- Understood that Beverley is looking at introducing the LGS system.
- Tammin may be considering introducing the software.

Following Mr B Jones' query, the Executive Officer advised that discussion related to purchasing and introduction of the LGS Software to replace Synergy or other financial accounting systems.

Cr D Ridgway sought clarification on whether the project rested with SEAVROC, or whether it was a matter for individual Councils. Further, if it rests with SEAVROC, does the matter require finalisation.

Cr M Reid suggested that the LGS Software was an asset of SEAVROC and required finalisation.

The Executive Officer advised that the Software was not an asset; the Group simply owned the rights in Western Australia.

Mr G Fardon clarified that the Member Councils own the rights as SEAVROC has no legal status.

Following comment by Cr D Ridgway and Cr M Reid in relation to details surrounding the LGS Software matter, Mr G Fardon provided comment as follows:

- Suggested a background paper on the subject be presented at the next SEAVROC meeting.
- Cunderdin is still trialling the software.
- Beverley is waiting on outcomes for Cunderdin.
- There is no compulsion on any Member Local Government to take up the software.
- Quairading has chosen not to participate at this point in time.
- Circumstances of rights and current status.
- Confirmed the need for a background paper to be presented at the next SEAVROC meeting.

The Chairman confirmed that the Executive Officer, should he be continuing in the role, present a paper to the next SEAVROC Executive Committee Meeting detailing the LGS Software matter.

Cr M Reid requested that the Executive Officer prepare the background paper and distribute this to Member Local Governments in ten days time, with the Executive Officer confirming that this would be done.

The Chairman suggested that if the Group chose to progress with a common information technology platform, the matter would be resolved accordingly, with costs influencing such a decision.

Cr M Reid suggested that this would also be determined by capability of the system.

Cr D White drew attention to Beverley's suggestion that Pingelly becomes a Member of SEAVROC, querying when it would be appropriate to have this discussion.

Cr D Ridgway advised that she would like the matter of Pingelly's membership to be listed on the next SEAVROC agenda.

The Executive Officer provided comment covering:

- When Brookton were looking at amalgamation with Pingelly, SEAVROC extended an invitation to Pingelly to become a member.
- Pingelly subsequently advised that they were not seeking membership of SEAVROC at that time.
- If Pingelly are now interested in membership, they need to forward correspondence accordingly.
- Such a request would be a matter of consideration of each Member Local Government.
- In accordance with SEAVROC's Memorandum of Understanding, a vote on membership must be unanimous.

Following a query by the Chairman, the Executive Officer advised that the Group must decide if they wish to approach Pingelly again, or whether the matter is left with Pingelly to approach SEAVROC in relation to possible membership.

The Executive Officer provided comment on the Shire of Tammin requesting membership, and this subsequently being granted in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding.

The Chairman suggested it was appropriate to "get SEAVROC up and running" before new members are brought on board. Further, suggesting that there are other interested parties.

Cr D Ridgway reiterated her request that the matter be listed for consideration on the next agenda, advising that Beverley, Brookton and Pingelly were working together on an aged care alliance at the moment, and therefore Pingelly have an association with two SEAVROC Member Councils.

The Chairman enquired if the Group wish to approach Pingelly in relation to Membership, or hold in abeyance at this point in time.

Cr D Ridgway advised it was appropriate that Pingelly join, and reiterated that this be discussed at the next meeting.

The Executive Officer advised that the matter cannot be considered unless a request is received, namely there needs to be an instrument which instigates an action. If a letter is received from Pingelly detailing such a request, this would precipitate a report being presented to the Executive Committee for consideration.

7. DELEGATES MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

8. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

Nil.

9. CLOSURE OF MEETING

Next Meeting

Following Cr S Uppill querying timing of the next SEAVROC Executive Committee Meeting, general discussion followed with input by the Chairman, Cr D Ridgway, Cr D Richards, Mr G Fardon and Cr M Reid.

Discussion determined that SEAVROC Executive Committee meetings would be held bi monthly on the first Thursday of the month, on an alphabetically rotated basis in relation to hosting of the meetings. Therefore, the next Executive Committee meeting will be held at the Shire of York on Thursday, 4 September 2014.

Closure

The Chairman took the opportunity of thanking Member Local Governments for their attendance and input, advising that it was good to have the Shires of Beverley and Brookton again at the table.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the Meeting closed at 11:55am.
