

ASSETS, PREMISES AND FUNDING OF THE NSW RURAL FIRE SERVICE

Organisation: Riverina Eastern Regional Organisation of Councils

Date Received: 16 May 2024

REROC

RIVERINA EASTERN REGIONAL
ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS

Response

Inquiry into the Assets, Premises and Funding of the NSW Rural Fire Service

Contact:

Julie Briggs

CEO

Riverina Eastern Regional Organisation of Councils

PO Box 646, Wagga Wagga NSW 2650

Phone: () Email:

www.reroc.com.au

Response

Inquiry into the Assets, Premises and Funding of the NSW Rural Fire Service Riverina Eastern Regional Organisation of Councils

Introduction

Our Member Councils welcome the opportunity to respond to the Public Accounts Committee Inquiry.

The Riverina Eastern Regional Organisation of Councils (REROC) represents eight Member Councils, Bland, Coolamon, Cootamundra-Gundagai, Greater Hume, Junee, Lockhart, Temora and Goldenfields Water.

REROC Region



Our Member Councils are strong supporters of the RFS and the volunteers who give so generously of their time and energy to help protect the communities our Members represent. In fact, a number of our Board are directly involved in the RFS through Brigade Membership or through the involvement of family members.

REROC has always taken a very keen interest in the operation of the RFS, our first correspondence about the RFS goes back to 2001 when we raised issues about the money that was being spent on

new communications technology that was inoperable in our Region. Consequently, our Member Councils are very keen to provide feedback to the Committee on the operation, cost and other related issues, including volunteer management.

Our Member Councils remain very concerned that structures and frameworks that were adopted at the turn of the century continue to inform and guide the operation of the RFS and its interactions with local government. The RFS in 2000 (24 years ago), was a very different beast; it has transformed from a volunteer-led organisation to the professional firefighting organisation it is today, with centralised offices in Sydney and paid regional staff located across country NSW.

In the late 1990's when RFS started to take over the operation of what had previously been a totally volunteer operation, the firefighting equipment the RFS used was predominately owned by the firefighters. At the time that control of the volunteer operations was being ceded to the RFS, most volunteers were wary of a State Government agency controlling private assets and therefore strongly supported the assets being left with councils where they could be controlled locally.

As a result of volunteers demanding that the local RFS assets stay local, councils ended up as caretakers of the assets. These arrangements were codified in the *Rural Fires Act NSW (1997)* ("the Act") under s119 which states:

All fire fighting equipment purchased or constructed wholly or partly from money to the credit of the Fund is to be vested in the council of the area for or on behalf of which the fire fighting equipment has been purchased or constructed.

Under s119 of the Act all Fire Fighting Equipment ("the Equipment") which is defined as fire fighting apparatus, buildings, water storage towers or look out towers that are purchased or constructed wholly or partially from the NSW Rural Fire Fighting Fund ("the Fund") must "be vested in the council of the area" for which it was purchased or constructed.

In those days, the RFS and council would undertake a genuine negotiation to determine the fire fighting equipment that was required for the LGA. Councils were equal players at the table and were able to genuinely influence the procurement decisions being made. This was particularly important as every asset that was purchased or constructed was vested in council and therefore included on council asset registers for depreciation. As part of this process, councils entered into Service Level Agreements with the RFS which dictated the role of the RFS within the LGA.

As stated above, the RFS of today is a wholly different organisation to the one that was transitioning to professionalism in the early 2000s. The early 2010s saw the RFS move to a Global Asset Management, the result of this was that the RFS Levy paid by a council was no longer spent on equipment to be used within the LGA but was pooled and spent anywhere in the State. Now, the RFS Head Office determines what equipment was purchased and where it was required, funding the purchasing through the pool. The approach has made it far more difficult for councils to track what is happening to the RFS Levy they pay.

Up until this change came into being, councils and the RFS signed Service Levels Agreement (SLA) which had traditionally reflected the negotiations undertaken for the purchase and management of equipment within an LGA. The move to Global Asset Management effectively made the SLAs

superfluous as councils no longer had any say or influence in the purchase or decommissioning of equipment. Consequently, in our Region SLAs have not been signed with the RFS since 2010.

Our Members note with some concern that the existence of the SLAs is sometimes used to indicate the active involvement of councils in the provision of the RFS services. It is also used to justify the continued vesting of fire fighting equipment with councils; however, the SLAs are just window-dressing at this point in time – creating an illusion of collaboration that does not reflect the reality of what is happening at the coalface.

Our Members suggest that it is easy to see how much the RFS has changed simply by looking at how the budgets have changed over the last 24 years. In 2000 the revenue for the RFS was \$70,849,000, while last financial year the RFS's revenue had risen to \$628,069,000. In 2020 the revenues hit an all-time high of \$988,251,000. Councils were advised at the time that the additional \$400,000,000 was a one-off increase to cover anticipated Workers Compensation costs, however it is unclear what transpired in relation to that need for additional revenue.

In addition, our Members agree that it is time for a complete review of the way that emergency services operate in the State. From our perspective we are seeing duplication and role crossover particularly between the RFS and SES. As climate change brings us more extreme weather events, we need to do more with less, volunteers are aging, budgets are getting tighter and we cannot afford to continue as we did quarter of a century ago.

The State, Local Government and the communities we represent need a more strategic approach to the delivery of emergency services. Currently we believe that there is a mismatch between the structure of command the structure of finance, removing structural duplication would result in services being delivered more efficiently and effectively. Our Members note that recently the RFS has been given responsibilities in responding to flood situations, previously these responsibilities were exclusively with Local Government and the SES. We are finding that all three entities are now responding to an event. We believe that the duplication of effort, the lack of clear lines of command is unlikely to result in quality outcomes and at worst can put lives at risk.

Of additional concern for our Members is the long-term sustainability of the volunteer base. The role of the RFS has escalated in recent years, putting added pressure on volunteer involvement. We note that the RFS website states on its volunteer recruitment page:

NSW RFS volunteers are ready to respond to emergencies 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, all year round, attending a range of incidents from bush and grass fires to house and structure fires, road accidents and assisting at other events like floods, storms and searches.¹

The traditional role of an RFS volunteer is to fight fires near home in order protect local property. Today's RFS volunteer is expected to do to much more and with that comes more training, more time away from home and business and more danger and more trauma. Our Members are reporting declining numbers of volunteers as they can no longer afford the time that it takes to stay trained and ready to meet the RFS's 24/7 RFS commitment to action.

¹ RFS Website: <https://www.rfs.nsw.gov.au/volunteer/join-the-nsw-rfs>

We note that RFS publicises that it has around 70,000 volunteers in NSW however, our Members report that many of these “volunteers” are not actively participating in their local Brigades and some are even in Nursing Homes. Our Members believe that the reality of available/active volunteers could be half that number. If they are correct, then this has significant run-on effects for resource planning in order to respond to disasters.

Our Members support a restructure of the volunteers into tiers of activity that reflect what the volunteer is willing and able to do. We believe creating a volunteer framework that better responds to what volunteers are willing to do will create a more sustainable volunteer base while also allowing better resource planning.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Our Members believe it is time for significant changes to be made to the operation of the RFS which includes:

- Developing a more strategic approach to the delivery of emergency services that reduces duplication of resources, including volunteer and non-volunteer labour.
- The State Government taking complete responsibility for the operation of the RFS including the responsibility for funding. The RFS is a State agency and should be funded by the State. If the State continues with an ESL, then it should be collected by Revenue NSW.
- Until the State Government takes on full responsibility of the RFS as an agency of the Government, the RFS Levy should:
 - Apply to every land parcel in an LGA. Every landowner benefits from the provision of emergency services, so every landowner should be required to make a contribution. This should be collected by Revenue NSW.
 - or in the alternative*
 - Be listed as a completely separate item on the rates notice or be issued as a completely separate account. The second approach would provide more transparency in relation to the cost of Emergency Services to the landowner. The approach echoes one of the recommendations made by IPART in its most recent review of rate pegging.
- Requiring the RFS to prepare an annual budget not a “bid” as is the case at the moment. A bid is a notional amount and as can be seen from Table One below, regularly goes over from between \$30 million to \$50 million dollars.
- Empowering IPART to provide direct oversight of the RFS Budget and recommended increases. To the best of our knowledge there is no independent oversight of the budget.
- Ceasing the practice of vesting firefighting equipment with the Councils. This occurs as a result of s119 of the Rural Fires Act and this legislative requirement does not reflect good accounting practice or the reality of the way assets are managed.
- Conducting an audit of volunteers to ascertain how many volunteers are willing and able to be deployed to respond to fires and disasters, where they are prepared to go and the level of involvement they seek with RFS.
- Structuring the volunteer experience to reflect what volunteers are willing and able to do.

Response to the Terms of Reference

Our Members provide the following responses to the Inquiry's Terms of Reference.

1. Mechanisms

Funding Rural Fire Service assets and premises

Our Member Councils have consistently raised concerns in relation to the ever-rising costs required to fund the operation of the Rural Fire Service in NSW. These costs directly eat away at the very small increase in revenues that rural councils receive from the annual rate peg. Over the last 10 years, over \$5 billion has been invested into the RFS, of which Local Government through its 11.7% contribution has directly contributed almost \$619,000,000. The contribution has come directly from rates income, impacting on Local Government's ability to provide services to its residents and businesses.

Funding for the RFS is based on a bid process rather than a budget, and it is a process over which Local Government has absolutely no control despite the signed SLAs which are supposed to guide local expenditure. Our Members agree that the current process is not fit-for-purpose, as Table One demonstrates the RFS consistently runs over budget, with councils expected to meet 11.7% of those cost overruns.

Our Members are very concerned that funding for Headquarters and Zone operations are going up but funding for local activities and facilities appears to be declining. This is resulting in local Brigades undertaking fundraising activities to meet local needs. In an agency with an annual budget in excess of half a billion dollars, the need to fundraise locally, demonstrates a clear structural flaw.

Table One: RFS Revenue over 10-year period *(taken from the RFS Annual Reports)*

RURAL FIRE SERVICE REVENUE		
Year Ended 30 June	Actual (\$)	Budget (\$)
2014	422,407,000	294,201,000
2015	340,477,000	297,039,000
2016	360,213,000	325,747,000
2017	381,632,000	351,537,000
2018	424,407,000	373,554,000
2019	520,348,000	396,181,000
2020	988,251,000	475,272,000
2021	650,053,000	590,083,000
2022	574,141,000	565,188,000
2023	628,069,000	623,907,000
TOTAL	\$5,289,998,000	\$4,292,709,000

Clearly the above trend of increases is way above the CPI and indeed way above the Local Government rate peg. The rate peg is pertinent in this discussion because Local Government is required to meet 11.7% of the cost of the Emergency Services, which includes the RFS. While IPART

has made allowances in the calculation of the rate peg, the cost of the RFS falls disproportionately on rural councils and the averaging that is applied in the calculation of rate peg does not reflect this.

The increases in RFS funding are completely out of step with the rate pegs that have been set by IPART at the same time. The RFS has enjoyed double digit increases to revenue at the same time that councils have had increases constrained to single digits. Table Two below shows the Local Government rate peg over the last decade and clearly demonstrates the mismatch between increases in Local Government revenue and the RFS increases.

Table Two: Local Government Rate Peg NSW²

Year	Rate Peg	Year	Rate Peg
2012-2013	3.4%	2018-2019	2.3%
2013-2014	3.4%	2019-2020	2.7%
2014 - 2015	2.3%	2020-2021	2.6%
2015-2016	2.4%	2021-2022	2.0%
2016-2017	1.8%	2022-2023	0.7%*
2017-2018	1.5%	2023-2024	3.7%*

*IPART included a calculation for a Population Factor resulting in different rates for councils. REROc Member Councils received the baseline increase indicated.

There is no question that the rate pegs have not matched the increased costs borne by local governments in relation to paying for emergency services and specifically the RFS. REROc has been collecting data on the mismatch between increasing costs for the RFS and other services against the rate peg for a number of years, Table Three below demonstrates the real difficulties that councils faced in 2020 when the increase rate pegged revenue did not meet the increase in State agency costs.

Table Three: 2020 Increases in ESL and LG Election Costs against Rate Peg Revenue

Member Councils	Increase in ESL Contribution in 2019/20 in \$ terms	Percentage Increase on Previous Payment	Increase in LG Election Costs in \$ terms	Percentage Increase on Previous Payment	Rate-pegged Revenue increase for 2020/21 in \$ terms	Rate peg 2020/21	What's left of the Rate Peg Increase after ESL and LG Election Cost Increases \$	% of Rate Increase Taken by ESL and Election Increases
Bland	\$ 92,519.00	25%	\$ 21,329.00	48%	\$ 185,000.00	2.70%	\$ 71,152.00	62%
Coolamon	\$ 45,086.00	24%	\$ 15,152.00	49%	\$ 64,000.00	2.70%	\$ 3,762.00	94%
Cootamundra-Gundagai	\$ 95,062.00	23%	\$ 103,946.00	142%	\$ 196,020.00	2.70%	-\$ 2,988.00	102%
Greater Hume	\$ 97,690.00	24%	\$ 28,980.00	50%	\$ 229,660.00	2.70%	\$ 102,990.00	55%
Junee	\$ 38,320.00	20%	\$ 26,336.00	58%	\$ 106,709.00	2.70%	\$ 42,053.00	61%
Lockhart	\$ 42,746.00	24%	\$ 12,056.00	67%	\$ 65,200.00	2.70%	\$ 10,398.00	84%
Temora	\$ 66,639.00	28%	\$ 35,000.00	87%	\$ 106,110.00	2.70%	\$ 4,471.00	96%
TOTAL FOR REGION	\$ 478,062.00		\$ 242,799.00					

Attachment One shows the impact of the ESL (and RFS component) on councils, demonstrating how the rate peg has completely failed to meet the increasing costs of the ESL over a decade that again shows the mismatch between rate increases and increases in RFS costs.

² IPART: <https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au/Home/Industries/Local-Government/For-Ratepayers/The-rate-peg>

Our Members agree that Local Government should not be required to meet the operational costs of a State Government agency. We believe that if the State was directly responsible for meeting the funding requirements of the RFS, then its budgets would be more closely watched.

In addition, Local Government is subsidising the operation of the RFS because councils are forced to carry RFS assets and equipment on council assets registers meaning that Local Government is bearing the cost of depreciation, not the RFS.

It has been estimated that over \$1.5 billion in RFS Equipment is sitting on the books of rural and regional councils in NSW, with the councils receiving no reimbursement from the RFS for those depreciation costs. Local Government is often advised by the State that it is “merely a book entry” with no material impact on council finances. If that is the case then our Members agree the RFS and by extension the State government has nothing to lose by listing the Equipment that is bought, sold and controlled by the RFS on its asset registers.

Maintaining Rural Fire Service assets and premises

Our Members advise that they have no control or influence on the maintenance of RFS assets and premises. Further our Members advise that they are required to pay the accounts for the maintenance and then wait for reimbursement from the RFS which can take months. Councils are effectively providing “loans” to the RFS to cover the costs of maintenance.

Of significant concern for our Member Councils was advice received from the previous Minister for Local Government that councils are responsible for condition assessments on the assets and premises. It is impossible for councils to conduct those conditions assessments if they cannot access the keys to premises and equipment, which is currently the case.

As an example of the inability of councils to access RFS premises, recently one of our Member Councils had staff undertaking roadworks near a RFS shed. The General Manager requested that his staff be able to use the shed in order to access its amenities. The request was denied and consequently the council had to pay for on-site amenities. The irony of course is that the shed is listed as a council asset which is currently being depreciated by council.

Accounting for the ownership of Rural Fire Service assets and premises

As stated above under current legislation (s119 of the Act) all Equipment must “be vested in the council of the area” for which it was purchased or constructed.

Further s119(5) requires councils to care and maintain the Equipment and s119(6) requires that the Commissioner only use the Equipment in an area outside of the council’s area, with the council’s agreement. Under the Act, councils own and control the Equipment but can only sell or dispose of it with the written consent of the Commissioner.

The legislation is clear, dictating that councils have control over all the Equipment purchased through the Fund. This situation is further reinforced by the NSW Auditor-General's insistence that the Equipment be included in the audited financial statements prepared by councils.

However, as stated above, in practice councils have no control over the equipment and that the RFS "holds the keys" figuratively and literally. We are currently in a farcical situation where the councils own the assets and premises but do not control them while the RFS have assumed total control over the Equipment they do not own. We have no knowledge of any council in our Region being asked for, nor providing approval for the Equipment to be used outside their LGA.

There is an on-going debate with the NSW Auditor about the treatment of the Equipment as council assets when clearly this stance is inconsistent with Australian Accounting Standards Board's definition of an asset:

A resource:

- (a) controlled by an entity as a result of past events; and*
- (b) from which future economic benefits are expected to flow to the entity.*

Future economic benefits controlled by the entity as a result of past transactions or other past events.³

Section 119 (6) of the Act requires that councils can only sell or dispose of the Equipment with the approval of the Commissioner is clearly at odds with the AASB standards which require that the entity "control" the asset.

As councils have no effective control over the purchase, sale or transfer of the Equipment and as the Commissioner has the power to remove the equipment and use it anywhere in the State, it is clearly inappropriate that the assets should continue to "appear" as being owned by councils. In addition, our Members advise that further confusing the situation is the fact that the RFS is the registered owners of most of the large vehicles they use, yet these vehicles are still appearing on council asset registers.

Addressing the ownership arrangements in relation to RFS Equipment is overdue. The illusion that Local Government has in any context, genuine ownership of the RFS Equipment must end. Our Members strongly support all Equipment being recognised as owned by the State and that the ownership be realised through the Equipment being listed on the RFS asset register.

Operational management, including the control of assets and premises, risks, and impacts to local government, and the ability to effect a response to emergencies

As stated above Local Government has no control over assets or premises and cannot access any RFS Equipment in order to respond to an emergency. In yet another irony, under a Section 44 Declaration the RFS can access council-owned heavy equipment in order to respond to an emergency. The RFS has wide ranging powers that allow them to procure council equipment for fire fighting purposes.

³ AASB: <https://aasb.gov.au/research-resources/glossary-links-acronyms/glossary-of-defined-terms/>

2. Arrangements between Councils and the Rural Fire Service are fit for purpose:

Service Level Agreements

As stated above, Service Level Agreements (SLAs) in our Region are more than a decade old. Our Members agree that they serve no constructive purpose. In addition, there is no negotiation of the SLAs; there is no room for co-design and they are prepared unilaterally.

Evidence of this is that we have been informed for almost 12 months that there are new SLAs in development and yet there has not been a single consultation, of which we are aware, in relation to the SLAs content or purpose. Our Members agree that the SLAs are window dressing designed to create the impression that Local Government has some influence on the way that the RFS conducts its operations in an LGA at a time when councils have no influence at all.

For example, in one of our LGAs the RFS decided that a new shed was required because the new trucks they had purchased did not fit inside the existing shed. There was no consultation with council about the design or size of the shed or its likely cost. There was no co-design involved in the development of the project, council merely acted in an administrative role. However, once the \$650,000 shed was completed it had to be listed on council's asset register.

Our Members agree that SLAs were effective tools in co-designing services when councils actually had a say in what was built and what was bought and sold. Today, that situation no longer exists.

The division of responsibilities for bushfire management and hazard reduction

Our Members agree that there is no division of responsibility, that RFS is the decision-maker and councils are merely the service provider. Our Members advise that they are provided with a fixed sum of money to provide hazard reduction services and that it is the RFS that decides where money is to be spent. There are administrative costs associated with the provision of quarterly reports by councils on the funding that is provided.

Our Members have noted in the past, with some concern, that the current Minister for Local Government views the payments for hazard reduction as some type of grant whereby councils are returned some of the Emergency Services Levy that they have paid. This is of concern because it fails to recognise that the councils in this instance are being paid a fee for service not provided with a grant.

Provision of Insurance

The Government has clearly laid responsibility for the Equipment at the feet of Local Government, however it is the RFS employees and volunteers who are using it. In the light of our ownership of the Equipment our Members are very concerned that should an RFS employee, volunteer or RFS contractor suffer injury or death using the Equipment, that councils will be held liable because they own the Equipment.

The situation is made worse by the fact that councils have no effective control over the maintenance of the Equipment, nor any say in the suitability of what is purchased or when it is disposed of, or when and where it is used.

Our Members have sought advice from the Government that Local Government is indemnified by RFS and the Government for any injury, death or damage that occurs as a result of the council-owned Equipment being used by an RFS employee, volunteer or third party. At this point the issue remains unresolved.

Bushfire Management Committees

Our Members agree that Bushfire Management Committees are of limited value, given the overarching role of the RFS in determining what does and does not happen in an LGA with respect to bushfire management.

Our Members agree that the Committees should be led by the local Brigade and that they should report their recommendation to the Local Emergency Management Committee (LEMC).

3. Appropriate role for local authorities in the provision of emergency services

Our Members agree that Local Government's role in the provision of emergency services is a support role.

4. Sustainability of local government contributions to emergency service provision

As can be seen from the above and Attachment One, Local Government contributions to emergency service provision is not sustainable. Every time the costs rise, a council must decide what local service to cut in order to pay for the running costs of a State agency. Something has to give, and as things currently stand, what gives is services to the communities that our Member Councils represent.

It is for this reason that we strongly support a more transparent billing arrangement for emergency services whereby landowners are billed separately for the provision of the services, this would ensure that State Agency costs are not hidden in the operational expenses that councils pay from their rates revenue.

5. Any other related matters

We have raised our concerns above about the sustainability of the volunteers within the RFS.

We believe that it is time for an audit of the numbers of volunteers to determine the reality of the resources available to provide that 24/7 response that the RFS talks about on its website. In addition, we believe that the 24/7 approach is a disincentive for many to volunteer because they do not want that level of commitment to volunteering. Our Members strongly support a tiered approach to volunteering that offers volunteers a level of engagement that reflects their ability to

commit time and energy to the RFS or SES. The tier that a volunteer chooses would dictate the level of training they undertake, the hours they commit and even how often their PPE is replaced. Our Members are awash with stories of PPE being replaced that has never or rarely been used. The cost to the RFS of these actions would be significant. A tiered approach where PPE is provided based on the type of service delivered would be more efficient and effective.

In addition, our Members are very concerned about the duplication of volunteerism in the Region with volunteers serving both the SES and RFS as well as community organisations that assist in disasters like Red Cross and the CWA. Above, we have suggested that a review of the structure of the emergency services would be timely, to ensure that the State has the resources that are needed to fight disasters effectively.

Conclusion

Our Members welcome the opportunity to provide this feedback to the Inquiry.

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the PAC to discuss the matters we have raised in more detail.

ATTACHMENT ONE: INCREASE IN TOTAL INCOME AS A RESULT OF RATE PEG: REROC MEMBER COUNCILS

Member Councils	Rate Pegged Income Increase 16/17	Rate Pegged Income Increase 2017/18	Rate Pegged income Increase 2018/19	Rate Pegged income Increase 2019/20	Rate Pegged income Increase 2020/21	Rate Pegged income Increase 2021/22	Rate Pegged income Increase 2022/23	Rate Pegged income Increase 2023/24
Bland	\$110,674.13	\$94,147.02	\$ 146,515.00	\$ 175,951.00	\$ 185,000.00	\$ 137,572.26	\$ 168,433.95	\$ 266,132.65
Coolamon	\$ 41,000.00	\$ 34,000.00	\$ 54,000.00	\$ 64,000.00	\$ 64,000.00	\$ 63,949.00	\$ 97,590.00	\$ 100,932.63
Cootamundra-Gundagai Rate Peg)	\$ 127,049.00	\$ 106,888.00	-\$ 105,488.00	\$ 453,328.00	\$ 196,020.00	\$ 156,253.00	\$ 64,807.00	\$ 403,394.00
Cootamundra-Gundagai (SRV)						\$ 1,406,285.00	\$ 1,416,517.00	\$ 141,733.00
Greater Hume	\$ 128,123.98	\$ 115,445.03	\$ 177,016.00	\$ 229,660.00	\$ 229,071.00	\$ 181,813.00	\$ 186,433.00	\$ 450,803.00
Junee			\$ 87,055.00	\$ 105,516.00	\$ 104,962.00	\$ 84,072.00	\$ 108,142.00	\$ 168,793.00
Lockhart	\$ 41,000.00	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 54,308.00	\$ 65,200.00	\$ 64,400.00	\$ 51,055.00	\$ 51,982.00	\$ 97,996.00
Temora	\$ 54,540.00	\$ 55,395.00	\$ 86,342.00	\$ 103,950.00	\$ 103,116.00	\$ 83,230.00	\$ 84,974.00	\$ 161,123.00
TOTAL FOR REGION	\$502,387.11	\$440,875.05	\$ 499,748.00	\$ 1,197,605.00	\$ 946,569.00	\$ 2,164,229.26	\$ 2,178,878.95	\$ 1,790,907.28
			* Net of exp SRV				* 0.7% + additional 1.3%	* incl SRV

INCREASES IN ESL CHARGES TO COUNCILS AND RFS COMPONENT OF INCREASE

Member Councils	Total ESL Contribution 6/17	RFS Component of ESL 20 6/17	Total ESL Contribution 17/ 8	RFS Component of ESL 2017/18	Increase in RFS Contributions	Total ESL Contribution 20 8/19	RFS Component of ESL 2018/19	Increase in RFS Contributions	Total ESL Contribution 2019/20	RFS Component of ESL 2019/20	Increase in RFS Contributions	Total ESL Contribution 2020/21	RFS Component of ESL 2020/21	Increase in RFS Contributions	Total ESL Contribution 2021/22	RFS Component of ESL 2021/22	Increase in RFS Contributions	Total ESL Contribution 2022/23	RFS Component of ESL 2022/23	Increase in RFS Contr butions	Total ESL Contri bution 2023/24	RFS Component of ESL 2023/24	Increase in RFS Contributions
Bland	\$ 368 179.84	\$ 335 850.28	\$ 413 005.00	\$ 381 150.00	\$ 45 299.72	\$ 375 955.00	\$ 346 689.00	\$ 34 461.00	\$ 468 474.00	\$ 436 031.00	\$ 89 342.00	\$ 659 820.00	\$ 622 420.00	\$ 186 389.00	\$ 497 681.00	\$ 454 446.00	\$ 167 974.00	\$ 649 987.00	\$ 606 752.00	\$ 152 306.00	\$ 666 805.00	\$ 607 162.00	\$ 4 0.00
Coolamon	\$ 186 106. 8	\$ 65 722.56	\$ 194 119.44	\$ 170 163.44	\$ 4 440.88	\$ 188 124.00	\$ 165 271.50	\$ 4 891.94	\$ 233 210.00	\$ 207 826.28	\$ 42 554.78	\$ 325 839.36	\$ 296 716.72	\$ 88 890.44	\$ 242 65.69	\$ 216 641.04	\$ 80 075.68	\$ 289 247.64	\$ 289 247.64	\$ 72 006.60	\$ 335 163.25	\$ 289 442.96	\$ 195.32
Cootamundra-Gundagai	\$ 413 882.00	\$ 340 425.00	\$ 424 757.00	\$ 349 547.00	\$ 9 122.00	\$ 4 0 357.00	\$ 339 536.00	\$ 10 011.00	\$ 505 419.00	\$ 426 988.00	\$ 87 452.00	\$ 699 327.00	\$ 609 511.00	\$ 182 523.00	\$ 24 540.08	\$ 445 021.00	\$ 164 490.00	\$ 696 247.20	\$ 594 68.00	\$ 149 147.00	\$ 731 148.59	\$ 594 570.00	\$ 402.00
Greater Hume	\$ 391 017.00	\$ 329 069.00	\$ 443 778.00	\$ 356 087.00	\$ 27 018.00	\$ 412 379.00	\$ 353 651.00	\$ 2 436.00	\$ 5 0 069.00	\$ 444 787.00	\$ 91 136.00	\$ 7 0 056.00	\$ 634 919.00	\$ 190 132.00	\$ 529 834.00	\$ 463 572.00	\$ 171 347.00	\$ 705 627.00	\$ 618 937.00	\$ 155 365.00	\$ 738 329.00	\$ 619 355.00	\$ 4 8.00
Junee					\$ -	\$ 194 464.00	\$ 165 268.00		\$ 240 404.00	\$ 207 860.00	\$ 42 592.00	\$ 334 560.00	\$ 296 716.00	\$ 88 856.00	\$ 249 552.00	\$ 216 640.00	\$ 80 076.00	\$ 333 620.00	\$ 289 248.00	\$ 72 608.00	\$ 351 868.00	\$ 289 444.00	\$ 196.00
Lockhart	\$ 173 780.00	\$ 157 000.00	\$ 178 639.00	\$ 161 207.00	\$ 4 207.00	\$ 178 187.00	\$ 156 573.00	\$ 4 634.00	\$ 220 933.00	\$ 196 920.00	\$ 40 347.00	\$ 308 658.00	\$ 281 00.00	\$ 84 180.00	\$ 229 689.00	\$ 205 238.88	\$ 75 861.12	\$ 305 176.00	\$ 274 024.10	\$ 68 785.22	\$ 315 547.00	\$ 274 209.10	\$ 185.00
Temora	\$ 297 960.20	\$ 253 360.72	\$ 268 511.00	\$ 223 850.00	\$ 29 510.72	\$ 283 518.96	\$ 240 919.00	\$ 17 069.00	\$ 350 158.60	\$ 303 004.00	\$ 62 085.00	\$ 486 480.59	\$ 432 529.00	\$ 129 525.00	\$ 363 802.60	\$ 315 801.27	\$ 116 227.73	\$ 482 705.82	\$ 421 641.13	\$ 105 839.86	\$ 503 015.76	\$ 421 926.08	\$ 284.95
TOTAL FOR REGION	\$ 1,830,925.42	\$ 1,581,427.56	\$ 1,922,809.44	\$ 1,642,004.44	\$ 60,576.88	\$ 2,042,984.96	\$ 1,767,907.50	\$ 39,364.94	\$ 2,528,667.60	\$ 2,223,416.28	\$ 455,508.78	\$ 3,524,740.95	\$ 3,173,911.72	\$ 950,495.44	\$ 2,637 273.37	\$ 2,317,360.19	\$ 704,829.29	\$ 3,495,986.59	\$ 3,094,017.87	\$ 776,657.68	\$ 3,641,876.60	\$ 3,096,109.14	\$ 2,091.27