Submission
No 102

INQUIRY INTO ABILITY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO FUND INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

Organisation: Riverina Eastern Regional Organisation of Councils

Date Received: 1 May 2024

RIVERINA EASTERN REGIONAL ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS

Response

Inquiry into the Ability of Local Government to Fund Infrastructure and Services

Response
Inquiry into the Ability of Local Government to Fund infrastructure and Services
Riverina Eastern Regional Organisation of Councils

Introduction

Our Member Councils welcome the opportunity to respond to the Standing Committee's 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. Our Member Councils provide a wide range of services and facilities to their communities that encompass everything from childcare and aged care to libraries, art galleries, swimming pool

and sporting facilities. One of the significant challenges faced by our Member Councils is the large geographic areas they service, often with multiple towns and villages that necessitate the duplication of facilities and services. There is no public transport to facilitate movement between urban areas therefore if rural councils are to provide equitable access to facilities like swimming pools, libraries, cultural spaces and sporting facilities councils have no choice but to provide them in multiple locations. This is a structural issue that underpins some of the struggles that rural councils face in funding infrastructure and services. It is impossible for them to consolidate facilities and services in single locations without substantially disadvantaging their residents.

Our Members believe that it is vitally important that in considering the ability of Local Government to fund infrastructure and services that the State recognises the substantial differences in service provision between rural towns and regional cities and metropolitan centres. For rural councils the tyranny of distance impacts on virtually every facet of their operations, from the thousands of kilometres of roads that they care for to the costs of transporting waste for recycling to difficulties that are faced in attracting highly skilled staff.

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

- ***The level of income councils require to adequately meet the needs of their communities.***

Local government revenue is received from the following sources:

- Commonwealth Grants Commission via the NSW Grants Commission
- Land Rates – which are set by IPART. Councils are able to apply for the Special Rate Variation for an increase beyond the rate peg.
- Charges for services such as sewerage, water and waste management. The fees from these services are "ring-fenced" and must be used for the purpose for which they were collected.
- Fees for services such as inspections
- Levies such as Section 7.11 and 7.12 development contributions
- Grant funding for special projects sourced from the Commonwealth and State Governments

Land rates are rate-pegged, meaning that councils have no control over the level at which they are set, IPART has that responsibility. Our Members have consistently opposed the pegging of rates by the State as it undermines the ability of councils to effectively deliver the services and facilities that their communities need and demand.

IPART's stance in relation to determining the rate peg is to ensure that Councils are able to continue to deliver Business-as-Usual (BAU). The rate peg is meant to consider the price rises impacting on councils and then account for these in the determination to ensure that rising costs are met. IPART can also factor in productivity gains to water-down the quantum of the rate increase.

The rate peg is supposed be set at a level that allows councils to undertake BAU, meaning that it should cover the increases in the day-to-day operations of the councils. Our Member Councils agree that the rate peg has completely failed to deliver on this aim. What has resulted is councils being forced to make decisions to push liabilities further down the line, delay the maintenance of community infrastructure, cutback on service or a combination of all three.

Increasingly, it is also resulting in the inability to attract skilled workers because councils cannot compete in a highly competitive labour market environment. Our inability to attract skilled workers has resulted in an increasing reliance on third-party providers which inevitably increases costs.

REROC has argued for many years that IPART should "ground-truth" the rate peg to ensure that it does deliver a BAU outcome. This would require that IPART apply the rate peg to a sample of councils to determine whether the additional income generated by the rate peg is sufficient to meet the increase in core operation costs.

An example of how ground truthing works is contained in Table One, an exercise that REROC undertook after the announcement of the 0.7% rate peg in 2022. The Table clearly shows that the total increase in revenue as a result of the rate peg did not meet the total increase in wages (that resulted from the application of the agreed Award wage increase). The aim of the rate peg to create BAU conditions, completely failed because it did not even cover the cost of wages, which represents around 40% of council expenditures.

Table One: 2022 Rate Peg set at 0.7% - Income Generated against Increased cost in Wages

Council	Total Revenue Increase as result of the 2023 Rate Peg	Total Increase in Wages	Difference
Bland	$48,802	$135,440	-$86,638
Coolamon	$17,884	$134,729	-$116,845
Cootamundra-Gundagai	16% SRV rate increase	$240,120	
Greater Hume	$64,407	$264,012	-$199,605
Junee	$29,000	$166,000	-$137,000
Lockhart	$18,173	$81,420	-$63,247
Temora	$29,500	$162,000	-$132,500

Table Two below is a comparison undertaken in 2020 by our Members to show the how much of the rate pegged increase in revenue was consumed by the Local Government elections and by ESL payment increases. This clearly shows that the rate peg is not allowing councils to carry on Business as Usual as the below table shows that the wage increase which was 1.5% in 2020 was unlikely to be accommodated after the other increases in costs were met.

Table Two: 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**					

- ***Examine if past rate pegs have matched increases in costs borne by local governments.***

There is no question that the rate pegs have not matched the increased costs borne by local governments. We have provided the above tables showing what has occurred in the recent past. REROC has been collecting this data for a number of years, **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 both wages and the ESL.

The rate peg has historically been based on the Local Government Cost Index (LGCI). Our Members do not believe the LGCI adequately reflects councils' real costs. For example, despite numerous approaches to IPART requesting that it cease using the NSW Public Service Wage Index as the indicia for wage increases and instead rely on the Local Government Award wage increase, the practice has continued. The Public Service Wage Index is consistently 1-1.5% below the actual wage increase imposed on councils through the NSW Local Government Award. Given that around 40% of a council's total expenditure is on wages the financial impact of this one decision is substantial.

In previous conversations with IPART about this issue we have been advised that the discounted approach is indicative of productivity gains upon which the increase is based. This is an economic fiction, the industry-wide bargaining that is undertaken to achieve the annual wage increase means that productivity gains are unlikely to be achieved at an individual council level, particularly as most councils have stretched their workforces as far as they can in order to balance budgets.

Failing to address wage increases appropriately is further exacerbated by the skills shortages that most councils in regional and rural NSW are facing and have faced for some considerable time. This has resulted in many of our Members being forced to offer over-Award wages in order to remain competitive in a very tight jobs' market. Not only is LGCI not recognising the full extent of mandated wage increases, but it is also not accommodating the supply-driven labour market. In our Region this is made worse by the volume of major infrastructure works that are currently being undertaken (Snowy 2.0, Inland Rail, HumeConnect) whereby everyone from roadworkers to engineers and planners are being recruited by private enterprise, on tight deadlines who can and will pay higher wages.

There is also an inherent problem with the way that the Emergency Services Levy (ESL) is handled. The ESL costs are pooled and then attributed to every council. However, the economic burden does not fall equally with rural councils meeting the full cost of the Rural Fire Service (RFS) contributions. The RFS contributions should be ring-fenced and councils permitted to recoup the total amount as a line item in the rates notice. We note that this has been recommended by IPART in its latest review of rate pegging but understand that the final sign-off on the approach by the Government has not been provided.

Another major cost item is the implementation of council Community Strategic Plans (CSP). Councils are required to produce and deliver on their CSP; however, the rate peg makes no provision for this. Every council is required to produce and deliver a CSP, councils are measured on how effectively they deliver CSP outcomes. Consequently REROC is of the opinion that the CSP is a core activity and therefore should be treated as a Business-As-Usual requirement.

Often CSPs identify new services of facilities that communities want or need, our Members do not believe it is appropriate that councils should have to seek a Special Rate Variation in order to deliver on a mandated activity for which they are measured. There should be provision in the rate peg calculation for the delivery of the CSP.

The inability of the current approach to factor in the cost of enhancing, increasing or introducing new services undermines the ability of councils to effectively deliver the commitments made to their communities through the Integrated Planning and Reporting regime. Councils are forced to reduce one service in order to increase another in a no-win scenario where the rate peg insists it is supporting a Business-As-Usual regime.

The calculation of the rate peg fails to consider policy changes or additional regulatory burdens which create additional cost burdens for councils. Where councils are required to deliver new regulatory functions, the State will often advise that the council can set charges to recoup the attendant costs. While this might work for councils with large population bases operating over a small landmass, for small councils the quantity of transactions undertaken rarely cover the actual costs in delivery. There is simply not the volume of work available to generate sufficient income to cover the costs unless councils make the decision to charge substantially for the regulatory service. However, revenue can be limited either by the State setting a ceiling fee for the service or the council deciding the cost-recovery fee would be prohibitive.

Additional regulatory or reporting requirements introduced by the State are likely to lead to either the recruitment of new staff or the engagement of specialist consultants to fill knowledge and skills gaps in councils. Again, this is an increase in costs beyond council control, which is not currently factored into setting the rate peg.

The introduction by the OLG of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committees (ARIC) is yet another example of a cost impost that is beyond councils' control. We estimate that the cost of an ARIC for most councils will be at least $50,000 per year, the cost can only be met if councils reduce their expenditure in other areas. The cost of the ARIC is in addition to the increasing costs of the NSW Audit Office's financial auditing of councils. Our Members are reporting that this year there has been a 40-50% increase in the cost of financial audits which are controlled by the Audit Office. The increases have resulted Member Councils now paying in excess of $120,000 for their audits. Again the rate peg increase does not cover these increases.

- ***Current levels of service delivery and financial sustainability in local government, including the impact of cost shifting on service delivery and financial sustainability, and whether this has changed over time.***

The LGNSW 2023 Cost-shifting Survey found that the total cost of cost-shifting, where the State Government shifts the cost of providing a service or infrastructure to Local Government to be $1.36 billion per annum. LGNSW states that this is a dramatic increase of 78% since the 2015/16 Financial Year, when the total cost shift was estimated at $820 million. LGNSW has consistently found, as a result of its annual survey that the following five activities represent the largest of the costs shifts:

- **Waste Levy** – councils pay the Levy which totalled $288.2 million, however, the NSW Government does not fully reinvest the waste levy, back into waste and circular economy infrastructure and programs.

- **Emergency Services Levy** – the ESL and associated emergency service contributions, which totalled $165.4 million in 2023 when combined with the cost of depreciating Rural Fire Service assets represents the largest direct cost shift to local councils. In 2021–22, councils contributed $142 million through the Emergency Services Levy, $12.7 million through Rural Fire Service (RFS) obligations, and $10.7 million in depreciation expenses on RFS assets.

  Rural councils bear the burden of the rising costs of the Rural Fire Service, the RFS does not set an annual budget but instead prepares a "bid" for funding which is approved by the relevant Ministers. There is no independent oversight of the RFS budget which has seen its revenue rise from $370,542,000 in 2013 to $520,348,000 in 2019 to $628,069,000 in 2023.[1] In 2020 the revenue $988,251,000[2], we understand this was the result of RFS making allowances for anticipated rises in Worker Compensation costs.

  Councils meet 11.7% of these costs and rather than them be apportioned so that they can be recouped outside the rate peg, to date they have been averaged across all councils, meaning that the councils paying the bill for the RFS services are not receiving adequate rate peg revenue to cover the costs of what is a State Government agency. **Attachment One** clearly demonstrates the shortfall issue. As noted above IPART has recently made a recommendation that the ESL should be separately listed on the rate notice and recouped separately to the rates.

  The issue of the Red Fleet has gained traction in the last 12 months. The issue has arisen because the *Rural Fire Service Act* vests the ownership of any asset purchased with the Rural Firefighting Fund with the local council. Virtually everything asset used by the RFS is purchased through the Fund. As a result, rural councils have found themselves being required to list RFS assets on their asset registers and depreciate them. It is estimated the value of the RFS assets being depreciated by Local Government on behalf of the State is $1.5 billion. Councils have no control over these assets, they do not decide when to buy or sell them, when to maintain them nor how, when and where they are deployed. The larger equipment like trucks are actually registered to the RFS not councils, so councils are depreciating assets to which they have no legal title. The costs of the assets' depreciation are not met by the RFS even though the Agency as the total benefit and control over them.

- **Pensioner Rebates** - The NSW Government's failure to fully reimburse local councils for mandatory pensioner rate rebates has resulted in councils losing $55.2 million. REROC believes that the pensioner concession is a form of welfare assistance and consequently the cost of the concession should be 100% met by the State Government. The State legislates for

[1] RFS Annual Report, 2013-14, https://www.rfs.nsw.gov.au/resources/publications/annual-reports
[2] Ibid.

this welfare payment and we believe it is unfair that local government and ratepayers must subsidise its cost.

- **Public Libraries** - The NSW Government is failing to meet the originally committed 50 per cent of the cost of libraries' operations. NSW has the lowest State Government per capita contribution to public libraries of all States and territories in Australia. It is local government that is picking up the funding shortfall of which LGNSW estimated to be $156.7 million per year[3], these funds are coming from rate-pegged, ratepayer funds.

- ***Assess the social and economic impacts of the rate peg in New South Wales for ratepayers, councils and council staff over the last 20 years and compare with other jurisdictions.***

The rate peg has taken a significant toll on Local Government's ability not just to meet the growing demands of its residents but to maintain services at current levels. Our Member Councils agree that the rate peg has impacted on councils in the following ways:

- Required councils to find efficiencies – however efficiencies are finite in nature and eventually manifest themselves in maintenance and service cuts.
- Reduction in services and reduced and delayed maintenance on infrastructure
- Undermining service provision
- Increased the pressure on staff to continually deliver more with less
- Reduced the attractiveness of local government as an employer of choice
- Reduced the financial viability of councils
- Impacted on the ability of councils to deliver on their Community Strategic Plans

As stated above, the rate peg has consistently failed to factor in the rising costs of wages, given that around 40% of a council's total expenditure is on wages the financial impact of this one decision is substantial.

The cumulative impact of this failure, which REROC has raised on numerous occasions with IPART since the introduction of the LGCI, is substantial. The goal of the LGCI is to ensure that councils can maintain Business as Usual, clearly if the cost of wage rises are not being properly factored in then it is impossible to reach that goal.

In addition, the rate peg makes no provision for the unique external factors that generate additional cost burdens for rural councils such as:

- The Rural Fire Service Contribution
- The introduction of new regulations or policy changes that create an additional financial or resourcing impost on councils such as the introduction of the ARIC regime, or the requirement to account for Rural Fire Service Equipment
- Natural disasters
- Population Density
- Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islanders

[3] LGNSW: *Cost Shifting 2023: How State Costs Eat Council Rates*

- Aged Population
- Environment such as Rainfall, topography and drainage
- Tourism Influx – population growth that must be serviced to accommodate a regular influx of tourists
- Remoteness.

- ***Review the operation of the special rate variation process and its effectiveness in providing the level of income Councils require to adequately meet the needs of their communities***

Special rate variations should not be used to meet shortfalls in core funding for councils. A request for an SRV should be just that, a request for additional funding in order to deliver a service or facility that is outside Business as Usual.

IPART's approach to the LGCI is to provide a sufficient increase in funds for councils to continue with Business-as-Usual. However, too often we are finding that the SRV process is being used to play "catch-up" because the rate peg has failed to deliver on its Business-as-Usual promise. The rate peg should provide councils with the income required to adequately meet the needs of their community, there should be no need to go to an SRV to meet those needs.

However, we believe the adherence to the BAU approach is unsustainable because it does not support sound financial practice and embeds a "no growth" approach. Consequently, REROC supports councils being given the flexibility to increase their rates above the rate peg by a set percentage without the need to lodge a Special Rate Variation.

REROC's Member Councils strongly agree that councils need the flexibility to increase rates without the need to resort to the SRV process which is both expensive and time consuming. REROC has previously requested that the Government consider giving councils the flexibility to increase their rates by up to 2% beyond the rate peg without the need to submit an SRV. Our Members continue to support this approach.

Our Member Councils believe that the suggested increase recognises the need to raise rates' revenue in order to deliver the CSP. We believe that while the rate peg continues to be determined without reference to the implementation of the CSP or other externalities councils are destined to struggle to deliver in all the areas upon which their performance is judged.

- **Any other matters**

There are a number of other matters that impact on the financial viability and sustainability of councils, and particularly rural councils. These matters include the following:

There is no funding to deliver the Community Strategic Plan
As stated above, a major cost item is the implementation of council Community Strategic Plans (CSP). Councils are required to produce and deliver on their CSP; however, the rate peg makes no provision for this. The delivery of the CSP is a core activity and consequently a Business-As-Usual

requirement, it is not appropriate that councils should have to seek a Special Rate Variation in order to deliver on a mandated activity for which they are measured. There should be provision in the rate peg calculation for the delivery of the CSP.

The costs of Natural Disaster and Resilience Activities
Natural disasters and the immediate costs that result during and following a disaster are of significant concern to councils. As stated above there is no provision for these costs in the rate peg, however they are increasingly impacting on council bottom lines. For example, during the bushfires in 2020 one of our Member Councils was forced to purchase satellite phones to ensure their staff could communicate with each other when the mobile phone system crashed.

In the instance of floods, the additional burden of immediate clean-ups from a public health perspective generates immediate additional costs for councils. There is a time lag between a disaster and the distribution of grants to meet the costs that arise from those disasters, in the interim councils need to start repairs and clean-ups. Our Members' experience with Natural Disaster funding is that it can take years for claims to be approved by the NSW Government meanwhile assets such as roads continue to deteriorate increasing the repair bill or alternatively councils meet the cost of the repairs and delay other works while they wait for Natural Disaster funding.

Our Members support the addition of a resilience factor to the rate peg that would allow councils to build a specific reserve to address the immediate financial resourcing required to deal with natural disasters including bushfires and support the implementation of resilience activities.

Councils are now also expected to prepare and implement Disaster Adaptation Plans, Pre-disaster Recovery Plans as well as Local Emergency Management Plans in order to make ready for and build resilience to disasters. These activities consume resources that councils do not have, so therefore come at the cost of other service delivery outcomes.

Rural Councils must provide services and facilities in multiple locations
Rural councils cover vast areas of land with multiple discrete population areas. The multiple population centres, together with the large distances between each and the fact that usually the only public transport is the school bus service results in rural councils having to provide multiple service points and infrastructure. Therefore, ensuring equity of access to council services and facilities can place a significant burden on financial resources.

For example, Coolamon Shire's residential population is spread over a very large area. There are 3 discrete population centres, Coolamon, Ganmain, Ardlethan & 3 small villages: Beckom, Marrar and Matong. As a consequence, Coolamon has 3 swimming pools, 4 public halls, 4 landfills and a mobile library service in addition to a library at Coolamon.

There is no possibility of concentrating the services and facilities in a single location which would cut costs but significantly decrease accessibility.

Rural Councils step in when the market fails
It is not unusual for a rural council to be forced to step in when the local market is not large enough to support commercial operations.

Rural councils regularly provide childcare services, age care facilities and medical facilities that are leased out at low rent or no rent to doctors to ensure the LGA has medical and allied health services locally.

Councils aim to run these services at, at least breakeven, however this is not always the case creating additional financial burdens for councils.

Land that is exempt from paying rates
Our Members agree that rating should be based on the use of the land, not its ownership. This approach would support the principle of competitive neutrality by ensuring that the same land uses were rated the same way regardless of the ownership of the property.

Our Members do not believe that it is appropriate that ratepayers in the LGA to pay for the exemptions that are provided to organisations that are carry-on income generating activities. The business activities of charities and the residents of community housing create demands for council services and infrastructure, the cost of which are being met by other ratepayers.

In some instances, the exempt enterprises are in direct competition with private providers, for example two nursing homes may operate side-by-side, the one operated by the private provider is paying rates, the one operated by the registered charity is not. Only one receives the exemption, yet both have comparable demands on council's services and facilities and both are competing for market share.

In LGAs where vast amounts of land are exempt from rates because they are held by the State for forestry or parks, councils miss out on rate income, despite the need to provide services such as local roads and infrastructure to the land.

Conclusion

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

Ultimately the role of local government is determined by the community it services. It is that community that holds the council accountable for their actions not just at the ballot box but because local government is the government that has the highest level of accessibility, councillors and council staff are held accountable for their actions everyday.

It is worth noting that this high level of accountability translates into a high level of constituent satisfaction. An IRIS Study undertaken for the Allan Inquiry in 2015, found that 50% of residents across NSW rated their level of satisfaction with their local council as high, 35% as medium and only 15% as low. In addition, the Study found that satisfaction levels with rural and regional councils were consistently higher than for metropolitan councils. Our members argue that this demonstrates the ability of local government not only to meet the needs of its constituents but to excel in the role.

There are a number of underlying issues that impact on the ability of local government to fulfil its role as a builder of communities; inadequate funding and the negative impact of rate-pegging, cost-shifting by Federal and State governments, the growing problem of being the "last man standing" as

Federal and State governments decrease their service delivery levels to rural and regional communities, increasing demands by the State on local government for compliance reporting and planning and the increasing reliance of the State on local government to maintain regional and rural road infrastructure.

If councils are to remain financially viable and successfully deliver on their Community Strategic Plans then the way that they are financed needs to change, working together with councils in a genuine co-design approach our Members believe that this can be achieved.

Our Members note that the Committee is intending to hold Hearings in regional NSW, REROC would welcome the opportunity to work with the Committee to arrange for a Hearing to be held in the eastern Riverina.

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 16/17	RFS Component of ESL 2016/17	Total ESL Contribution 17/18	RFS Component of ESL 2017/18	Increase in RFS Contributions	Total ESL Contribution 2018/19	RFS Component of ESL 2018/19	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
Coolamon	$ 186,106.38	$ 165,722.56	$ 194,119.44	$ 170,163.44	$ 4,440.88	$ 188,124.00	$ 165,271.50	-$ 4,891.94
Cootamundra-Gundagai	$ 413,882.00	$ 340,425.00	$ 424,757.00	$ 349,547.00	$ 9,122.00	$ 410,357.00	$ 339,536.00	-$ 10,011.00
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
Junee					$ -	$ 194,464.00	$ 165,268.00	
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
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
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**

Member Councils	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
Bland	$ 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
Coolamon	$ 233,210.00	$ 207,826.28	$ 42,554.78	$ 325,839.36	$ 296,716.72	$ 88,890.44	$242,165.69	$ 216,641.04	-$ 80,075.68
Cootamundra-Gundagai	$ 505,419.00	$ 426,988.00	$ 87,452.00	$ 699,327.00	$ 609,511.00	$ 182,523.00	$ 524,549.08	$ 445,021.00	-$ 164,490.00
Greater Hume	$ 510,069.00	$ 444,787.00	$ 91,136.00	$ 710,056.00	$ 634,919.00	$ 190,132.00	$ 529,834.00	$ 463,572.00	-$ 171,347.00
Junee	$ 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
Lockhart	$ 220,933.00	$ 196,920.00	$ 40,347.00	$ 308,658.00	$ 281,100.00	$ 84,180.00	$ 229,689.00	$ 205,238.88	$ 75,861.12
Temora	$ 350,158.60	$ 303,004.00	$ 62,085.00	$ 486,480.59	$ 432,529.00	$ 129,525.00	$ 363,802.60	$ 315,801.27	-$ 116,727.73
TOTAL FOR REGION	**$ 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**

Member Councils	Total ESL Contribution 2022/23	RFS Component of ESL 2022/23	Increase in RFS Contributions	Total ESL Contribution 2023/24	RFS Component of ESL 2023/24	Increase in RFS Contributions
Bland	$ 649,987.00	$ 606,752.00	$ 152,306.00	$ 666,805.00	$ 607,162.00	$ 410.00
Coolamon	$322,623.57	$ 289,247.64	$ 72,606.60	$335,163.25	$ 289,442.96	$ 195.32
Cootamundra-Gundagai	$ 696,247.20	$ 594,168.00	$ 149,147.00	$ 731,148.59	$ 594,570.00	$ 402.00
Greater Hume	$ 705,627.00	$ 618,937.00	$ 155,365.00	$ 738,329.00	$ 619,355.00	$ 418.00
Junee	$ 333,620.00	$ 289,248.00	$ 72,608.00	$ 351,868.00	$ 289,444.00	$ 196.00
Lockhart	$ 305,176.00	$ 274,024.10	$ 68,785.22	$ 315,547.00	$ 274,209.10	$ 185.00
Temora	$ 482,705.82	$ 421,641.13	$ 105,839.86	$ 503,015.76	$ 421,926.08	$ 284.95
TOTAL FOR REGION	**$ 3,495,986.59**	**$ 3,094,017.87**	**$ 776,657.68**	**$ 3,641,876.60**	**$ 3,096,109.14**	**$ 2,091.27**