



## Q1 Regional Arrangements (TOR 3) (cont.)

Type of Regional Arrangement	1997-98 outlay	1998-99 outlay	1999-2000 outlay	2000-01 outlay	2001-02 outlay
Other (specify)					
Boonah Beaudesert Ipswich Joint Tourism Association	\$1 000	\$1 000	\$1 000	\$1 000	\$1 000
Queensland Fire Services – Maintenance of Retic/Fire Hydrants and water used for fire fighting (CSO)	\$56 305	\$11 444	\$20 132	\$22 138	\$45 142
In-kind Lab Support to Ecosystem Health Monitoring Program	\$27 027	\$15 000	\$15 000	\$14 576	\$15 000
Cash	\$14 000	\$14 000	\$14 000	\$14 000	\$14 000
Moreton Bay Waterways & Catchments Partnership (RWQMS)	\$49 396	\$53 000	\$53 000	\$63 000	\$63 000
Bremer River Management Group	\$40 000	\$45 000	\$45 000	\$45 000	\$45 000
Waterways Cleanup				\$10 000	\$10 000
Regional Planning Forum (SEQ2021 Project)					\$30 000

**\*Note:**

Also participate basis of time/effort into variety of groups, studies SEQROC is taking responsibility – should be State Government on regional planning and infrastructure development.

*(b) Do you consider there is scope for more regional level activities involving Local Government to provide enhanced outcomes and improved services for communities, including more effective use of resources?*

YES

If 'yes' what opportunities do you consider exist?

Yes if the regional plans clearly identify regional issues and enable local government to respond. Need downward funding from State/Federal Government.

Yes, specifically in sub regional and regional natural resource management and sport/recreation provision.

## Q2 Agency Arrangements

Could you please identify below specific **contract works** (and value in 2001–02) undertaken for State, Federal or other semi-government agencies. This relates to reimbursable works undertaken on a fee for service basis for these other bodies.

Agency	Nature of Activities	Value of Contracts (2001–02)
Main Roads	Road maintenance	\$800 000
	Various Water/Sewerage Private Works	\$26 890
	Amenity/Landscape Works	\$50 000
Main Roads		
Dept Natural Resources and Mines	Various Water/Sewerage Private Works	\$107
Qld Parks and Wildlife Service		
Environmental Protection Agency		
Public Works Dept		
Queensland Health (incl. Ipswich Hospital)	Various Water/Sewerage Private Works	\$9 932
Queensland Education		
Telstra		
Ergon/Energex	Various Water/Sewerage Private Works	\$2 491
Others (specify)		
Queensland Ambulance Service	Various Water/Sewerage Private Works	\$4 560
ATSIC	Various Water/Sewerage Private Works	\$1 715
Queensland Housing Commission	Various Water/Sewerage Private Works	\$107 436
Qbuild	Various Water/Sewerage Private Works	\$347

## Q3 Discretionary Activities

Could you please identify below, specific functions and activities (and value in 2001–02) undertaken by your Council, which would not normally be regarded as an activity of local government, or would typically be provided by a State or Federal agency (including corporatised/privatised organisations) elsewhere in Australia. The reason for involvement could be inadequate or non existent services.

Function	Nature of Activity	Outlays (2001–02)	Revenue 2001–02 (if any)
Law and Order (e.g. night patrols)	Safe City Camera –	\$749 606	\$432 455 (benefited levy)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBD area and Security Patrols in CBD</li> <li>• Outer CBD</li> <li>• Goodna Business District</li> </ul> Trail bike patrols and provision of plant to Queensland Police	\$25 000	
Health (e.g. support for rural doctor, hospital funding)			

### Q3 Discretionary Activities (cont.)

Function	Nature of Activity	Outlays (2001–02)	Revenue 2001–02 (if any)
Education (e.g. support to some aspect of primary/secondary education)	Library, Internet Training and Library Services	Difficult to quantify as the resources are not used solely by students (* see note)	
Welfare (e.g. aged care)			
Public Housing (not staff housing)	Jordan Village Aged Care	\$76 483	\$52 000
Communications (e.g. television/radio)			
Roads/Transport (not Council roads or MRD contract works)			
Environment Protections (e.g. clean up of chemical spills)	Securing/managing land of regional conservation value and off reserve partnership with private land owners. Also support of catchment management and landcare groups.	\$1 400 000	
Other (specify)			
Office Accommodation – community organisations, W. G. Hayden Humanities Building	Low cost office accommodation for community based community service organisations	\$420 662	\$15 000
Youth Development Officer (Department of Families only fund 5 across the State)	Direct and advocacy service for young people	\$77 709	Nil
Regional Art Gallery – Global Arts Link	Public Art Gallery and Social History Museum State Government only funds State based institutions for operational costs. Need to receive funds from State to operate regional art and cultural facilities.	\$1 288 521	\$54 000
Planning Legislation	Implementation of Planning Legislation	\$300 000-400 000 per annum (**see note)	
Community Health	Disposal of syringes and sharps (Queensland Health Needle Exchange Program)	\$10 000-15 000	

\* Note with respect to Education

Statistics indicate that students whether TAFE, School or University make up approximately 35% of users of public libraries which are primarily funded by local government yet there is no monetary recognition for the role played by public libraries in supporting education.

### Q3 Discretionary Activities (cont.)

**\*\* Note with respect to Planning legislation**

Local governments are taking responsibility for the implementation of new planning legislation. Considerable expense in the development of regional plans and implementation/development control process. State Departments have not taken a strategic approach to role/service delivery in accordance with regional plans.

### Q4 Devolution of Responsibilities (TOR 4)

*The following question seeks to identify both costs imposed on Local Government through transfer from Commonwealth or State Governments [part (a)] as well as costs resulting from increased compliance or administrative requirements of other spheres of government [part (b)].*

*(a) Do you consider that devolution of responsibilities (i.e. functions transferred from the Commonwealth or State to Local Government) over the last ten years to your Council have placed an increased financial burden on you Council, after allowing for any increased revenues resulting.*

YES

*If 'yes', please identify below those functions or activities that you consider have been devolved from the State or Commonwealth in the last ten years and have resulted in increased financial burdens (e.g. environmental responsibilities, emergency services, etc.)*

Activity/Function	Estimated Annual Cost	Estimated Annual Income (i.e. fees, user charges or specific purpose grants)
Fire ant inspection of projects	\$100 000	Nil
Devolution of parts of Environmental Protection Act	\$201 279	\$80 100
Mosquito Control on Crown Land	\$20 000	Nil
Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002	\$210 950	\$27 000
Federal funded grants programs – DIMIA Migrant Settlement Worker	Council provides additional funds through meeting overhead costs, administration and operational support costs \$25 000 per annum per officer	\$20 000 per year for two years
New Planning Legislation	New planning legislation positive but rather top down using local government to bottom up feed into the process. Local government required to try to anticipate state interests.  IPA and planning associated legislation being fed down to local government to implement. IPA contemplates state/regional interest by example \$1.5m funded local government SEQ2021; State \$1.5m. Regional planning clearly a state role and responsibility. Local Government showing the way.	

#### **Q4 Devolution of Responsibilities (TOR 4) (cont.)**

##### General Comment:

Negotiations with State and Federal governments on funding levels to support targeted joint programs/activities will require greater attention to the level of contribution provided by the parties and a recognition there is increased pressure on Local Governments to meet overhead and operational costs (without an increase in resources) associated with the financial administration of grants **as well as** develop capacity of community based organisations to deliver services which may still remain or previously were part of the State and Federal governments portfolio.

In recognition of these arrangements Ipswich City Council has valued, enjoyed and continue to support the success of strong working relationships and partnerships with State and Federal government departments to deliver outcomes that achieve enhanced quality of life for Ipswich residents, whilst meeting multiple agency objectives. In addition these partnerships have been facilitated through the Local Government Association of Queensland, specifically the Local Area Multicultural Program, to assist in developing structural change within communities to enable all levels of government address the needs of diverse communities in an integrated and holistic way.

This is evidenced by the capacity and results achieved by Ipswich City Council in securing ongoing funding to respond to identified community needs in the areas of:

**Public Safety** – Safe City Program securing ongoing funding from Department of Local Government and Planning under the Security Improvement Program to support crime prevention initiatives and the Management of Public Intoxication Program, funded by Department of Families in recognition of the need for an integrated local response to address the issues of youth and public intoxication.

- The partnerships achieved in securing funding are further supported by engagement of the private sector, which establishes the basis for achieving all levels of governments objectives in developing capacity within the community to achieve long-term sustainability.
- Provision of home maintenance and modification services to older persons and people with disabilities to improve safety within the home through the Home Assist Secure and Home Modifications Program fully funded by Departments of Housing and Families and thus support independent living of people in these target groups.

**Social Justice** – Provision of advocacy and brokerage services to connect people most disadvantaged in the community to access services provided by both State and Federal agencies inclusive of people from Non-English Speaking Background and refugees and migrants – respectively the Department of Immigration , Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs and Multicultural Affairs Queensland.

The key challenge in regards to the process of different delivery models utilised by Federal, State and Local governments is that there is lack of syncopation between each level of governments service delivery model.

In particular for Federal government agencies services are delivered through a centralised model that relies on the community having highly developed and well resourced technological platforms to access information as well engage with the funding agents. From the State perspective, whilst there are regional models of service delivery, the decision making and resource allocation capability of many State government agencies has become centralised thus limiting the capacity of these agencies to effect strong sectoral partnerships.

**Q4 Devolution of Responsibilities (TOR 4) (cont.)**

The continuing trend that Local Governments are experiencing is the increase in community expectations through the measured withdrawal of service provision previously undertaken by Federal and State agencies and increased consumer education the community is undertaking as a result of this process. This coupled with local government being within the community and being at the direct interface has facilitated a shift in communities seeking more from local government as the vehicle to enact the response to provide the appropriate levels of services and resources to meet local communities needs.

*(b) Could you please identify other functions and activities where requirements of Commonwealth or State legislation have resulted in increased compliance/administrative costs for Local Government over the last ten years. Could you also estimate the additional annual compliance costs you believe are associated with each activity identified.*

<b>Activity/Function</b>	<b>Additional Annual Compliance Cost</b>
Environmental Compliance	\$10 000
Workplace Health & Safety	\$10 000
Water Act 2000	\$10 000
Environmental Protection Act	\$100 000
Increase Compliance for Landfill Remediation	\$1 200 000
Insurance – Public Liability	Impact on service providers contract by C&CS Department to undertake works in Home Assist Secure and Global Arts Link – costs yet to be measured
Jordan Village	Increase in costs to meet legislative requirements including disability, Workplace, Health and Safety. Increase in \$15 000 for 2002–03
W. G. Hayden Humanities Building	As above, costs yet to be quantified due to audit currently being undertaken

*(c) In relation to both the devolution of responsibilities [part (a) above] or additional compliance and administrative costs [part (b) above], could you please estimate the number of additional staff required (if any) to meet these additional responsibilities over the last ten years.*

*Estimated additional staff required for (a) and (b) above: 19*

**Q5 Rationalisation of Roles (TOR 5)**

*(a) Are there any specific areas of service provision in your local area which are currently undertaken by State or Commonwealth Government departments or agencies which you feel could be better undertaken by your Council in terms of better use of resources and better service outcomes?*

YES. Serious consideration could be given to expanding the role of local governments to include responsibilities in the areas of health, education, environment, community law enforcement and employment and job creation programs where local governments are best placed to deliver appropriate services subject to the provision of adequate funding by either the State or Federal Government.

## Q5 Rationalisation of Roles (TOR 5) (cont.)

If 'yes', could you please identify the specific services or functions you are referring to:

Function/Service	Why better outcome?
Employment and job creation programs and other Federal Government and other agency programs	State Government overheads will no longer be charged to Programs and more money will be available for projects. Local authorities are better placed to determine local priorities ensuring more effective use of available funds.

*(b) Are there any specific roles of Local Government that you consider would be better undertaken by the State or Commonwealth Governments?*

YES

If 'yes', could you please identify the specific services or functions you are referring to:

Function/Service	Why better outcome?
Regional Conservation	This would better recognise the wider significance and catchment of the regional values rather than rely on individual Councils.

## Q6 Other Issues

*Are there any other issues relevant to funding arrangements for Local Government that you consider are important to bring to the attention of this Inquiry? If so, what are they?*

The key issue in relation to funding arrangements is the State and Federal government meeting the true costs of Local Government delivering services on behalf of these levels of government in order to provide services that ensures a quality of life for Australian citizens.

## Q7 Other Comments

*Do you have any additional comments to make in relation to this Inquiry and its Terms of Reference, or any particular points you would like to see made in the LGAQ submission to the Inquiry?*