

cbd

REPORT

and

DETERMINATION

of

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL

under

SECTIONS 239 AND 241

of the

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1993

27 April 2012

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL
2012 ANNUAL REVIEW
REPORT

INTRODUCTION

PURSUANT to section 241 of the Local Government Act 1993 (the LG Act) the Local Government Remuneration Tribunal hereby determines in each category of Council, the maximum and minimum amount of fees to be paid to Mayors and Councillors of Councils, as well as Chairpersons and Members of County Councils.

On 14 November 2011 the Tribunal wrote to all Mayors advising of the commencement of the 2012 annual review. In respect of this review the Tribunal advised Councils that in addition to reviewing the minimum and maximum fee levels it would undertake a fundamental review of the categories. Section 239 of the LG Act requires the Tribunal to determine the categories of Councils and Mayoral offices at least once every 3 years.

AMENDMENTS TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1993 ("LG Act").

On 27 June 2011, the Parliament passed amendments to the LG Act to apply the same government public sector wages cap that binds the Industrial Relations Commission to the determination of ranges of fees for Councillors and Mayors. Similar amendments have been made to other legislation so that a similar cap applies to Members of Parliament, statutory officers and public sector executives.

For the LG Act the amendments provide for the addition of a new section 242A.

"242A Tribunal to give effect to declared government policy on remuneration for public sector staff"

- (1) *In making a determination, the Remuneration Tribunal is to give effect to the same policies on increases in remuneration as those that the Industrial Relations Commission is required to give effect to under section 146C of the Industrial Relations Act 1996 when making or varying awards or orders relating to the conditions of employment of public sector employees.*
- (2) *The policies referred to in subsection (1) do not include any policy that provides for increases in remuneration based on employee-related savings.*

Section 146C of the Industrial Relations Act 1996 Act ("the IR Act") provides

"...146C Commission to give effect to certain aspects of government policy on public sector employment"

- (1) *The Commission must, when making or varying any award or order, give effect to any policy on conditions of employment of public sector employees:*
 - (a) *that is declared by the regulations to be an aspect of government policy that is required to be given effect to by the Commission, and*
 - (b) *that applies to the matter to which the award or order relates.*
- (2) *Any such regulation may declare a policy by setting out the policy in the regulation or by adopting a policy set out in a relevant document referred to in the regulation."*

The current policy on wages pursuant to section 146C (1) (a) of the IR Act is articulated in the Industrial Relations (Public Sector Conditions of Employment) Regulation 2011. Clause 6 of the Regulation provides:

"...Other policies"

- (3) *The following policies are also declared, but are subject to compliance with the declared paramount policies:*
 - (a) *Public sector employees may be awarded increases in remuneration or other conditions of employment that do not increase employee-related costs by more than 2.5% per annum.*
 - (b) *Increases in remuneration or other conditions of employment that increase employee-related costs by more than 2.5% per annum can be awarded, but only if sufficient employee-related cost savings have been achieved to fully offset the increased employee-related costs. For this purpose:*
 - (i) *whether relevant savings have been achieved is to be determined by agreement of the relevant parties or, in the absence of agreement, by the Commission, and*
 - (ii) *increases may be awarded before the relevant savings have been achieved, but are not payable until they are achieved, and*
 - (iii) *the full savings are not required to be awarded as increases in remuneration or other conditions of employment.*
 - (c) *For the purposes of achieving employee-related cost savings, existing conditions of employment of the kind but in excess of the guaranteed minimum conditions of employment may only be reduced with the agreement of the relevant parties in the proceedings."*

On 31 October 2011 the Industrial Court of NSW determined that a challenge to the constitutional validity of the legislation amending the IR Act had failed.

Accordingly, subject to any successful challenge to the validity of the legislation amending the LG Act, and so far as the Tribunal is aware no such challenge has been lodged, the Tribunal when making a determination must now apply the same public sector wages cap that binds the Industrial Relations Commission.

Increases beyond 2.5 per cent per annum can be awarded by the Industrial Relations Commission but subject to the requirement that:

"...sufficient employee-related cost savings have been achieved to fully offset the increased employee-related costs."

However no increase beyond 2.5 per cent may be applied by the Tribunal to the minimum and maximum amounts of fees to be paid to Councillors and Mayors, because although section 242A (1) of the LG Act requires the Tribunal to apply the same policies as those of the Industrial Relations Commission, section 242A (2) of the LG Act expressly provides:

(2) The policies referred to in subsection (1) do not include any policy that provides for increases in remuneration based on employee-related savings.

This intent was confirmed by the Hon. Greg Pearce (Minister for Finance and Services, and Minister for the Illawarra) in the Minister's Second reading speech: Legislative Council, *Parliamentary Debates* (Hansard), 22 June 2011 at p. 3101 on the amendments to the Act where he stated:

"This bill will extend the Government's public sector wages policy to elected officials, State parliamentarians and local mayors and councillors, senior executives in the public service and statutory office holders. The Government's public sector wages policy is about delivering fair wage increases to hardworking public servants. It is also about ensuring that the State budget can be brought under control. This legislation means that we can get on with the business of delivering the infrastructure and services which this State needs and which its people deserve. Last week this Parliament passed the Industrial Relations Amendment (Public Sector Conditions of Employment) Bill 2011. That legislation requires the Industrial Relations Commission to give effect to the Government's wages policy when making decisions relating to public sector salaries. The reasons that bill was necessary are the very same reasons that it is now appropriate to extend the policy to other office holders who are paid from the public purse. If the policy is good enough for public servants it is certainly also good enough for senior executives and for elected officials. That is why, for the first time, the Government's wages policy will be formally extended to apply to elected officials and senior bureaucrats.

..Schedule 2 to the bill applies the same policy to elected officials at the local government level, to mayors and councillors. It provides that in future the Local Government Remuneration Tribunal will be required to give effect to the Government wages cap when setting the range of fees for mayors and councillors."

The intent of Parliament is clear. The 2.5 per cent cap on increases is to apply to the minimum and maximum fees that apply to Councillors and Mayors. The effect of the amendments to the LG Act is to remove the Tribunal's discretion to determine any increase in the minimum and maximum fees beyond 2.5 per cent.

2012 REVIEW OF CATEGORIES

Section 239 of the Act requires the Tribunal to determine categories for Councils and Mayoral offices for the purpose of determining fees, and section 240 of the Act requires the Tribunal to determine categories according to the following matters:

"240 (1)

- the size of areas
- the physical terrain of areas
- the population of areas and the distribution of the population
- the nature and volume of business dealt with by each Council
- the nature and extent of the development of areas
- the diversity of communities served
- the regional, national and international significance of the Council
- such matters as the Remuneration Tribunal considers relevant to the provision of efficient and effective local government
- such other matters as may be prescribed by the regulations. "

Prior to undertaking its review of categories the Tribunal, as is its normal practice, invited submissions from Mayors. For the current review the Tribunal requested that any submissions made should address the following matters:

- Whether the existing categories should be reduced/expanded and if so on what basis
- Whether the current categorisation is appropriate for your Council. If not, where do you consider it should be categorised and on what basis do you consider this re-categorisation should be granted.
- Significant changes in the role and responsibilities of Councillors and Mayors since 2009.
- Other matters you may wish the Tribunal to consider as part of this review.

The Tribunal also wrote to the Presidents of the Local Government and Shires Associations (LGSA) in similar terms, and subsequently met with the President of the Shires Association and Deputy President of the Local Government Association. The Tribunal wishes to place on record its appreciation to the President and Deputy President for meeting with the Tribunal.

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

In response to this review the Tribunal received 19 submissions from individual Councils and a submission from the LGSA. They key points from those submissions are summarised below.

Metropolitan Major

Penrith supports the current system of categorisation for Councils. The Council considers it appropriate to reclassify Penrith from Metropolitan Major to Major City in view of the Council's identified regional planning and service delivery role.

Metropolitan Centre

Individual submissions have been received from Bankstown, Fairfield, Gosford, Randwick and Sutherland Shire Councils. All Councils in this group have sought recategorisation to the category of Metropolitan Major.

Bankstown has suggested that the Tribunal establish a minimum population threshold of 180,000 for those Councils within the category of Metropolitan Major. The Tribunal could also consider consolidating the current categories of Metropolitan Centre, Metropolitan Major and Major City into two categories to achieve a simpler and more equitable grouping of similar Councils.

The submission from Fairfield has argued for recategorisation to Metropolitan Major on the basis that its population exceeds that of Penrith which is categorised thus.

Gosford has sought recategorisation on the basis of its population increase, expanded budget and service delivery issues. The submission has also advised that Gosford has been identified (by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure) as one of six major regional cities around Sydney and the Central Coast is now recognised as a separate region by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS).

Randwick City Council has sought recategorisation on the basis of its regional, state and national significance. The Council has indicated its support for the current categorisation system, but has suggested that the definition of Major Metropolitan be expanded to include a Council with a smaller population whose regional and national focus may be extensive.

The submission from Sutherland has again sought recategorisation to Metropolitan Major. The Council has argued that there is too great a disparity within the Metropolitan Centre Category between the larger Councils and the smaller Councils in the category. Sutherland suggests that the larger Councils in this category, including Sutherland, are as large as or larger than, and have responsibilities equal to or greater than, the Metropolitan Major Category and Major City Category Councils.

Metropolitan

Submissions have been received from Holroyd, Kogarah and Waverley Councils.

Holroyd Council seeks recategorisation to Metropolitan Centre. The submission states that Holroyd has both grown and changed dramatically in recent years and now finds itself to be a major industrial region. The submission argues that the Council is now a City of regional significance in the same way Councils such as Hurstville, North Sydney and Willoughby have grown into regionally dominant local government areas.

Kogarah seeks recategorisation to Metropolitan Centre. The Council's request is based on the growth and importance of Kogarah Town Centre and the impact this has had on the role and function of Councillors and Council.

Waverley has argued that the existing categorisation does not adequately reflect the strategic make up of the metropolitan area of Sydney or its future direction. The categorisation should take into account and be consistent with the strategic direction of Sydney as set out in the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036. In accordance with the strategy Waverley would be categorised with Hurstville, Willoughby and Campbelltown for remuneration purposes.

The Tribunal has also received a submission from the LGSA which supports the recategorisation of Auburn City Council and Canada Bay City Council to the category of Metropolitan Centre. Both Auburn and Canada Bay were found to have experienced significant growth and, based on population, population growth, revenue and expenditure those Councils were found to be comparable to other Councils in the Metropolitan Centre Category.

Regional Rural

Submissions from Councils in this group were received from Albury, Hawkesbury, Shellharbour, Shoalhaven and Wagga Wagga.

The submission received from Albury has not sought a change to the current method of categorisation but instead requested that the Tribunal consider the provision of a separate allowance for Deputy Mayors in recognition of their additional ongoing responsibilities.

Hawkesbury Council has argued that the work of its elected representatives, and in particular the Mayor, is equivalent to that experienced in the adjoining Councils of Penrith, Blacktown and The Hills, which are classified in higher categories. Hawkesbury Council has requested that the Tribunal give consideration to placing Hawkesbury City Council in a higher category or at the very least introduce a new category.

Shellharbour supports its current categorisation, however requests that the maximum for the range be increased to provide a realistic payment for those Councils considered at the top of the range.

Shoalhaven has argued that a case exists to differentiate the smaller Councils in category 3 from the larger Councils like Shoalhaven. Shoalhaven has also suggested an alternative category structure which would provide for a base level of remuneration together with additional incremental payments based upon the level of Council responsibility i.e. water/sewerage, population density etc.

Wagga Wagga supports the current categorisation model. The submission also notes the significant changes in the role and responsibilities of Councillors and Mayors since 2009 including:

- Increase in community expectations of Council
- Increase in governance requirements and legislative requirements
- Reduction in Councillor numbers
- Growth in population.

The Tribunal has also received a submission from the LGSA which supports the recategorisation of Cessnock, Coffs Harbour, Queanbeyan, Port Macquarie Hastings, Maitland, Port Stephens and Tamworth Regional to the category of Metropolitan. Those Councils were found to have experienced significant growth and based on population, population growth, revenue and expenditure were found to be comparable to other Councils in the Metropolitan Category.

Rural

Submissions from Councils in this group were received from Cabonne, Kiama, Kyogle and Muswellbrook.

Cabonne Council have supported the submission of the LGSA.

Kiama Council has argued that the current categorisation is inappropriate. The Council has additional pressures associated with being part of the Sydney Metropolitan Regional Planning area. In addition, the Council has a larger population, budget and area than a number of Councils categorised as metropolitan, but the Councillors and Mayors receive lower fees.

The submission from Kyogle has argued that the maximum fees payable to the rural category should be increased to the regional rural level. In support of this the Council has argued that there is essentially no difference in the role and responsibilities of Councillors/Mayors between these categories. They all handle varied functions, update their knowledge to understand long term strategic, financial and asset management planning issues as well as juggling Council workload.

Muswellbrook has also sought recategorisation to the category of regional rural. Muswellbrook submits that, notwithstanding its geographic area and population, it is the centre for the delivery of substantial regional services throughout the Upper Hunter Region.

CATEGORIES – FINDINGS

The Tribunal last undertook a fundamental review of the categories of Councils in 2009. In undertaking that review, the Tribunal found that there was no strong case to significantly alter the current categories of Councillor and Mayoral offices or to move individual Councils between categories. While the groupings remained unchanged, the Tribunal decided to apply descriptive titles to the categories to more accurately reflect the nature of the differences between the various groups.

While the majority of submissions indicated support for the existing categorisation framework, a number of submissions requested that the Tribunal have regard to the classification of metropolitan centres within Sydney as outlined in the “Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036” (Department of Planning and Infrastructure Dec 2010). The plan categorises suburbs within the Sydney metropolitan area as being Global Sydney, Regional Cities, Major Centres, Specialised Centres, Town Centres, Villages, and Neighbourhoods.

While those descriptors of the various categories are useful for comparative purposes, they do not present a relevant alternative to the current method of categorisation by the Tribunal which categorisation is purely for remuneration purposes. In addition, the categorisation of centres as outlined in the Metropolitan Plan is not based on local government boundaries and does not extend beyond the metropolitan area.

The categories as developed by the Tribunal are for the sole purpose of setting remuneration. In determining those categories the Tribunal is required to have regard to the matters outlined in section 240 of the Act. Those matters do not include having regard to plans or assumptions as to the future development of council areas. Having regard to the s.240 matters, the Tribunal has grouped Councils in categories on the basis that they have a large number of features in common. However, as each Council is different and has different challenges and opportunities, there will always be room for a difference of views as to the significance of differences between Councils in different categories while ever there is a requirement to categorise them.

In seeking recategorisation Councils often seek to draw a comparison between themselves and another Council in a category which provides a higher range of fees. These comparisons are usually based on one or two factors only, usually population or financial indicators. As outlined in the Act the Tribunal is required to have regard to a range of factors when categorising Councils. In suggesting whether or not recategorisation is warranted Councils should ensure they have taken into account the range of matters outlined in the Act prior to submitting a case to the Tribunal.

Having regard to the submissions received, the findings of previous reviews, and issues raised by the LGSA and the Division of Local Government, the Tribunal finds that no change is warranted to the existing categorisation framework or to the current categorisation of individual Councils. The characteristics of Councils categorised in each of the groups is outlined in detail in appendix A of the 2009 report and determination. The Tribunal has reviewed the characteristics of each of the categories and found that they continue to adequately reflect the differences between the various types of Councils, and the Tribunal has also reviewed the individual requests for recategorisation and found that no change in the categorisation of individual Councils is warranted.

The Tribunal’s response to each of the requests for recategorisation is outlined in the following summary.

Major City

The Tribunal does not support Penrith's request to move from the category of Metropolitan Major to Major City. The Tribunal found, having regard to the definitions provided in the 2009 report and determination, the extent of regional services provided by Penrith is not comparable to that provided by Councils in the category of Major City. In addition, the Tribunal notes that there would be no material gain for Councillors or Mayors in recategorisation to Major City as the fees are identical to those provided to Metropolitan Major. As outlined in the 2009 report and determination the descriptive titles were applied to avoid the perception of a ranking system and were designed to reflect the characteristics of Councils for the purposes of categorisation for remuneration purposes only.

Metropolitan Major

The Councils which sought recategorisation to Metropolitan Major did so on the basis of size of population, population growth and provision of regional services. A number of submissions also provided comparisons with Penrith as justification for their inclusion in this category.

Metropolitan Major (previously category 1A) was created in 2001 in recognition of Blacktown's significant population (264,799 in 2001). As outlined in the 2001 report and determination category 1A was to comprise category 1 Councils with a resident population of 250,000 (Blacktown) or more or any other special feature of section 240 which the Tribunal considers distinguishes them from other Councils in category 1.

In 2002 the Tribunal determined that Penrith would also be categorised as category 1A. The recategorisation was based on Penrith's leading role in regional planning and providing services to greater western Sydney. The Tribunal also highlighted growth in the region and stated:

"it is anticipated that Penrith will continue to grow to about 200,000 in the next 10 years depending on the ebb and flow of urban development projects"

The Tribunal notes that Penrith's population is currently 186,221 (est. res. pop. 30 June 2010). The current population is well short of the Tribunal's estimate of 200,000 by 2012.

The Tribunal has considered many requests for recategorisation since the categories were first established in 1994 and has only moved Councils where there was considered to be significant reason for doing so. While the Tribunal's decision to re-categorise Penrith to category 1A was based on what were considered significant reasons at the time, the Tribunal made a number of assumptions about the long term development of the Council which have not been realised.

Fairfield, Bankstown, Gosford, Randwick and Sutherland Councils have provided submissions, but the Tribunal has found that their submissions did not demonstrate a significant case for recategorisation. While a number of these Councils have populations that exceed that of Penrith, it is clear that the Tribunal's earlier assumptions about projected growth in Penrith's population did not eventuate so that comparative population numbers are not relevant, and the relevant Councils do not provide or embody the same regional focus as does Penrith. In addition, while populations have increased overall, the ABS reveals that these Councils, like Penrith, have not experienced significant growth.

Metropolitan Centre

These Councils are defined typically as large multi-purpose organisations which serve as regional centres for the interests of a wider number of residents. They are characterised as having large populations, and support significant infrastructure, commercial/retail facilities and may host major recreational, health and education facilities.

Six Councils have sought recategorisation to Metropolitan Centre with an additional two Councils nominated for inclusion in this group by the LGSA. Reasons to seek recategorisation include population growth and provision of regional services. A number of submissions provided comparisons with Hurstville as justification for their inclusion in this category.

The Tribunal's 2001 determination recategorised Hurstville from category 2 (Metropolitan) to category 1 (Metropolitan Centre). The Tribunal's decision to recategorise Hurstville was based on expected population growth and its assessment that the Hurstville CBD is a regional growth centre for the St George region. The Tribunal also found that

"The three Category 1 Councils most directly comparable with Hurstville are Hornsby, Willoughby and North Sydney."

With the exception of North Sydney which has a large CBD, Willoughby and North Sydney Councils are the smallest within the category of Metropolitan Centre in respect of population and scope of operations. Their inclusion was based at the time on the particular circumstances which set them aside from other Councils in category 2 (Metropolitan).

Each Council has its own particular characteristics and it is not one but an aggregation of those which determines categorisation. The Tribunal has reviewed those Councils which have sought or been nominated for recategorisation to Metropolitan Centre having regard to the definitions for each category and the characteristics of the Councils within each group. Based on the information received the Tribunal found that those Councils did not demonstrate either the scale or diversity of operations of Metropolitan Centres and therefore recategorisation is not warranted at this time.

Metropolitan

A number of Councils categorised as Regional Rural were nominated by the LGSA for inclusion within the category of Metropolitan. That recommendation was based mainly on population and financial indicators.

In 2009 the Tribunal introduced descriptive titles for each of the categories to better differentiate the groups based on their particular characteristics. The descriptive titles replaced the previous number system which had created a perception of ranking. Regional Rural Councils are distinct from Metropolitan Councils in that they contain a mix of urban and rural settlements and provide regional services, such as airports, to communities throughout their region.

The range of fees payable to Councils within the categories of Metropolitan and Regional Rural is currently identical. While there is some comparability between these groups in regard to size of population and financial operations, when having regard to a wider range of factors, Councils in the category of Regional Rural retain enough distinct characteristics to warrant a separate category.

Regional Rural

The Tribunal reviewed the arguments provided by both Muswellbrook and Kiama for recategorisation to regional rural. While these Councils are at the top end of the rural category, they do not presently provide the extent of regional services which would warrant reclassification to Regional Rural.

The Tribunal has also considered the submission from Kyogle which has argued that there is essentially no difference in the role and responsibilities of the Mayor and Councillors of Kyogle and those of Mayors and Councillors in surrounding Councils which are in a higher category. A not dissimilar submission was made by Hawkesbury. The LG Act outlines the role and responsibilities of Councillors (Part 2, Division 2) and Mayors (Part 2, Division 3). While all Councillors and Mayors are expected to undertake duties to comply with the statutory role and responsibilities, the workload and the complexity of the work required from individual elected officials will differ from Council to Council.

The Tribunal is required by the LG Act to categorise Councils for the purpose of determining remuneration and does so having regard to the matters outlined in section 240 (1) of the LG Act. The scale or diversity of operations within Councils impacts upon the role and responsibilities of Councillors. Councils within the Rural Regional category are expected to have additional responsibilities associated with the provision of regional services and these additional responsibilities are reflected in a higher fee.

Shoalhaven has suggested that a new category be introduced to cater for the larger Regional Rural Councils. This category would also include Tweed, Port Macquarie and Coffs Harbour. Based on the information provided, Shoalhaven has not demonstrated, aside from size of population, that it is significantly different from other large Councils in the Regional Rural group. On that basis the Tribunal does not support the creation of a new category at this time.

CONCLUSION

The Tribunal continues to monitor local government initiatives and inform itself of the Government's direction for local government. In particular the Tribunal welcomes proposals to improve local government such as those identified as part of the Destination2036 initiative.

The Minister for Local Government, the Hon Don Page MP, recently announced an independent review to identify options to improve the strength and effectiveness of local government in NSW. A strong and viable local government sector that is able to meet the service delivery and infrastructure needs of local communities is critical to the future prosperity of NSW.

Local government has been working with the NSW Government as part of the Destination2036 initiative to identify solutions to the challenges faced by the sector. The review will build on the Destination2036 initiative and identify options for governance models, structural arrangements and boundary changes. It will take into account the different nature and needs of regional, rural and metropolitan communities.

The review is to be undertaken by a three member panel comprising the Chairperson, Professor Graham Sansom and Members Ms Jude Munro, A.O. and Mr Glenn Inglis. The panel will commence on 14 May 2012 and is expected to report back to the Minister for Local Government by July 2013. Any changes recommended by the panel will then need to be considered by Government.

The review panel will consult widely with the local government sector, the broader community and other key stakeholders. The terms of reference for the panel will result in consideration of and recommendations on many of the actions identified in the draft Destination2036 action plan. Councils have expressed strong support for the Destination 2036 initiative and the draft action plan. The work plan sets out the first steps in a long-term reform agenda.

The Tribunal supports initiatives which will bring about improvements in the local government sector. In addition, the Tribunal welcomes the collaborative approach taken by the Government and the local government sector to bring about reform. The Tribunal will monitor the progress of the panel over the coming year.

As outlined at the beginning of the report the Tribunal is now required to have regard to the Government's wages policy when determining the increase to apply to the minimum and maximum fees that apply to Councillors and Mayors. The public sector wages policy currently provides for a cap on increases of 2.5 per cent.

The Tribunal has reviewed the key economic indicators, including the Consumer Price Index and Labour Price Index, and finds that the full increase of 2.5 per cent available to it is warranted. On that basis, and having regard to the above, and after taking the views of the Assessors into account, the Tribunal considers that an increase of 2.5 per cent in the fees for Councillors and Mayors is appropriate and so determines

Dated: 27 April 2012.

HELEN WRIGHT,
Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

**DETERMINATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 239 OF CATEGORIES OF COUNCILS AND
COUNTY COUNCILS EFFECTIVE FROM 1 JULY 2012**

Category – Principal City (1)

Sydney

Category – Major City (3)

Newcastle

Parramatta

Wollongong

Category – Metropolitan Major (2)

Blacktown

Penrith

Category – Metropolitan Centre (16)

Bankstown

Liverpool

Campbelltown

North Sydney

Fairfield

Randwick

Gosford

Ryde

The Hills

Sutherland

Hornsby

Warringah

Hurstville

Willoughby

Lake Macquarie

Wyong

Category – Metropolitan (21)

Ashfield

Holroyd

Marrickville

Auburn

Hunters Hill

Mosman

Botany

Kogarah

Pittwater

Burwood

Ku-ring-gai

Rockdale

Camden

Lane Cove

Strathfield

Canada Bay

Leichhardt

Waverley

Canterbury

Manly

Woollahra

Category – Regional Rural (32)

Albury

Cessnock

Greater Taree

Port Stephens

Armidale Dumaresq

Clarence Valley

Griffith

Shellharbour

Ballina

Coffs Harbour

Hawkesbury

Shoalhaven

Bathurst

Dubbo

Kempsey

Tamworth

Bega Valley

Eurobodalla

Lismore

Tweed

Blue Mountains

Great Lakes

Maitland

Wagga Wagga

Broken Hill

Goulburn Mulwaree

Orange

Wingecarribee

Byron

Queanbeyan

Port Macquarie-Hastings

Wollondilly

Category – Rural (77)

Balranald

Cowra

Lachlan

Snowy River

Bellingen

Deniliquin

Leeton

Temora

Berrigan

Dungog

Lithgow

Tenterfield

Bland

Forbes

Liverpool Plains

Tumbarumba

Blayney

Gilgandra

Lockhart

Tumut

Bogan

Glen Innes Severn

Mid-Western

Upper Hunter

Bombala

Gloucester

Moree Plains

Upper Lachlan

Boorowa

Greater Hume

Murray

Uralla

Bourke

Gundagai

Murrumbidgee

Urana

Brewarrina

Gunnedah

Muswellbrook

Wakool

Cabonne

Guyra

Nambucca

Walcha

Carrathool

Gwydir

Narrabri

Walgett

Central Darling

Harden

Narrandera

Warren

Cobar

Hay

Narromine

Warrumbungle

Conargo

Inverell

Palerang

Weddin

Coolamon

Jerilderie

Parkes

Wellington

Cooma-Monaro

Junee

Oberon

Wentworth

Coonamble

Kiama

Richmond Valley

Yass Valley

Cootamundra

Kyogle

Singleton

Young

Corowa

TOTAL GENERAL PURPOSE COUNCILS**152**

Category – County Councils Water (5)

Central Tablelands Riverina Water
 Goldenfields Water Rous
 MidCoast

Category – County Councils Other (9)

Castlereagh – Macquarie Richmond River
 Central Murray Southern Slopes
 Far North Coast Upper Hunter
 Hawkesbury River Upper Macquarie
 New England Tablelands

TOTAL COUNTY COUNCILS**14****DETERMINATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 241 OF FEES FOR COUNCILLORS AND MAYORS**

Pursuant to section 241 of the Local Government Act 1993, the annual fees to be paid in each of the categories to Councillors, Mayors, Members and Chairpersons of County Councils effective on and from 1 July 2012 are determined as follows:

	Councillor/Member Annual Fee		Mayor/Chairperson Additional Fee*	
	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Principal City	23,250	34,100	142,250	187,180
Major City	15,490	25,580	32,940	74,530
Metropolitan Major	15,490	25,580	32,940	74,530
Metropolitan Centre	11,640	21,700	24,700	57,660
Metropolitan	7,740	17,060	16,480	37,230
Regional Rural	7,740	17,060	16,480	37,230
Rural	7,740	10,220	8,220	22,310
County Council – Water	1,540	8,530	3,300	14,000
County Council – Other	1,540	5,100	3,300	9,310

* This fee must be paid in addition to the fee paid to the Mayor/Chairperson as a Councillor/Member (section 249 (2)).

Dated: 27 April 2012.

HELEN WRIGHT,
 Local Government Remuneration Tribunal