LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD
REPORT TO MINISTER 2002 - 03

Introduction

Since the Board last reported, in the autumn of 2002, it has conducted four General Reviews covering Northern Midlands and King Island Councils and Launceston and Clarence City Councils. It has also undertaken a Special Review concerning the number of Aldermen at Burnie City Council. In addition it has completed follow up reviews of Flinders and West Coast Councils. While a General Review of Brighton Council was largely undertaken in the 2002-03 year, the report had not been published during that year and the major features of this review will form part of the next Board annual report.

The Board has completed a review of its Guidelines for general reviews. The revised guidelines are published on the Board’s website as well as being an attachment to this Report.

This year’s report takes a somewhat different approach to those of earlier years. It discusses issues which have arisen principally during the last year in relation to the ten sets of issues contained in the Guidelines for general reviews.

1. Constitutional and structural matters covered by section 9(1) of the Act;
2. Governance;
3. Regulatory functions;
4. Community Development Communication and Consultation;
5. Roles and Responsibilities of Elected Members;
7. Asset Management;
8. Financial matters
9. Developing Local Government; and
10. Other matters.

In each case the discussion introduces the issues under consideration and recent positive and negative trends are identified with reference also being made to the findings described in earlier annual reports.

Of the Councils most recently reviewed, those whose practices in a particular area may be regarded as providing an example that may be applied by others elsewhere have been identified.

Finally the report concludes with an updated list of examples of leading practice, which was commenced in the last annual report.

Such issues as municipal boundaries and the number of Councillors did not feature significantly in the
general reviews the Board has conducted during the last year.

Following representation from Burnie City Council, however, the Minister requested the Board to
undertake a Specific Review of the number of Aldermen. Presentation by Council of a case that the
number should be reduced from twelve to nine was followed by a discussion with Council
representatives and others who gave evidence to the Board. Following this discussion, the Board
developed six criteria that should on balance be satisfied in order for it to make a recommendation in
accordance with the Council submission. These criteria were:

- More efficient decision making
- Same or better representation
- Leadership
- Promotes better teamwork
- More able to fulfil the changing and growing role of Local Government
- Council and community support.

Discussion with Burnie City Council representatives around the issues of representation proved to be
sufficiently interesting for the Board to consider that they might have wider application across Local
Government as a whole. The Board made the following observations in its report of this Special
Review:

During consideration of this proposal the Board has found it useful to distinguish
between direct and indirect representation of community opinion. Traditionally,
representation has been seen primarily as representation of electors through
individual elected members to the Council. Such direct representation, while it is
uniquely personal, may not be democratic or equitable, since it depends for its
effectiveness upon the assumption that all citizens have equal access to information
and equal access to or knowledge of elected representatives. If that assumption
cannot be maintained, such direct representation could be elitist because those who
are well-connected are more likely to have their voices heard and their interests
served. Defects in such direct representation may, in part, have led both to a distrust
of government and to demands for greater and more effective representation of,
consultation with, and participation by, citizens in decisions which affect them and
the community in which they live.

The forms of indirect representation under the term “community consultation and
participation” have the potential to improve the quality of representation overall and
ensure that it is more equitable, inclusive, diverse and balanced.

The Board is encouraged by the recognition by Council that the role of elected
members has changed significantly as a result of the 1993 legislation. The effect of
this legislation has been to move the elected member away from being an advocate
representing individual community members or ratepayers in a particular area. The
role is now one of representing the whole of the community, of interpreting a range of
data that is derived from community consultation measures and helping to set the
policy and long-term direction based on much more comprehensive information.
In considering the wider application of the changing nature of representation by elected representatives and their changing role, the Board notes that it has previously reported that it continues to observe an increased acceptance of the philosophy and practice of community consultation in Tasmanian Local Government as a whole. This matter is referred to later in this report in section 4 Community Consultation.
2. Governance

In conducting general reviews the Board has in mind that a basic principle of the Act is that Councils are accountable to their communities. Review of the various accountability measures contained in the Act is, therefore, a major focus of the review of Governance functions of Councils.

a. **Annual Reports.** Previously reported improvements in the quality of these reports have been a feature of General Reviews conducted during the last year.

b. **Annual General Meetings.** The requirement that councils conduct an Annual General Meeting (AGM) is a feature of the current Act. In almost all of the reviews it has conducted, the Board has observed that these meetings have been poorly attended and Council promotion of these events has varied. The Board is pleased to report, however, that the General Review of Launceston City Council revealed a Council that has continued to attract a large number of citizens to its AGM. It has achieved this by taking action that reflects its belief that the AGM is an important means of reporting to and communicating with its community. These actions include holding a City Expo. in conjunction with the Annual General Meeting as well as invitations being sent to individuals and groups that represent the Launceston community. The Board believes that councils could do more to use the AGM as a means of communication and consultation with their communities but nevertheless has reported that this is a matter ultimately for each council to determine.

c. **Strategic planning.** The strategic plan should, in the Board’s view, be the primary document which guides all of a Council’s activity and advocacy and should be a summary of all other plans, policies and programmes. It should be the instrument which describes the Council’s philosophical basis for its existence and its accountability and governance frameworks. Most Council’s have now endorsed what might be termed second-generation strategic plans, which are characterised by development through extensive and at times intensive community consultation exercises. The Board believes that it is prudent that these plans be revised and updated in a consultative manner on an annual basis.

d. **Council committees, workshops and representation.** This issue received extensive coverage in the last annual report particularly as it related to exclusion of access by the public and the transparency of decision-making that this is intended to guarantee. There appears to be some confusion about the distinction between Council Committees established under Section 23 and Special Committees under Section 24. Section 23 Committees consist of Councillors only and meetings are subject to advertising, public availability of agendas and minutes as well as public access to meetings except when a meeting moves into “closed session” under the prescribed criteria. The Board continues to detect a tendency for decisions effectively to be made in workshops or in other informal gatherings with only scant discussion of issues in meetings that are accessible to the public.

e. **Reporting by Council representatives.** Previous annual reports have highlighted the large amount of time that elected members spend representing their Councils on various committees, boards and authorities. The Board has also previously reported that the quality of that representation is compromised when reporting arrangements by representatives to Councils are deficient. This is particularly the case when the representation is on a single or joint authority, which delivers a service that is normally delivered by Councils with the associated opportunity for transparent decision-making and community accountability. The Board found an example of leading practice in this regard where at Clarence the Council has developed a “Governance framework for establishment and the appointment of Committees Boards and Authorities by the Council.”
f. **Voter participation in Council elections.** The 2002 Council elections again reflected the general pattern that voter turnout continues to be higher in the smaller rural municipal areas than in the larger urban centres. This represents a challenge particularly to Councils of larger population areas to attempt to engage the community more in local democratic processes.

g. **Delegations.** The Board has observed widely differing practices during the last year. In most Councils, appropriate delegations are in place and delegations registers are up-to-date and in order. This is generally a feature of councils where the respective roles of the elected representatives and the General Manager and employees are well understood and accepted. In other examples, the reverse is the case. While the level of delegations particularly to the General Manager and Council officers is a matter for individual councils to decide, the Board continues to recommend that systems of delegation be put in place and approved under seal and that delegations be subject to periodic review. While recognising the essential democratic role played by the elected body, the Board nevertheless observes that delegated decision-making is likely to provide better service to the Community, to be more efficient and less costly than extensive operational decisions being made by the elected representatives.
3. Regulatory Functions

Councils’ regulatory functions reviewed by the Board include animal control, public and environmental health, building planning and development control, waste management, emergency management planning and planning with regard to people with disabilities. Extensive use is made by the Board of information arising from the state-wide Key Performance Indicator (KPI) project contained in the publication “Measuring Council Performance in Tasmania”.

a. **Planning.** Last year the Board reported that the recognition by elected representatives of Councils of their role as members of planning authorities was urgently required. It was also reported that not all Councils had come to terms with the provisions of the *Judicial Review Act*. This year the Board is pleased to report some progress. The Board understands that many Council’s have undertaken professional development in the provisions of this legislation and that both elected members and employees have been involved. Clarence City Council in particular has developed an excellent system of incorporating the provisions of this legislation into its decision-making processes.

There are two outstanding issues to which the Board wishes to draw attention. Firstly Councils must ensure that they comply with the provisions of planning schemes and comply with conditions of approval where they are involved either as proponents or advocates of a development. Secondly, there is a need for Council’s to separate their role as developer or proponent from the role of the planning authority. The Board suggests that in cases where Councils find themselves in this conflicting position, they deal with reports on each of these aspects separately.

b. **Disability Access and Action Plans.** The Board has observed excellent examples at, for example, Clarence, Hobart and Launceston, both in the development of plans under the *Disability Discrimination Act* and involvement by access advisory committees in the planning and development process. It has also observed, however, that not all Council’s have yet developed an action plan under the legislation. It regards this as a matter of importance and of some urgency.

c. **Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).** On two occasions during the last year the Board discovered that Councils had submitted data for inclusion in the KPI project that conflicted with data included later in those Councils’ submissions to a general review by the Board. The Board believes that the KPI project is sufficiently important that all data should be audited for its accuracy before being submitted.

In an area of increasing importance, which is normally not the subject of legislative prescription, general reviews provide an opportunity for Councils to demonstrate policies, programs and activities which are largely discretionary in nature.

a. Community consultation. Reference has already been made to the extensive nature of the consultation that has accompanied the revision of strategic plans. The Board is pleased to report again that there is a much greater acceptance of the principle of consultation across the complete range of decision-making. In conducting the Special Review into the number of aldermen at Burnie, the Board observed that it would be extremely valuable to obtain from the various community development officers employed by Tasmanian councils an impression of how the results of consultation are used by elected members in decision-making. While a number of Councils have comprehensive community consultation policies, which are applied consistently, in others the approach to consultation is more ad hoc. In the Board’s view, these Councils should develop a more structured approach to consultation.

b. Planning. A feature of the reviews of Councils in this area is the evidence of a great variety of planning being undertaken in the community development area. Such plans encompass Social, Community, Cultural, Recreational and Economic Development issues. It is in the area of economic development, however, that planning seems generally to be bearing most fruit and the Board has identified excellent examples of a comprehensive set of policies and strategies including a wider regional emphasis at Launceston. King Island provides an excellent example of a small Council that has undertaken a number of significant economic development initiatives.

c. Community Safety. The Board observes that many Council’s have responded in various ways to concerns about community safety. The Board found an excellent example at Northern Midlands where a draft Longford Community Safety Plan had been developed with widespread participation and community involvement.

d. Grants and Donations. The Board has identified that many councils have developed formalised systems for grants and donations to individuals and community groups. Such systems normally involve a public invitation to submit applications for grants or donations and a system of allocation of funds based upon objective, published criteria.
5. **Roles and Responsibilities of Elected Members.**

a. **Delineation of roles of Elected Members and the General Manager.** This issue was covered at some length in the last annual report. The general reviews that the Board has conducted more recently have reinforced the Board’s earlier assessment that may be summarised as follows:

- There is a misunderstanding by some elected representatives of their powers as individuals compared with their powers as members of the corporate body;
- Tensions exist that are based upon the belief that management is not sufficiently transparent and accountable;
- There are deficiencies in the legislation that fail to distinguish between the functions and powers of the elected body as distinct from those of the corporate entity. Nor are the respective responsibilities of the elected body and the General Manager well defined;
- Not all elected members are providing the necessary leadership in strategy, in policy formulation and in performance monitoring particularly in the performance review of the General Managers; and
- Much of the tension between elected members and General Managers, concerns the functions of the General Manager in the appointment of employees.

As the Board has previously reported, it has continued to remind Councils that the Act places obligations upon them with respect to human resource management in its requirements that Councils are to ensure that all employees are appointed and promoted according to merit and without discrimination and that all employees receive fair and equitable treatment without discrimination. The Board believes that General Managers must recognise that, in appointing and directing employees, they are acting as the agent or the servant of the Council. On the other hand, the Board has reminded elected members that they have no power to appoint or direct Council employees, other than the General Manager (see below). The Board recognises that a good relationship between a Council and its General Manager is crucial to the functioning of any well-run Council. For this reason, the Board, in its general reviews, pays attention to the accountability mechanisms that exist in the form of the General Manager’s annual performance review.

The Board is pleased that the deficiencies in the legislation it has drawn attention to are being addressed as part of the current review of the Act. It is also pleased to note an example at Clarence of a Council where the respective roles of elected members, the General Manager and employees are well understood.

b. **Role of the Mayor.** The Board has noted that the introduction of the universal popular election of Mayors appears to have contributed to a reluctance by some Councillors to recognise the leadership role provided to the Mayor by the Local Government Act 1993. Acceptance by all Councillors of the leadership role of the Mayor varies. In some cases, mayors have, therefore, reported difficulties in complying with the provision that they are required to oversee the Councillors in the performance of their functions and in the exercise of their powers.

While the Board has no doubt that most electors would expect that their majority decision to elect a person as Mayor would lead to the acceptance of that outcome by all elected members, this is not always the case.

The Board made a recommendation to Clarence City Council which it believes has broader application to all councils that the Mayor should play a leading role in the induction of new elected members and that such induction processes should be well-documented. There may be
some capacity to provide similar written material both to newly elected representatives and to
new employees.

c. **Conduct of elected members.** The conduct of some elected members has been an issue the
Board has been faced with during the year under review. It notes that there now appears to be
recognition of the need for a code of conduct for both elected members and employees and that
this forms part of the proposals for changes to the *Act*. The Board has discovered examples of
elected members who are unaware of constraints currently placed upon them by:

i. the *Act* through such provisions as those relating to pecuniary interest, improper
   use of information, and misuse of office;

ii. the provisions of meeting procedures by-laws where these exist; and

iii. the provisions under the *Judicial Review Act 2000* that decisions must be made
    objectively and impartially.

d. **Officer Reports to Councils.** This issue was canvassed in the last annual report, which noted
that these had been of variable quality. During the year under review, the Board has viewed some
excellent examples. The Board has consistently recommended, and continues to hold the view,
that Councils use templates for officer reports (where these are not employed) to ensure that the
full range of relevant issues are presented to the elected body when making decisions.

The usefulness of reports to councils on financial performance has been found to vary widely
with the best examples relying heavily on graphical representation. The Board suggests that there
may be an opportunity here for General Managers and senior financial officers to share expertise
with the objective of promoting an across-the-board improvement in the standard of these reports.

e. **Performance Review of the General Manager.** Where it does not occur, the Board has
included in every report of a general review that it has completed during the last year, a
recommendation that Council adopt a policy to ensure that future reviews of the performance of
General Managers are facilitated by an independent body, using a system that encourages elected
members and employees of Council to take an active part. In recommending this, the Board does
not intend that these reviews should pass out of the control of Councils. It is the Board’s view
that Council should still play an integral part in the review, but that the use of an independent
body will ensure equity and procedural fairness, and continuity when elected members change.

The Board believes that Councils should be exemplary employers. It continues to find improvements in the development of human resource policies and procedures. There are, however, a number of matters upon which comment is warranted.

a. Occupational Health and Safety. During the year under review, the Board has again detected an increased awareness of occupational health and safety and an improvement in practices of employees and management alike. An area of emerging concern, however, is the supervision of contractors. Not all councils have consistent policies and procedures in place to ensure that the same high occupational health and safety standards that are required of council employees are required of and monitored in the practices of contractors and their employees. Councils expose themselves to unnecessary risk if their practices are deficient in this regard. It is also inequitable for councils to expose their employees to competition from contractors if those contractors are not required to adhere to the same occupational health and safety regime.

b. Information to employees. The Board has found good examples during the year of councils that make efforts to ensure that employees are informed of council decisions and other relevant information. While the Board recognises that it is sometimes difficult to treat all sections of the workforce equally in this regard and that there is an inherent difficulty in relation to employees who work away from the principal council offices, it is nevertheless good practice to find ways to ensure that all employees are fully informed.

c. Induction of new employees. While many Councils have excellent induction programmes in place, there continues to be a general need for improvement in this area. The Board has made recommendations during the year that Councils develop written material in the form of an information booklet that can be given to employees when they commence work. (The same material could be used in the induction of elected representatives.) First day instruction on and familiarisation with occupational health and safety policies and practices is an important requirement.

d. Enterprise Bargaining Agreements. Most Council’s have continued to negotiate successive agreements through the Enterprise Bargaining process. However, as the Board has reported in previous years, some inherent difficulties have emerged. The first concerns the unequal power relationship on enterprise bargaining committees leading to some employees feeling that they are placed at a disadvantage by being required to negotiate with management and, in some cases, elected representatives. The Board believes that joint training of all members of these committees is desirable if constructive outcomes are to be achieved.

Secondly, both management and employees have reported to the Board that there is now little left with which to bargain and that there is an increasingly limited range of items that could be the subject of agreement. The Board believes that part of the answer to this dilemma may lie in the adoption of a strategic approach in which the human resource management implications of the strategic direction a Council intends to take are jointly identified by the Enterprise Bargaining Committee through a study of the council strategic plan.

e. Grievance Procedures. The Board has recommended to a number of councils that equal employment opportunity officers and/or persons nominated to hear grievances should be appointed. The Board believes that if procedures to deal with grievances and complaints of harassment and bullying are to be effective, at least some nominated contact persons should be chosen by the employees and that those concerned should receive adequate training.
7. Asset Management.

Councils are the custodians of infrastructure assets that are required to perform over many generations. The management of these assets involving development of comprehensive registers, adequate routine maintenance and planned replacement as well as programmed asset disposal is something which the Board has progressively emphasised in its reports of reviews of Councils. It encourages councils to fund a significant proportion of the depreciation expense. In last year’s report, the Board referred to a generally higher level of awareness by councils of the obligations that they have in this regard. The Board notes that this continues to be the case. It continues to be concerned, however, about the capacity of some councils to fulfil these obligations as well as being able to respond to the day-to-day concerns of the communities they represent. In its year 2000 Annual Report, the Board observed that a number of councils, mainly in the Lyons Electoral Division which contains 80% of the State’s area and 20% of its population, are struggling to meet their obligations in service provision to their ratepayers. The Board continues to have these concerns and to believe that a study of the kind referred to in the 2000 Annual Report be conducted. Such a study would have as its major objective the identification of options enabling local democracy to be preserved while ensuring adequate provision of services.

On a more positive note, and notwithstanding the above remarks, the Board is pleased to report that in connection with the General Review of Northern Midlands Council, it found that assets were being managed by this medium-sized Council in an exemplary fashion. The Council’s asset management system is largely integrated with its asset accounting (see below) and is able to predict the expected total financial demand for the maintenance and replacement of the total asset base over the next 50 years. More importantly, Council assets attracted a high average condition rating with financial measurements such as accumulated depreciation reflecting this reality.

The financial effectiveness of a Council is crucial to the manner in which it performs its functions. The Board continues to be concerned that financial statements are not able to provide effective signals of the condition of assets or the level of community equity. The principal reason for this concern is the often tenuous link between asset management and asset accounting and the failure of such financial indicators as to the written down value of assets to be a reliable predictor of the condition or remaining economic life of those assets. The Board believes that this will continue to be the case until a uniform approach to asset valuation and depreciation policies is adopted by all councils. As the Board reported last year, it has reluctantly come to the view that no meaningful comparison or benchmarking between Councils will be possible until the necessary definitional problems have been resolved on a State-wide basis.

The Board is concerned that many councils continue to run significant annual deficits and that consequently the value of community assets continues to decline. Notwithstanding the examples of the construction of long-term predictive models for asset replacement and renewal that it has found when reviewing some councils, the Board believes that councils generally should give a higher priority to long-term financial and asset planning.

On a more positive note, the Board is pleased to report that most Councils have given a high priority to risk management and that the Risk Management Rating that is derived by the sole insurer of Tasmanian Councils against this type of risk, has progressively improved in many cases.

Councils do not operate in a vacuum. They have opportunities to work with other Councils, the State Government and with other organisations for the betterment of the community. Among other things, the Board is concerned, in conducting general reviews, with councils’ involvement in public policy development.

Councils contribute positively in this area. There has been a general acceptance of the State-wide K.P.I. project. Regional cooperation is also a common feature of Tasmanian Local Government.

More and more councils are negotiating both bi-lateral and multi-lateral partnership agreements with the State Government. The Board was impressed with the extensive community consultation exercise at Launceston which formed the basis, not only of the Council’s Strategic Plan but also of its partnership agreement, the first to be negotiated by the State with a larger council.

Tasmanian Councils are undertaking a leadership role in Local Government, not only regionally and within the State but also nationally. This role is exercised through the involvement of both elected representatives and employees.
10. Other Matters.

During the course of successive reviews, the Board has progressively drawn attention to the provisions of the *Local Government Act 1993* that should be considered for review at the appropriate time. Accordingly, in December 2002, the Board prepared a report for the current review of the Act. The contents of this report found their way into the discussion paper that initiated that process. Apart from drawing attention to the fact that the Board anticipated that it would be unable to complete the initial round of general reviews by the end of January 2004 and to a procedural issue in connection with the conduct of reviews, the Board made no reference to those sections of the Act which concern its role. Rather, it confined itself to those matters that have emerged from the reviews it has undertaken in recent years.

The Board has become aware, during recent months, of doubts expressed by some Councils of the utility and cost of general reviews into the governance and operations of Councils. The Board has taken the view that its role is to undertake reviews that result in the production of reports that are of the highest possible quality and add value to Tasmanian Local Government as a whole. It should also, in the Board’s view, report significant examples of excellence and leading practice so that these may be recognised and promoted. On the issue of the cost of General Reviews, the Board observes that strict compliance with its Guidelines would impose costs significantly less than those that will inevitably be incurred by councils that wish to go beyond such basic compliance.

**Leading Practice**

According to the guidelines issued by the Board for the conduct of general reviews, one of the outcomes of such reviews is the identification of leading practice. For the first time, the 2002 report contained reference to a number of such examples. These examples were drawn only from those Councils that had been reviewed since the current guidelines for general reviews came into operation early in 1999. This list has now been updated to include those councils that were reviewed in the last year. There are doubtless examples of leading practice in other councils that are yet to be reviewed under these guidelines.

Information concerning the practices listed may be obtained from the General Managers of the Councils concerned. References are provided below to the Board’s reviews.

- Philosophical basis for the role of Local Government: connection, collaboration and a high standard of customer service
  - Launceston pages 3,9,10,143,146
- Induction of employees; documentation and policies and practices.
  - Devonport, Chapter 8 page 84
  - Hobart, Chapter 6
- Human Resource management generally
  - Clarence page 4 and Chapter 6
- Information to employees
  - Clarence pages 4 and 42
- Performance appraisal of managers and employees; policies and practices.
  - Central Coast, Chapter 7 page 32
- Devonport, Chapter 8 page 86
- Hobart, Chapter 6

- Annual Review of General Manager using a 360 degree approach.
  - Devonport, Chapter 8 page 91

- Asset Planning and Management.
  - Devonport, Chapter 9
  - Hobart, Chapter 7
  - Northern Midlands, pages 4 and 103-104

- Financial Management.
  - Devonport, Chapter 10

- Resourcing councillors.
  - Hobart, Chapter 5

- Economic Development.
  - Burnie, Chapter 7 page 55
  - Clarence, page 121
  - Launceston, pages 3,58,60,98
  - King Island, pages 38-40

- Community Consultation.
  - Devonport, Chapter 7
  - Central Coast, Chapter 6 page 28
  - Kentish, Chapter 7 page 60
  - Flinders, Chapter 6 page 25
  - Hobart, Chapter 4
  - Huon Valley, Chapter 7 page 59

- Development of Strategic Plan based upon research and Community Consultation
  - Clarence pages 3 and 121

- Primacy of the Strategic Plan.
  - Clarence, pages 3 and 44
  - Launceston, pages 3,7 and 8

- Development of Strategic Plan and Partnership Agreement based upon research and Community Consultation
  - Launceston pages 3,7 and 8

- Number of people attending A.G.M. accompanied by promotion of Council
  - Launceston pages 3,14,15 and 16

- Emergency Management Planning
  - Launceston page 4

- Delineation of roles of elected members and the General Manager
- Clarence page 166
- Governance Framework for Council representation on Committees, Boards and Authorities
  - Clarence pages 3, 13 and 25
- Community Development.
  - Hobart, Chapter 4
- Sewage treatment and effluent re-use.
  - Hobart, Chapter 7
  - Clarence, pages 5 and 214
- Laboratory.
  - Hobart, Chapter 7
- Small Town Plans.
  - Central Coast, Chapter 6 pages 28-9
- Meeting special needs.
  - airport (Flinders) Chapter 5 page 22
  - medical practitioners (Glamorgan/Spring Bay) Chapter 11 pages 82-3
  - aged care (Huon Valley) Chapter 12 pages 137 - 8
  - hospital (West Coast) Chapter 7 pages 64 and 76
- Website.
  - Hobart, Chapter 2
  - Kingborough, Chapter 4 page 73
- G.I.S.
  - Devonport, Chapter 5 page 16
- Young People.
  - Burnie, Chapter 7 page 68
  - Hobart, Chapter 4
  - Huon Valley, Chapter 7 page 70
- D.D.A. Action plans
  - Clarence page 103
  - Launceston page 114
- Community Safety
  - Northern Midlands pages 3 and 45
- Cultural Planning, Queen Victoria Museum and Inveresk Site
  - Launceston page 63
- Council publications and information.
  - Central Coast, Chapter 6 page 30
  - Devonport, Chapter 7
  - Flinders, Chapter 4 page 17
- Hobart, Chapter 4,
- Kingborough, Chapter 4 page 83
- Launceston, pages 4 and 97

- Comprehensiveness of Annual Report.
  - West Coast, Chapter 5 pages 20-1

- Foodsafe and Healthy Options projects.
  - Kingborough, Chapter 3 pages 35 & 40

- Stormwater treatment.

- Kingston Wetlands
  - Kingborough Chapter 3 pages 39-40

- Healthy Rivers.
  - Huon Valley, Chapter 7 page 81 & Chapter 6 page 49

- Rotation of meetings.
  - Glamorgan/Spring Bay, chapter 7 page 40
  - Kentish, Chapter 7 page 70
  - West Coast, Chapter 5 page 24

- Regular visits by senior staff to outlying centres.
  - West Coast, Chapter 5 page 26

- Customer Service Centre.
  - Hobart, Chapter 3

- Officer Reports to Council.
  - Hobart, Chapter 5
  - West Coast, Chapter 5 page 37

- Template for officer reports to Council.
  - Hobart, Chapter 5

- Risk Management.
  - Clarence, pages 5 and 253
  - Launceston, page 107

- Local Government Leadership, Regionally, State-wide and Nationally
  - Launceston pages 4,23,25 and 65