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Executive Summary

The Purpose of the Long Term Financial Plan
The Local Government Act 1989 requires Council to exercise sound financial management in managing the affairs of the City of Bayside. A key component of sound financial management is the preparation of longer term financial strategies, plans and budgets.

The Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) is the key ten year financial planning document that contains a series of financial strategies and accompanying performance indicators that Council considers when making significant strategic decisions about resource allocation.

The goal of the LTFP is to ensure financial sustainability which is defined as:

“The Bayside Community receives good quality services and enjoys well maintained facilities and infrastructure at an affordable level of property rates both now and into the future.”

The directions of the Long Term Financial Plan are informed by the Council Plan and the medium to long term service strategies adopted by Council. The LTFP also feeds back the other way, providing the context and financial limits that need to be considered in the development of long term plans and the management of expectations about what can be achieved.

Key Financial Issues and Challenges
The key issues and challenges for Bayside include:

- providing sufficient funding to renew existing assets to ensure they continue to meet community needs
- delivering new and upgraded community infrastructure (roads, buildings, drains, footpaths etc) to address the demands of a growing and changing community
- continuing to provide an appropriate range and level of services to the community
- maintaining Council Rates and charges at an acceptable level
- managing within a narrow revenue base with limited growth opportunities
- managing ongoing cost shifting from other levels of government, dealing with changes to legislative requirements and the expanding expectations of Local Government
- managing the extreme nature of Defined Benefits Superannuation Shortfall calls
- introduction of rate capping from 2016/17
Strategies to address these Challenges
The key strategies embedded in the LTFP are to:

- Rate increases are set in accordance with the fair go rates framework
- Continue to review four services each year to ensure services provided to the community provide value and are sustainably funded
- Identify efficiency gains in the operating budget in order to ensure a financially sustainable operating surplus in a rate cap environment
- Ensure that service users are making a reasonable contribution to the cost of those services through appropriate fees and charges by maintaining an annual 5% increase in non-statutory fees and charges.
- Identify alternative revenue streams and funding opportunities to take pressure off rate increases
- Explore greater financial and community returns from Council’s property portfolio
- Increase funding for capital renewal and new/upgrade works
- Reduce the level of debt held by Council and ensure that any new debt is based on a sound business case and demonstrated community benefit.
- Continue to manage the extreme nature of Defined benefits superannuation shortfalls by quarantining funds in a reserve with an annual increase of $500k.
- Ensure that any new programs or projects generate specific community value and are funded in a sustainable way.

These strategies are interrelated and the implications of particular directions in each area must be considered holistically. Maintaining financial sustainability is a balancing act – managing expectations against available resources and making informed decisions about priorities.

Summary of Key Outcomes
The LTFP is a 10 year plan that feeds directly into the Annual Budget and the Strategic Resource Plan (4 year view). The updated Strategic Resource Plan for 2017/18 seeks to deliver the following key outcomes:

- A strong annual Operating Surplus of $23.1 million in 2017/18 and average surplus of $17.5 million in the forecast years
- An ambitious productivity and efficiency savings target of $2 million required over the next 3 years to combat the impact of rate capping
- Rate increases will be capped at CPI in accordance with the new Rate capping environment introduced by the State Government
- Deliver $162.2 million of Infrastructure investment over the next 4 years to improve community assets
- An accelerated debt reduction strategy to repay Council’s debt in full by 2018
- Utilizing cash reserves of $14.6 million over the next 4 years to deliver an increase in capital investment
- Maintaining strong cash reserves for the life of the long term financial plan.
While the successful implementation of the Plan will ensure that Bayside exceeds the targets set by the Victorian Auditor General in the short term there are longer term risks to maintaining Council’s current level of services and infrastructure investment if ambitious savings targets are not achieved or additional sources of revenue identified in the short term.

**BACKGROUND**

Section 136 of the Local Government Act 1989 sets out the following principles of sound financial management:

“(1) A Council must implement the principles of sound financial management.

(2) The principles of sound financial management are that a Council must-

(a) manage financial risks faced by the Council prudently, having regard to economic circumstances;

(b) pursue spending and rating policies that are consistent with a reasonable degree of stability in the level of the rates burden;

(c) ensure that decisions are made and actions are taken having regard to their financial effects on future generations;

(d) ensure full, accurate and timely disclosure of financial information relating to the Council.”

Implicit in these principles is the requirement to develop a long term plan to guide financial decision making to ensure the financial sustainability of the Council. The key documents that Council uses to set its financial direction are:

- The Long Term Financial Plan – 10 year view
- The Strategic Resource Plan – 4 year view
- The Annual Budget – 1 year view.

One of the challenges for Council is the relatively short term nature of the political cycle in which pressure is often applied to deliver things now or to reduce rates, or usually both!

If Council is to truly implement sound financial management, these short term pressures should be considered in a longer term planning context and the impact of decisions made now modelled over the 10 year period so that the consequences are clear for all stakeholders.

Bayside has an adopted Long Term Financial Plan and over the last few months this Plan has been reviewed based on new and emerging issues and revisiting the assumptions on which the existing Plan was based.

The outcomes of this review are presented in the following sections of this document.
WHAT IS FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY?

The Australian Local Government Association’s (ALGA’s) definition of financial sustainability is:

“A Council’s long-term financial performance and position is sustainable where planned long term service and infrastructure levels and standards are met without unplanned increases in rates or disruptive cuts to services.”

Another way of looking at it is:

“The Bayside Community receives good quality services and enjoys well maintained facilities and infrastructure at an affordable level of property rates both now and into the future.”

However it is defined, it is important to have some agreed quantifiable measures of sustainability to judge where Council is now and what corrective action may need to be taken.

Measures of Sustainability

The following table lists a range of indicators that are often used to measure sustainability. The final column in the table indicates whether Bayside currently meets these targets.

The Victorian Auditor General’s Office (VAGO) uses the following measures of financial sustainability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>VAGO Target</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>2015/16 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underlying result</td>
<td>Greater than 5%</td>
<td>Adjusted net surplus/total underlying revenue</td>
<td>Adjusted net surplus is calculated by removing non-cash developer contributions and one-off items from the statement of income and expenditure.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>Greater than 1.5</td>
<td>Current Assets/Current Liabilities</td>
<td>Measure of ability to pay existing liabilities within 12 months. Borrowing Prudential Guidelines require &gt; 1.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness</td>
<td>Less than 40.0</td>
<td>Non-current liabilities/own sourced revenue</td>
<td>Compares non-current liabilities (including loans) to own source revenue. Own-sourced revenue is used because it does not include capital grants.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-financing</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 20.0</td>
<td>Net Operating cash flow/underlying revenue.</td>
<td>This is a measure of local government’s ability to fund the replacement of assets from cash generated by their operations: the higher the percentages, the more able to do so.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital replacement</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 1.5</td>
<td>Capital spend/depreciation</td>
<td>This is a measure of whether local governments are spending on infrastructure at a greater rate than the infrastructure is depreciating.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewal gap</strong></td>
<td>Greater than 1.0</td>
<td>Renewal and upgrade expenditure/depreciation</td>
<td>This is a measure of whether local governments are spending on renewing, restoring and replacing existing assets with depreciation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these measures, Bayside City is currently in a sound financial position. However, there are some looming challenges including rate capping that will test the financial sustainability of Council in the coming years.
**KEY FINANCIAL ISSUES AND CHALLENGES**

In developing the revised Long Term Financial Plan a range of issues and challenges have been identified that will have an impact on Council’s financial position in the years ahead. These issues include:

**Asset Renewal**

Council owns and controls a wide variety of assets ranging from land and buildings to roads, drains, footpaths and open space improvements. The total value of Council’s fixed assets is $2.9 billion. Land owned or managed by Council including the value of land under roads makes up $2.5 billion with the balance of $400 million made up of renewable infrastructure such as roads, footpaths, drains, buildings and other plant and equipment. Many of these assets were constructed in the 1960 -1970s during the major growth phase of Bayside and are approaching the end of their useful life. This means that Council will need to spend increasing amounts on renewing this infrastructure so that it continues to meet the needs of the community.

The following graph shows the increasing renewal requirement as well as the budget available for new assets.

![Graph showing increasing renewal requirement and budget](image)

What this shows is that the asset renewal expenditure required by Council will increase to $23.2 million by 2022. This increase in renewal expenditure will ensure that assets remain fit for purpose. The alternative is to allow the asset stock to deteriorate over time which will not be an acceptable outcome for the community.

**New Community Infrastructure**

In addition to expenditure on renewing existing assets, there is an ongoing demand for new infrastructure driven by growth, changes in demographics, and increasing community expectations. In recent years Council has increased its spend to around $14-$16 million per annum on new and upgrade works but is still quite low in comparison to the state average. The increase in new capital expenditure over the next 4 years is being funded utilizing $14.6 million of capital designated cash reserves and an increase in external funding.
The Impact of rate capping
The introduction of the rate capping environment will place considerable pressure on the ability of Council to meet the infrastructure expectations of the community. The introduction of rate capping from 1 July 2016 has reduced the LTTP capital program by $8 million and the Council’s capacity to meet the renewal and new capital program is reliant on further $2 million of savings being found in the operating budget over the next 3 years.

Total Capital Investment compared to other Councils
Despite the increase in investment in infrastructure in recent years the following graph shows Bayside is still the third lowest amongst its peers for capital expenditure and below the average for inner metro Councils and the state average.

The following graph indicates that Bayside spends in recent years has increased but still remains about $80 per assessment less on Infrastructure than comparable Councils. This equates to around $3.5 million in overall terms. The estimate for 2016/17 exceeds the average inner metro and reflects the recent implementation of Council’s infrastructure strategies which are designed to respond to the communities need for improved infrastructure and deliver better service outcomes to the community.

Note: Purple columns relate to Bayside
The challenge is to provide sufficient funding for capital works that will allow the renewal issue to be resolved and to maintain a viable allocation for new works. It is proposed to increase capital expenditure on Renewal and New Capital in coming years partly funded from efficiency gains in the operating budget.

**Delivering Community Services**

Council delivers around 100 different services to the Bayside community and expectations about the role of Council have expanded significantly over the last decade driven by the policies of State and Federal Governments and the accessibility of Council to the community.

Bayside is a comparatively low spending Council in comparison to other inner metropolitan Councils.

The following graph indicates that Bayside spends about $268 per assessment less on Operating costs than comparable Councils.

**Note:** Purple columns relate to Bayside
The current service mix has developed over time often driven by the availability of government grants or by the policy direction of Council at a particular point in time. Council has commenced a program of rotating strategic service reviews to ensure Council delivers the right mix of services. The results of these reviews will be incorporated into the long term financial plan as they occur.

Rating Levels
The level of Council rates is an issue that has become a discussion topic in communities across Victoria. Based on data released by the Australian Taxation Office Council Rates and charges represent less than 3.5% of the total taxation paid in Australia. Most household pay considerably more in personal income tax, GST, stamp duty etc.

Council rates are perceived to be a major impost for two main reasons. Firstly, the rate bill is received all at once via the annual rate notice which makes it very visible. Secondly, the link between the rates paid and the various services provided is not clear to many ratepayers making it difficult to make an informed decision about whether it represents value for money.

Rate Capping
The introduction of rate capping in July 2016 is expected to reduce rate revenue by $1.4 million in year 1 and up to $75 million over the life of the LTFP. Bayside expects to raise $88.7 million in rates and taxes in 2017/18 based on a 2.0% rate cap.

In comparison State government's property taxes, levied from the Bayside municipality in the 2013/14 financial year was over $200 million made up of Land tax $37million and Stamp Duty $163 million. Stamp Duty and Land tax are not indexed and as property prices rise the State Government receives a windfall gain. This is one of the main factors influencing the forecast budget surplus of $1.7 billion in the December 2016 Treasury Update. The update confirms that forecast revenue from taxation revenue is up $123 million particularly for land tax which will exceed budget by $158 million reflecting the increasing valuations of Victorian properties. In contrast Local Government rate levels are based on the revenue required by Council to deliver services but will be capped by the new Rate Capping legislation introduced by the State Government.

Bayside rating levels per assessment are marginally higher than the average for inner metropolitan Councils as the following graph shows.
This is driven by several factors including:

- Bayside receives a lower level of State and Federal Government grants than many other Councils. This is a function of the high socio economic status of the Bayside community
- Bayside is a relatively small municipality compared with the other inner metropolitan Councils. This means it does not have the same economies of scale and ability to spread costs over a higher number of rate-able properties.

The challenge is to strike a balance between continuing to provide the services and works expected by the community at a level of property rates that is affordable and which the community sees as value for money.

**Restricted Revenue Base**

Bayside relies heavily on Council rates as its major source of income. The following graph indicates that Bayside receives 72% of its total income from rates which is higher than the average for inner metropolitan Councils.

![Rate Revenue / Adj Total Revenue Chart](chart)

*Note: Purple columns relate to Bayside*
The factors that contribute to this situation are:

- Bayside is considered to be a wealthy community which means that it receives a relatively low level of government grants as these grants are often allocated on a perceived needs basis.
- Council does not have significant revenue generating assets nor does it receive substantial revenue from car parking fees and fines.

An additional factor is that Bayside is predominantly a residential municipality with commercial/industrial assessments making up around 7% of the total number of rate-able properties. This is low compared to other inner metropolitan Councils. This means that the bulk of the rate burden falls on households.

The challenge here is to find alternative revenue sources to offset some of the reliance on property rates.

**Cost Shifting and Legislative Impacts**

Cost shifting from State and Federal Governments continues be a major problem for Local Government in Victoria.

Cost shifting occurs when other levels of Government:

- Fail to increase the recurrent grants to local government to match the increasing cost of providing those services thus eroding the real value of the grants
- Introduce new taxes, levies or charges on services Council provides
- Shifts the responsibility for services onto local government without the funding required to discharge that responsibility
- Introduce new laws or regulations that require Councils to spend money on compliance
- Restrict the increase in fees and charges for various services provided by Council to a level less than the increase in the cost of providing those services.

The impact on Bayside through these cost shifting in recent years includes:

**Type 1: Cost Shifting for Specific Services**

- Home and Community Care (HACC) - $421k from 2011/12 to 2016/17
- Library Services - $92k from 2011/12 to 2016/17
- Maternal and Child Health - $173k from 2011/12 to 2016/17
- School Crossing Supervision - $219k from 2011/12 to 2015/16

**Type 2: Loss of funding**

- A freeze on indexation of the federal financial assistance grants. The Commonwealth announced in its 2014-15 Budget that it will pause indexation of the total national pool of financial assistance grants to local government for three years (2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17). The cumulative impact on Bayside City Council for the three years totals $0.364 million.
Type 3: Statutory fee that prohibits full cost recovery
- Planning fees (set by the State and have been frozen for most of the past 15 years)
- Revenue foregone for the past 6 years is estimated to be $9.16m if Council were allowed to fully recover the cost of providing planning services.

Type 4: Levies
- State Government landfill levy has increased from $9 per tonne in 2008/09 to $62.03 per tonne in 2016/17 (589% increase in 8 years) and has added $1.1 million to Council's cost base.
- Total landfill levy for Bayside City Council is $7.58m for the 8 years 2008/09 to 2016/17.
- Animal registration levy - $298k from 2011/12 to 2016/17

The challenge is to continue to provide services that are part funded by other levels of government when the ratepayer is expected to continue to pick up an increasing share of the burden.

**Future Defined Benefits Superannuation Shortfall calls**
The Defined Benefits Superannuation Scheme provides lump sum benefits based on years of service and final average salary. It is a multi-employer sponsored plan, where the assets and liabilities are pooled and are not allocated to each employer. Council makes employer contributions to this plan as determined by the Trustee, currently at 9.50% of members' salaries.

Council is also obligated to:
- Reimburse the Fund to cover the excess of the benefits paid as a consequence of retrenchment above the funded resignation or retirement benefit;
- Make additional contributions to cover the contribution tax payable on the contributions
- Make member contributions to cover the shortfall in assets in the Fund.

Currently 10% of Council employees are members.

Since 1997, Council has made in total $15.3 million to the Fund for shortfall calls due to low investment returns achieved by the Fund. As a contributing member, Council is therefore liable for any future funding shortfall calls.

The challenge is ensure that Council has sufficient cash in reserves to cover these future shortfall calls.
RESPONDING TO THE CHALLENGES

In responding to these challenges and ensuring the financial sustainability of Bayside in the long term, Council has a number of budget ‘levers’ that it can adjust. The following section sets out the strategic direction for each of these interrelated aspects of the financial plan.

Property Rates and Charges

Council Rates and Waste Charges will remain the major source of revenue for Bayside into the future.

The introduction of the Rate Capping and Variation Framework by the State Government which commenced in 2016 requires Council to cap future rate increase for the General Rates and Municipal Charge to the rate of inflation. The Minister for Local Government announced in December 2016 that the rate cap for the 2017/18 year would be 2.0%.

Bayside does not currently utilise differential rating for different property types. A review of the current approach to property rating has been undertaken to consider alternative ways of distributing the rate burden. This review has confirmed that the most equitable manner of distributing the rate burden in Bayside is to maintain one general rate to be applied to all property types.

Strategic Direction:

Short Term

That Council General Rates and Municipal Charge be capped at 2.0% for the 2017/18 year in accordance with the Rate Capping and Variation Framework.

That the increase in the Waste Management Charge for 2017/18 be set based on full cost recovery as allowed under the rate capping framework.

Medium/ Long Term

That Council investigates options to reduce the reliance on property rates over time by identifying alternative revenue streams and funding opportunities.

That the Waste Management charge be set at a level that fully recovers the cost on waste collection and disposal services on an annual basis.
**User Fees and Charges**

User Fees and Charges represent around 11% of Council’s revenue. This is slightly lower than the inner metro average. Many of these fees and charges are set by State Government and are inadequately indexed.

In the recent past Bayside has indexed most of its fees and charges by the Consumer Price Index (CPI), typically in the range of 2.5% - 3.5%. This is despite the fact that CPI bears no relationship on the cost of providing Council services. The cost of Council services is driven by increases in labour, contract, and utilities costs and tends to be around 4.0% - 5.0% per annum.

Increasing the indexation of fees and charges to reflect the increase in the costs of providing those services would generate a relatively minor amount in the context of the overall budget. However, under indexation of fees and charges over time shifts more pressure onto Council rates.

New or expanded fees and charges are also an option that needs to be explored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>That discretionary fees and charges be indexed by at least 5% in the 2017/18 budget.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Medium/ Long Term</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>That discretionary fees and charges be indexed generally in line with the cost of providing the relevant services.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*That new and expanded fees and charges be investigated for consideration in future Budget deliberations.*
Government Grants and Contributions

Grants and Contributions represent around 10% of Council’s revenue. This is lower than the inner metro average. Bayside is on the minimum grant from the Victorian Grants Commission and always will be due to the high socio economic status of the community in average terms.

Specific purpose grants (mainly in the Community Services area) are usually indexed by CPI which means that they do not keep pace with the cost of providing the services to which they are linked.

Advocacy to attract and retain government funding will be important as the financial position of both State and Federal governments continues to deteriorate. Attracting higher levels of capital grants to help offset the cost of some major projects should be a particular area of focus.

Harnessing greater community contributions to capital projects is also an area worth further exploration. Examples such as the proposed Banksia Reserve joint sports facility demonstrate that the role of Council can in some circumstances change from directly funding facilities to coordinating the efforts of community groups and providing loan guarantees.

Council will not be able to fund the replacement of all of the existing community buildings in a time frame suitable to the users of those buildings without a strong partnership approach that draws together funding from a range of contributors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That Council regularly engages with local Members of State and Federal Parliaments to ensure they understand the financial pressures on Bayside City Council and the need for improved funding from other levels of government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Medium/ Long Term</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

That Council engages with community groups and sporting organizations to build strong partnerships and to explore alternative funding models for the replacement/upgrade of community facilities.
Council Owned Property

Council owns or controls around 1200 individual property titles in Bayside. Many of these parcels are used for roads, open space, sports facilities etc and will continue to be used for this purpose into the future.

Council also owns a range of properties that are used for commercial purposes and to deliver Council services whilst others are utilized to varying degrees by community groups. Some of these properties are not well used and apart from the commercial properties, the financial return on these properties is minimal whilst the maintenance costs are substantial.

Council has adopted a property strategy that seeks to ensure that Council property is well utilized, maintained and generates value through financial or community return.

This area can be controversial particularly when changes to property use are proposed. Engagement with the community regarding decisions taken in accordance with the Property Strategy is essential so that an informed debate can occur.

Strategic Direction:

Short Term

That property decisions are made in accordance with the adopted Property Strategy and in consultation with the community.

Medium/ Long Term

That opportunities to improve community utilization and / or financial return of Council property be implemented in accordance with the strategy.

Expenditure on Services to the Community

The Operating expenditure is driven by three main variables:

- The services Council provides
- The quantity and quality of those services
- The efficiency and productivity of the processes used to deliver those services.

It therefore follows that the level of Operating Costs can to some extent be influenced by the choices Council make about these variables.

The decision about which services are to be provided and the scope of those services is driven by Council and the commencement of a rigorous review of Council services is underway and will take several years to complete. Changing the scope, method of
delivery, or discontinuing services can be a contentious and lengthy process. It requires appropriate consultation with direct users of services and the wider community.

Expansions to the range or scope of services are often sought by particular interest groups in the community and Government policy initiatives can also place expectations on Council to take on new responsibilities. Given the financial constraints on Council, any proposals for new or expanded services should be critically reviewed to ensure they are focused on areas of key community priority and can be funded in a responsible way.

Improving the efficiency and productivity of the organization to deliver services at a lower cost is a major driver of this year’s draft budget and delivering community value in the long term is a key area of focus for Council in the years ahead.

Council has achieved productivity savings of $4.8 million in the operating budget over the last 4 years as a result of the introduction of cost management initiatives including savings targets in each budget and internal service reviews. While the achievement of these productivity savings have delivered historically low rates and allowed additional funds to be redirected to capital investment and debt reduction, the capacity of the organization to achieve further savings without impacting service delivery is diminishing. The 2017/18 budget guidelines include a savings target of $1.055 million which represents 2% of the net cost of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the results of the rotating strategic reviews be incorporated into the long term financial plan once completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That productivity savings of $1.055 million in the recurrent Operating Budget for 2017/18 be directed to achieve a net cost of services increase of 2.8%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium/ Long Term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That productivity savings of $1 million over the next 2 years be achieved in order to reduce the underlying net cost of services and ensure financial sustainability in a rate capping environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the ongoing program of strategic service reviews continue for all major service areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Debt Management**

In the long term, borrowing money does not increase the amount of money available to spend. It allows a higher level of expenditure in a given year, but as it must be repaid with interest it requires a reduction in expenditure in future years.
Council’s previous debt strategy has been to repay approximately $2.5 million per year which would result in Council being debt free by 2023. During 2015/16 and 2016/17 $9.4 million of loans matured and Council through its budget process approved an accelerated debt reduction strategy. This will result in a loan balance of $2.1 million as at 30 June 2017 which is due to mature during 2017/18. Council has the capacity to fund the repayment of debt as it matures without adversely impacting on liquidity.

**Strategic Direction:**

**Short Term**

*Council repay $2.1M on maturity during 2017/18 and subject to any new debt being approved for new infrastructure achieve debt free status.*

**Medium / Long Term**

*That new debt will only be considered where a compelling business case is presented and clear community benefits are demonstrated.*

**Capital Works**

Funding of capital renewal is a fundamental element of financial sustainability and should be prioritized ahead of new and upgrade projects. The Asset Management Plans prepared for each major area of infrastructure should guide the setting of priorities for funding and a long term capital plan is required to ensure that a strategic approach is taken to the allocation of funds to new and upgrade projects.

**Strategic Direction:**

**Short Term**

*That funding for the Renewal of existing assets be given priority over new and upgrade projects in the Capital Works Program.*

*Where appropriate utilize restricted and discretionary reserves rather than Council rates to fund new projects.*

**Medium/ Long Term**

*That a 10 year Capital Works Plan be developed which is informed by the infrastructure requirements of the Strategic Service Plans and Asset Management Plans. The plan is to ensure the increase in required renewal expenditure is achieved and sufficient funds for new and upgrade works are delivered.*
Funding Defined Benefits Superannuation Shortfall call

Since 1997, Council has made in total $15.3 million to the Fund for shortfall calls due to low investment returns achieved by the Fund. In 2012/13, Council made a shortfall call contribution of $5.3 million to the Fund, which is a substantial amount in one year.

One of the MAV Defined Benefits Taskforce recommendations was to make annual allowances for shortfalls, to smooth out the extreme nature of the shortfalls over time. This will ensure that Council will not be subject to large once-off shortfalls.

Strategic Direction:

Short Term

That $0.5 million is quarantined in Reserves for future Defined Benefits Superannuation Shortfall calls in the 2017/18 budget.

Medium/ Long Term

That an annual allowance of $0.5 million is quarantined in Reserves to smooth out the extreme nature of the Defined Benefits Superannuation Shortfall calls.

SUMMARY OF THE OUTCOMES OF THE LONG TERM FINANCIAL PLAN

Ten Year View of the Key Outputs form the Plan
Key Financial Ratios

4. Financial performance indicators

The following table highlights Council’s current and projected performance across a range of key financial performance indicators. These indicators provide a useful analysis of Council’s financial position and performance and should be used in the context of the organisation’s objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating position</strong></td>
<td>Adjusted underlying result</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquidity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital</td>
<td>Current assets / current liabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>298.4%</td>
<td>326.9%</td>
<td>315.2%</td>
<td>298.4%</td>
<td>286.1%</td>
<td>289.8%</td>
<td>↗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted cash</td>
<td>Unrestricted cash / current liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>185.9%</td>
<td>189.8%</td>
<td>200.5%</td>
<td>186.8%</td>
<td>179.2%</td>
<td>183.5%</td>
<td>↗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obligations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and borrowings</td>
<td>Interest bearing loans and borrowings / rate revenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and borrowings</td>
<td>Interest and principal repayments on interest bearing loans and borrowings / rate revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness</td>
<td>Non-current liabilities / own source revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>↗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset renewal</td>
<td>Asset renewal expenditure / depreciation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>135.2%</td>
<td>140.2%</td>
<td>107.5%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates concentration</td>
<td>Rate revenue / adjusted underlying revenue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>↗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates effort</td>
<td>Rate revenue / CIV of rateable properties in the municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>↗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure level</td>
<td>Total expenditure / no. of property assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,181</td>
<td>$2,299</td>
<td>$2,370</td>
<td>$2,429</td>
<td>$2,489</td>
<td>$2,566</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue level</td>
<td>Residential rate revenue / no. of residential property assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,897</td>
<td>$1,888</td>
<td>$1,988</td>
<td>$2,034</td>
<td>$2,088</td>
<td>$2,143</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce turnover</td>
<td>No. of permanent staff resignations &amp; terminations / average no. of permanent staff for the financial year</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>↗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to indicators

1 Adjusted underlying result – An indicator of the sustainable operating result required to enable Council to continue to provide core services and meet its objectives. Improvement in financial performance expected over the period, although continued losses means reliance on Council’s cash reserves or increased debt to maintain services.

2 Working Capital - The proportion of current liabilities represented by current assets. Working capital is forecast to decrease significantly in 2017/2018 year due to a run down in cash reserves to fund the capital program. The trend in later years is to remain steady at an acceptable level.

3 Debt compared to rates - Trend indicates Council’s reducing reliance on debt against its annual rate revenue through redemption of long term debt.

4 Asset renewal - This percentage indicates the extent of Council’s renewals against its depreciation charge (an indication of the decline in value of its existing capital assets). A percentage greater than 100 indicates Council is maintaining its existing assets, while a percentage less than 100 means its assets are deteriorating faster than they are being renewed and future capital expenditure will be required to renew assets.

5 Rates concentration - Reflects extent of reliance on rate revenues to fund all of Council’s on-going services. Trend indicates Council will become more reliant on rate revenue compared to all other revenue sources.