

REPORT

and

DETERMINATIONS

Of

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL

Under

SECTIONS 239 AND 241

of the

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1993

19 April 2001

REPORT

The Local Government Remuneration Tribunal (the Tribunal) was set up under Chapter 9, Part 2, Division 4 of the Local Government Act 1993 (the 1993 Act). This Act implemented wide-ranging reforms of local government including the remuneration of elected members of Councils.

The 1993 Act requires the Tribunal each year to determine the categories of Councils for the purpose of determining fees for such elected persons and to report to the Minister by 1 May of its determination. The Tribunal has no power to fix fees for any particular Council but is confined to determining the minimum and maximum fee appropriate for each category.

This function has been discussed in previous Reports *and need not be re-iterated on this occasion.*

While Councils must pay each Councillor the same annual fee, only the minimum fee is mandatory. Any fee in excess of the minimum fee is a matter for each Council to determine. It is to be noted also that such fees paid do not constitute salary for the purposes of any Act (Section 251(2)). In addition, Councils must adopt a policy concerning the payment of expenses incurred in the performance of Council functions and the provision of facilities (section 252(1)).

One of the unique features of the 1993 Act is the creation of categories of Councils. Previously, the parliament fixed the same fee for all Councils regardless of size or particular characteristics. But the concept of a payment of a fee and not a salary for the performance of local government services by Councillors and Mayors remained unchanged.

The Tribunal has expressed the view in its Reports that the recompense by way of fees is to ensure that as far as practicable, no person is debarred by way of financial burden from offering for local government service in the performance of statutory functions. The extent to which this matter has been resolved since the commencement of the 1993 Act is stated in the 1997 and 1998 Reports.

2001 REVIEW INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS

For the 2001 review the Tribunal adopted its usual practice and wrote to each Mayor seeking submissions on matters for consideration by the Tribunal. The Tribunal received a total of 31 submissions.

The Local Government and Shires Associations (the Associations) have drawn the Tribunal's attention to various areas of change which impinge upon the operation of Councils, particularly in regard to management, consultation and planning. Particular attention was drawn to the involvement of Councils in water reform and roads and the increase in community representation from Councils. For example, local Councils are becoming more directly involved in traffic management and parking enforcement.

The submission also supported the claims of some Category 1 Councils that greater emphasis be placed on resident population in distinguishing categories of Councils. However, such support was qualified by the statement that:

"In arguing this we are not detracting from the Councils such as Sydney City which, whilst they have a lesser population base, have other features of significance that the Tribunal must also take into account".

This latter comment was also supported by a number of rural Councils and other Councils with migratory populations in Sydney.

CATEGORY S1 SUBMISSIONS

The Tribunal received submissions from the Director General of the Premier's Department, on behalf of the Premier, and the Office of the Lord Mayor. The Director General's submission provided detailed factual information about the increased significance of Sydney to the State and National economies the increased focus of Sydney as a business centre for major national and international companies as well as the heightened tourism and leisure industries. The Director General considered that the amount of involvement of the Lord Mayor particularly with the business sector should be a prime consideration of the Tribunal.

The Office of the Lord Mayor has argued that the role and responsibilities of the Lord Mayor of Sydney have increased in significance since the Olympic Games as the City “...*seeks to build a solid foundation of economic growth on the international impetus from last September’s memorable sporting event.*”

CATEGORY 1 SUBMISSIONS

Submissions were received from Baulkham Hills, Blacktown, Gosford, Penrith and Sutherland to change their categorisation from Category 1 to either Category S2 or a new Category 1A but with Category S2 fees.

The reasons advanced for such changes differ from Council to Council. In brief:

Blacktown relies on its resident population, the scope and magnitude of its operations, the extent of its present and future development potential and the impact it has on the State;

Gosford relies on the opportunity cost to Councillors in carrying out Council business. The complexities of that business, given the water and sewerage operations, are peculiar to Gosford, compared with other larger coastal Councils;

Penrith seeks to distinguish those particular aspects of large mainly urban Councils located at the fringe of urban areas;

Sutherland relies on population size and projected population growth;

Baulkham Hills detailed the commitment, time, diversity and sacrifice required to fulfil the role of Councillor and highlighted population regionalisation developments. The Council submitted that fees should be linked to a percentage of State Government MPs salaries.

CATEGORY 2 SUBMISSIONS

Hurstville has sought recategorisation to Category 1 on the basis of its significant regional activities.

Canterbury Council has sought an increase in the maximum fees payable to Councillors and Mayors. They base this claim on the increased demands on Councillors time and commitment as well as the diversity of knowledge required by Councillors.

Kogarah has not specifically sought reclassification or increases in fees but has proposed that the diverse nature of the resident population of urban Council areas should be given greater recognition in terms of categorisation.

Manly sought an increase in fees based on the workload of the Mayor and Councillors. It was claimed that increased community consultation has given rise to a large number of committees which have increased workload. This increase in workload was a common feature of Councils' comments and is summarised in the submissions of the Associations.

CATEGORY 3 SUBMISSIONS

Camden submitted that the Council should be reclassified as Category 2. This submission was based on the significant growth in urban development which has taken place in the area since 1995. This has led to a significant increase in demands on the Council. The Council contended that no additional emphasis should be placed on population for Category S1, S2 and 1 Councils.

Dubbo sought an increase in fees in Category 3. The workload and accountability of Councillors in rural areas was highlighted. It was also claimed that current fee levels do not encourage people with full-time employment to run for office.

Tamworth supported the inclusion of a Council's population and total expenditure in the determination of categories.

Goulburn has not sought express recategorisation or an increase in fees. However, the Council supports recognition of population factors for Councils in Category 1. In some instances, it was stated that population is greater than Wollongong and Newcastle. In regard to regionalisation, Goulburn has lodged a proposal with the Minister to merge with the surrounding Mulwaree Shire Council.

Hawkesbury again sought a review of its Category 3 status in the light of its population, projected population growth, socio-economic diversity and its diverse and unique topography.

CATEGORY 4 SUBMISSIONS

Bellingen submitted that emphasis should be given to diversity and distribution of population. The Council sought an increase in the fees for Mayors.

Nambucca sought an increase in fees to \$8,000 for Councillors and \$16,000 for Mayors. The Council emphasised the additional workloads associated with regionalisation matters.

Glen Innes submitted that the fees payable to Councillors and Mayors should be indexed to award increases made to Council employees under the Local Government Award.

CATEGORY 5 SUBMISSIONS

Gilgandra sought reclassification to Category 4. The Council drew attention to the increased role in the Council's now traditional areas, such as aged care, youth services and disability services. The time commitment resulting in non-traditional Category 5 Councils has increased significantly.

Gundagai submitted that Category 4 and Category 5 Councils should be able to set the minimum fee at zero. The Council currently pays Councillors the minimum fee applicable. It was claimed that any increase in the minimum fee will divert funds from other services provided by the Council.

Manilla sought an increase in Category 5 fees. The Council considers that resident population is irrelevant for the purposes of determining the categories of Councils. Rural Councillors were stated to have a much greater workload because Councils are unable to attract the skilled staff available in urban areas.

Pristine Waters, a new Council, sought reclassification from Category 5 to Category 4 on the basis of increased population, area and responsibility arising from the amalgamation of Ulmarra and Nymboida and the reduction in the number of Councillors from 15 to 9. The Council area is the largest on the eastern seaboard in New South Wales. The area is scattered

with small population pockets and villages. There is significant diversity of community issues and lifestyle as the Council covers coastal areas, agricultural areas and national parks. Agriculture, tourism and forestry are the main industries. Councillors are involved in environmental and estuary management, tourism promotion, agriculture sustainability, forestry issues and waste management and the operation of an airport. The Council is also responsible for water and sewerage services. The Council currently supports over 100 community committees with a significant number having a Councillor representative.

Yallaroi sought an increase in the Mayor's fee to \$10,000. This submission was based on the claim that the commitment required of the Mayor is similar to that of a larger Council.

Yarrowlumla sought reclassification to Category 4 because of its geographic location and the significant impact of the ACT and sub-region on the operation and responsibility of the Council.

COMMENT

CATEGORY S1

The Olympics in 2000 was the biggest event Sydney has experienced. The Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney was directly involved in the preparation and management of the event as a member of SOCOG. As the appointment then constituted some 12 per cent of his time, this was taken into account in fixing the fee in 1994. The latter appointment expired in December 2000. It is now necessary to re-evaluate the fee in the changed circumstances.

Based on the information supplied by the Office of the Lord Mayor and the Director General of the Premier's Department, Sydney's international exposure during 2000, *inter alia*, attracted events such as business conventions and trade shows as well as tourism business investment. Sydney was currently ranked the number one convention city in the world for 2000, based on the number of events and delegate numbers. This has generated considerable business in the city. The Sydney Convention and Visitors Bureau (SCVB) estimates that it has secured 125 meetings and conventions for New South Wales over the next seven years, valued at over A\$722 million to the economy.

In terms of world cities, Sydney is often ranked number one in place to live and often quoted as the best tourist destination, particularly now as a result of the Olympics. While this may impact on the city as a whole, the City of Sydney as the hub of Sydney would face greater challenges in meeting visitor expectations.

It was stated that the Lord Mayor is required to devote an increasing amount of time and effort to deal with the relationships between the business sector and the city in managing Council's policy and operational relationships with the sector. This arises from the fact that Sydney is now the financial, business and ITC hub of Australia with head office locations of major Australian financial institutions and financial bodies such as the Australian Stock Exchange and Sydney Futures Exchange being located in the City. Increasingly Sydney is also being chosen as the Asia Pacific regional headquarters for multi national corporations and Sydney has the largest concentration of Information Technology and Telecommunications companies in Australia with Sydney being the major gateway to Australia for international fibre optic cable which enables electronic information and commerce to be transferred between Australia and the rest of the world.

The fees for the Lord Mayor were first set at a time which foreshadowed the Olympic Games and the Mayor was a member of SOCOG, engaged on a part-time basis. With the onset of the Olympics the involvement of the Lord Mayor, as a Member of SOCOG, increased.

In 2000 Council voted to increase the fees for Councillors and the Lord Mayor to the maximum of Category S1. The aftermath of the Games has increased the ceremonial role of the Mayor in tourism, sporting, Federation and associated national and international activities. The continued growth of the city as the centre for commerce and leisure far outstrip any other city in Australia. The role of the Lord Mayor has, as a consequence of these changes increased and continues to increase proportionally.

Based on the material provided to the Tribunal, it is prepared to accept the submission that the present duties and responsibilities are both greater and more onerous to a point where a significant increase in the fee payable to the Lord Mayor is warranted.

CATEGORY 1

The manner which the Tribunal adopted in categorising Councils is discussed in the 1995 Report and it is not proposed to repeat it here. Suffice to say there has not been established a definitive basis for the inclusion of any Category 1 Council in Category S2. The influence of regional leadership cannot be applied to any one Category 1 Council in the Sydney Production Region in similar fashion to Newcastle and Wollongong. This applies to all those Category 1 Councils which sought recategorisation to Category S2.

Attention has been drawn by the Associations as to the widening of matters delegated to Councils. In addition, increased population in New South Wales, particularly from immigration has led to significant growth in the size of some Councils and additional social matters arising from the settlement of immigrants. The increasing population of urban Councils contrasts significantly with the majority of rural Councils whose populations are either static or declining.

Planning for the necessary new infrastructures and the upgrading of existing infrastructures is said to impose significant planning and policy making decisions upon Councils to cater for increasing populations, particularly in urban areas.

Rural Councils have demonstrated similar population growth in some areas, particularly on the New South Wales coastline and the need for planning decisions in regard to water supply, flood mitigation, airport control and other activities not usually dealt with by urban Councils. It has been submitted that population as a factor is not properly measured by size of resident population alone, but rather the impact of such size on the services expected from all the population. As the Associations have stated, Councils such as Sydney City which have a lesser population base have other features of significance that should be taken into account. The Tribunal agrees with this comment and it has observed it in practice, for example in equating Category 2 and Category 3 as to the level of fees.

At this stage, however, the Associations submit that the Tribunal should now place greater emphasis on the population of those Councils with high levels of resident population.

It has been repeatedly submitted from the first determination of the Tribunal that individual responsibilities of Councillors are the same, regardless of the size of the Council. This view, of course, was adopted during the whole period of operation of the Local Government Act 1919. The 1993 Act established this Tribunal to determine this issue subject to specific conditions. The manner in which the remuneration of Councillors and Mayors has been determined is detailed in the annual Reports of the Tribunal since 1994.

The 1919 Act adopted a system essentially of voluntary service. It is clear that despite the opportunity for Councillors and Mayors to receive significantly larger fees than available under the 1919 Act, there is still a discernible element of preparedness to offer voluntary services, particularly in rural areas. This public spirit of voluntary service was apparent during the Olympic Games. But, of course, this was for a short finite period compared with a four year commitment to local government service.

A difficulty which arises in categorisation structure is that while the number of Councils has remained relatively stable, differences, particularly in regard to population and population growth, continue to widen. Most rural Councils have not significantly changed as to population and resources compared with urban Councils. It is only to be expected that the extent of contribution of Councillors will widen as to policy decisions to provide for increasing and changing demands. In other words, it is the effect of an increased population which is important, not size. It is this factor which the Tribunal took into account in deciding that the claim for a new Category 1A should be granted.

Blacktown has been urging this Tribunal for some years to give special recognition to the role of Blacktown for its leadership role in the promotion and economic development of the Western Sydney region. It is now the largest local government area in terms of population in New South Wales. The population of 254,817 resides in 45 suburbs, catering for 100 educational facilities, 10 industrial estates, 30 retail and commercial centres, 4 leisure centres, 4 libraries, 120 child care facilities, 800 parks and reserves, as well as high profile clubs, tourism, sporting, entertainment, accommodation, conference and recreational facilities. In the foreseeable future, because of the population growth, there will be major additions to residential and industrial areas.

CATEGORY 2

Hurstville embraces wholly or partly, the suburbs of Allawah, Beverly Hills, Carlton, Hurstville, Kingsgrove, Lugarno, Mortdale, Narwee, Oatley, Peakhurst, Peakhurst Heights, Penshurst and Riverwood. Industrial estates are located in Kingsgrove and Peakhurst.

It is claimed that Hurstville's CBD is a regional growth centre providing retail and commercial facilities for the St George region. There is a concentration of commercial, office and retail space covering small and medium sized businesses in the medical, financial, insurance, real estate sections and a range of community and government services.

The population of 69,867 has grown in recent years, requiring increased building of residential flats and other forms of medium density housing. Details were supplied concerning the style of environment, storm water management, the preservation of open space and the population residing in the Council area and the manner in which the Council has been involved.

Hurstville provides a transport interchange involving 700 buses and 230 trains each day. The number of passengers using the Hurstville railway station exceeds 23,000 each day.

Hurstville also seeks a widening of the range between the minimum and maximum fees to reflect the diversity of roles of different Councils in the same categories.

It is a matter of comment that the maximum fee for Category 2 is greater than the minimum fee for Category 1. The question raised is whether a case has been made out to justify progression of the Council's maximum fees to the maximum of Category 1.

The three Category 1 Councils most directly comparable with Hurstville are Hornsby, Willoughby and North Sydney. Based on the information provided, the Tribunal is satisfied that Hurstville functions as a regional centre for the St George area and should be re-categorised accordingly.

The comments of Canterbury, Kogarah and Manly have been dealt with by the Tribunal in its previous reports.

CATEGORY 3

The Tribunal has accepted the submission from Camden that it now functions more like a suburban Council than a rural Council and for this reason has decided to recategorise the Council from Category 3 to Category 2.

The Dubbo claim that the fee level is a deterrent to persons engaged in full-time employment has often been stated but never substantiated. The Tribunal has expressed its views on this matter in previous reports and does not propose to comment further on this occasion.

The Tribunal has considered the submission from Hawkesbury and has taken into account the issues raised in the overall assessment of fees.

CATEGORY 4

The submissions of the Category 4 Councils have been considered carefully. The matters put forward are not new and have been examined previously. Increases based on workload and or diversity of population have been considered in previous reports. As to a link with award increases the Tribunal notes that such an approach would be contrary to the legislation.

CATEGORY 5

The Tribunal considered that it is too early to assess the claim of Pristine Waters Council for categorisation as Category 4. The amalgamation was claimed to effect significant cost savings and an increased workload for a reduced number of Councillors particularly as the factor “the provision of efficient and effective local government” in section 240 of the 1993 Act is relied upon. The Tribunal will re assess the application of Pristine Waters in its next annual review when the effects of the amalgamation are more apparent.

The changes which have occurred in Yarrawlumla and Gilgandra justify their classification as Category 4, particularly in relation to their activities in the provision of efficient and effective local government.

COUNTY COUNCILS

CLARENCE RIVER COUNTY COUNCIL

The Tribunal had the opportunity to discuss in detail with the Council the role of the Council as a flood plain management authority. The Clarence River is the largest coastal river catchment in New South Wales and the associated flood plain is managed by the Council over the four local government areas of Grafton City Council, Maclean Shire Council, Copmanhurst Shire Council and Pristine Waters Council. The population of the Clarence Valley is in excess of 50,000 and management of the plain has a significant effect on the two major industries in the area of sugar cane production and fishing.

The Council is responsible for 186 separate flood mitigation drains which are essential for the sugar cane and grazing industries.

The Council owns in excess of \$200 million infrastructure assets in the flood plain which require continual monitoring, maintenance and upgrading. It also has responsibility for noxious weeds control as a part of its function in managing the flood plain.

In short, it was claimed the Council's role in flood plain management for the Clarence Valley involves a diverse and complex range of issues which require considerable time, judgment, deliberation and assessment on the part of Councillors. The Tribunal was advised that the Council works closely with the Environmental Protection Authority, the Department of Land and Water Conservation and State Fisheries and is subject also to the protection of the Environment Act and also the Mines Act, the Occupational Health and Safety Act and the requirements of WorkCover in the operation of a quarry to obtain rock for river bank protection.

The Tribunal is satisfied that the Council has made out a case for categorisation as Category S4.

LOWER CLARENCE COUNTY COUNCIL

The lower Clarence County Council services the areas of Coffs Harbour City, Copmanhurst Shire, Grafton City, Maclean Shire, Nymboida Shire and Ulmarra Shire. In 1997 it prepared a Regional Water Efficiency Strategic Plan involving a wide cross-section of the community. It is one of the two key parts of Council's Regional Water Strategy, the other being the construction of a major water storage facility at Shannon Creek in the Nymboida River catchment.

Action to use water more efficiently has existed since the 1970s, commencing with the introduction of water use metering by the Council followed by "user pays" pricing in the 1980s.

Water use and management reform is now under study, with river flows and water quality of major concern. Emphasis has been placed on the creation of partnerships to share the responsibilities, costs and benefits of wise water use and management. The Council and its six constituent local government Councils are presently developing water related strategic business plans (e.g. water supply, sewerage, stormwater). The Council is taking a leadership role encouraging Councils to take an integrated approach to the urban water cycle. There are a number of important links between the plan and other government planning initiatives in the region which also have to be considered, details of which were presented to the Tribunal, as was the planning framework.

The Tribunal considers that this County Council is most relevantly placed in Category S4. The activities of this County Council are not comparable with Category 4 and Category 5 Councils but its activities will be taken into account in determining the maximum fee in Category S4. This view equally applies to Mid Coast Water County Council.

FEES

As to the question of minimum fees, only one Council indicated objection to the payment of a minimum fee on the basis of cost. On the other hand, another Council suggested that minimum fees are no more than a contribution to actual costs. There are obviously people who nominate for local government because of their interest in local government, whether or not this involves them in inconvenience or economic loss, and not for the primary purpose of payment. Nevertheless, no sufficient case has been made out for the removal of a statutory minimum or its appropriate adjustment in accordance with changing economic conditions.

The fees have been determined on the basis that they are set as common fees equally applicable to all Councillors. This necessitates an averaging procedure whereby active Councillors may be seen as underpaid compared with less active Councillors in performing the functions required of Councils as a whole.

It was stated in the 1998 Report that each annual review was determined in the framework of the economic circumstances of the time. It was noted then, and taken into consideration in the 2000 Report, that new local government elections had recently taken place and the State was experiencing stable economic conditions. No general increases were granted on that occasion and this factor has been taken into account in the present Determination. The trend over the past two years indicates that some economic adjustment is warranted to underpin the increasing responsibilities placed upon Mayors and Councillors over that period. These changes constitute a proper basis for the adjustment of all fees.

After considering the views of the Assessors, the Tribunal will increase all minimum and maximum fees for Councils by approximately 7 percent for Councillors and 10 percent for Mayors. Special considerations apply to the Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney.

The Tribunal has given careful consideration to the increased role and responsibilities that now attach to the office of Lord Mayor. The Tribunal has noted that the Government has not, in its submission to the Tribunal, expressed a view as to the quantum of any increase while the

office of the Mayor has sought an increase to equate his fee to that of a Minister in Government. For the 2000 annual review the Mayor had sought an increase to compensate for the loss of his fee as a member of SOCOG ie \$50,000.

It was apparent during the preparation for the Olympic Games and their conduct that the role of the Lord Mayor, as Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney and his representation on SOCOG overlapped. Pursuant to the Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games Act 1993, the Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney was appointed a Vice-President of SOCOG (Section 16) with remuneration determined by the Premier (Section 22).

Apart from his responsibilities as a SOCOG member, his ceremonial functions were significantly involved and recognised at an international level. This level of function is an important feature of the office of the Lord Mayor which transcends that of any other Mayor in New South Wales and indeed in Australia. The continuation of this function together with the additional duties now thrust upon the Mayor as a result of the national and international events of 2000 and 2001 require a fresh assessment of the Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney's relativity with other Mayors in New South Wales.

The unique position of the Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney in the hierarchy of public office in the State has to be taken into account in the determination of remuneration. The importance of the continuation of the role of the Lord Mayor into the post-Olympic period as a promoter of the public image of the State also has to be given appropriate weight.

The Lord Mayor, in effect, is now performing the dual role of Mayor of part of the Sydney CBD and more extensively a widely recognised ceremonial role on behalf of the whole of Sydney.

The Tribunal is satisfied that as a result of the cessation of SOCOG, the time formerly devoted by the Lord Mayor to specific SOCOG functions is now utilised by the Lord Mayor in attending to significantly increased responsibilities in the functioning of the Sydney City Council. The time has now come for the Tribunal to determine a new benchmark for the Office.

The demands upon the Lord Mayor at the time of the commencement of the 1993 Act were enabled to be performed on a part time basis. Accordingly, in addition to taking into account the level of increase determined for all Councils, the Tribunal considers that the appropriate range of fees should reflect the present individual demands now made of the Office. This is to reflect the status of the Council of the City of Sydney in its unique role in the State of New South Wales and Australia.

Accordingly, in addition to taking into account the level of increase granted to all other Councils, the Tribunal considers that, in addition to the Councillor fee fixed by the Council, the Council may fix a mayoral fee in the range of \$95,000 to \$125,000 for the Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney. In determining these fees the Tribunal has noted that, pursuant to section 248 of the 1993 Act, the Council deducts \$7,000 per annum from the Lord Mayor's annual fee for payment to the Deputy Mayor elected pursuant to section 231 of the 1993 Act.

CATEGORY 1A

The Tribunal has had regard to the submissions of the Associations and some Category 1 Councils concerning the weight to be given to the population of the Category 1 Councils.

The Tribunal accepts that the achievement of a population such as that of Blacktown imposes additional burdens of responsibility and justify recognition by way of increased remuneration.

Accordingly, at this stage, it is proposed to create a new category for Councils complying with the significant features of Category 1 Councils and with a residential population of 250,000 or more. Category 1 Councils are subject to current maximum fees of \$14,000 for Councillors plus \$35,000 for the Mayor. The newly created Category 1A will provide a similar range as for Category S2 which is currently \$10,000 - \$16,000 for Councillors and \$20,000 - \$45,000 for Mayors. The above fees will be adjusted by the current determination.

The new Category 1A shall be comprised of Category 1 Councils with a resident population of 250,000 or more or any other special feature of section 240 which the Tribunal considers distinguishes them from other Councils in Category 1.

The level of fees adopted by Councils after this determination is a matter for the discretion of each Council to be determined in the particular circumstances of each Council.

Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

(The Honourable Charles L Cullen QC)
Dated: 19 April 2001

**DETERMINATION OF CATEGORIES OF COUNCILS AND COUNTY COUNCILS
FOR 2001/2002**

Category S1 (1 Council)	Sydney
Category S2 (2 Councils)	Newcastle Wollongong
Category S3	County Councils
Category S4	County Councils (engaged in significant commercial activities)

Category 1A (1 Council)

Blacktown

Category 1. (18 Councils)

Bankstown	North Sydney
Baulkham Hills	Parramatta
Campbelltown	Penrith
Fairfield	Randwick
Gosford	South Sydney
Hornsby	Sutherland
Hurstville	Warringah
Lake Macquarie	Willoughby
Liverpool	Wyong

Category 2. (22 Councils)

Ashfield	Lane Cove
Auburn	Leichhardt
Botany	Manly
Burwood	Marrickville
Camden	Mosman
Canada Bay	Pittwater
Canterbury	Rockdale
Holroyd	Ryde
Hunters Hill	Strathfield
Kogarah	Waverley
Ku ring Gai	Woollahra

Category 3. (32 Councils)

Albury	Griffith
Armidale Dumaresq	Hastings
Ballina	Hawkesbury
Bathurst	Kempsey
Bega Valley	Lismore
Blue Mountains	Maitland
Broken Hill	Orange
Byron	Pt Stephens
Cessnock	Queanbeyan
Coffs Harbour	Shellharbour
Dubbo	Shoalhaven
Eurobodalla	Tamworth
Goulburn	Tweed Heads
Grafton	Wagga Wagga
Gt Lakes	Wingecarribee
Greater Taree	Wollondilly

4. (35 Councils)

Bellingen	Murray
Cabonne	Muswellbrook
Cobar	Nambucca
Cooma-Monaro	Narrabri
Cootamundra	Narrandera
Cowra	Parkes
Deniliquin	Parry
Forbes	Richmond Valley
Gilgandra	Singleton
Glen Innes	Snowy River
Greater Lithgow	Tumut
Gunnedah	Walgett
Inverell	Wellington
Kiama	Wentworth
Leeton	Yarrowlumla
Maclean	Yass
Moree Plains	Young
Mudgee	

Category 5. (62 Councils)

Balranald	Evans	Quirindi
Barraba	Gloucester	Rylstone
Berrigen	Gundagai	Scone
Bingara	Gunning	Severn
Bland	Guyra	Tallaganda
Blayney	Harden	Temora
Bogan	Hay	Tenterfield
Bombala	Holbrook	Tumbarumba
Boorowa	Hume	Uralla
Bourke	Jerilderie	Urana
Brewarrina	Junee	Wakool
Carrathool	Kyogle	Walcha
Central Darling	Lachlan	Warren
Conargo	Lockhart	Weddin
Coolah	Manilla	Windouran
Coolamon	Merriwa	Yallaroi
Coonabarabran	Mulwaree	
Coonamble	Murrumbidgee	
Copmanhurst	Murrurundi	
Corowa	Narromine	
Crookwell	Nundle	
Culcairn	Oberon	
Dungog	Pristine Waters	

TOTAL GENERAL PURPOSE COUNCILS

173

Category S3 (12 Councils)

Castlereagh – Macquarie	New England
Central Murray	North West Weeds
Central Northern	Richmond River
Far North Coast	Southern Slopes
Hawkesbury River	Upper Hunter
Mid Western	Upper Macquarie

Category S4 (8 Councils)

Central Tablelands	Lower Clarence
Clarence River	MidCoast
Cudgegong	Riverina Water
Goldenfields Water	Rous

TOTAL COUNTY COUNCILS 20

DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL REMUNERATION FEES FOR COUNCILLORS AND MAYORS

Pursuant to s.241 of the Local Government Act 1993, the annual fees to be paid in each of the categories determined under s.234 to Councillors, Mayors, members and chairpersons of County Councils during the period 1 July 2001 to 30 June 2002 are determined as follows:

	Councillor/Member Annual Fee		Mayor/Chairperson Additional Fee*	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Category 5	5,350	- 5,885	5,500	- 9,350
Category 4	5,350	- 7,060	5,500	- 14,905
Category 3	5,350	- 11,770	11,000	- 24,860
Category 2	5,350	- 11,770	11,000	- 24,860
Category 1	8,025	- 14,980	16,500	- 38,500
Category 1A	10,700	- 17,665	22,000	- 49,775
S4	1,070	- 5,350	2,200	- 7,700
S3	1,070	- 3,530	2,200	- 6,215
S2	10,700	- 17,655	22,000	- 49,775
S1	16,050	- 23,540	95,000	- 125,000

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

Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

(The Honourable Charles L Cullen Q.C.)

Dated: 19 April 2001