



City of Greater Geraldton Participatory Budgeting

Community Summit Report Outcomes and Recommendations 23 March 2015

Forward

In 2013/14 the City undertook an in-depth community engagement process to prioritise capital works and review City services. This feedback has been invaluable in the City's decision making processes. However, community engagement is an on-going process, a two way conversation, and because there have been some significant changes such as reduced State and Federal Government funding, escalating utility costs and a growing backlog of infrastructure renewals over the last 12 months, it is important to continue that conversation.

These factors, combined with the need to keep rates rises down, meant it was important to review and cease some non-mandatory services to achieve financial sustainability.

Cutting back on services requires Council to make difficult decisions about which non-mandatory services the City can continue to offer and which must be discontinued or reduced, whilst still being able to maintain assets and pay bills when they fall due.

To help the Council in its decision making processes, the City held a Community Summit. The purpose of the Summit was to prioritise the non-mandatory services the City delivers within the context of budget constraints.

The Community Summit was designed to provide members of the community with an opportunity to learn more about the non-mandatory services the City provides, deliberate with other participants about the relative importance of those services and develop a priority list of non-mandatory services created from their combined vote.

The prioritised list will be a critical piece of information to assist Council in deciding which services it will continue to deliver and those it won't. It will join a suite of other documents that the City will submit to Council to help inform their decision.

Background:

The City of Greater Geraldton, like other local governments in Western Australia, is facing the difficult challenge of achieving financial sustainability in an environment of reduced funding, escalating costs and increasing community expectation. Within this environment, the City of Greater Geraldton is challenged with balancing the needs and aspirations of a growing community, with community ability and willingness to pay.

The City's current budget for 2014-15 forecasts a net operating loss from ordinary activities of \$6.85m. Based on the City's current adopted Long Term Financial Plan, which incorporates an annual rate revenue rise of 5.2% (excluding growth factor), Council does not expect to be in a break-even position until 2021-22. The City of Greater Geraldton's financial position means that many community needs and aspirations are unlikely to be delivered within the short term and that some very difficult choices, about which services can be continued and which must be discontinued or reduced, must be made.

In coming up with solutions to these challenges, the City has long recognised that the best solutions are those that are made collaboratively between Council, City staff and the community utilising the principles of engagement and deliberative democracy.

The City of Greater Geraldton has initiated several leading practice community participation processes to facilitate community input into Council decision making. The most recent initiative was the Participatory Budgeting Community Panels held from November 2013 to March 2014.

Under the banner of #changesCGGcommunity, the City worked with the community via two Community Panels. The first panel met over four weeks to determine the priorities for the 10 Year Capital Works Plan and develop a framework for evaluating new projects for inclusion in future capital works plans. This provided staff with a more focused approach for progressing capital works and some level of certainty for the community about what facilities they can expect Council to deliver in the coming years. The second panel reviewed the level of services the City provides and made recommendations to Council on increasing, decreasing or maintaining the current level of service. The second panel chose to utilise the values-based assessment criteria developed by first panel, with some minor modifications to suit services rather than capital works projects, to ensure continuity of fundamental principles.

Changes in the external environment that have impacted upon the City's budget have necessitated a further review with a focus on the range of non-mandatory services provided by the City. These changes include;

1. Significant reductions in State and Federal Government funding;
2. Escalating costs, particularly utility costs; and

3. A large backlog of essential infrastructure renewal.

Additionally, the City recognises the need to ensure rates rises are kept at manageable levels while still providing services that best align with community priorities. Therefore, the City needed to engage further with the community to better understand community prioritisation of the non-mandatory services it delivers. The Community Summit process was developed to provide an opportunity for the community to have informed and considered input thereby ensuring services are aligned with community need, aspiration and importantly, community willingness and capacity to pay.

Output and Outcomes

The primary output required from the Summit was a prioritised list of non-mandatory City services.

Desired outcomes included;

- Clearer and stronger alignment between services and community priorities;
- Greater understanding in the community of the range of services provided by the City and funded via their rates – i.e. people would have a greater appreciation of how their rates were being used;
- Shared ownership of the difficult decisions facing Council in balancing community need and expectations with the budget;
- Improved trust between the City and community; and
- Increased transparency of decision-making.

Principles

All non-mandatory services would be included in the process.

The whole cost of each service would need to be considered, including the cost of staff to provide the service.

To achieve the output required (i.e. a prioritised list) participants would not be able to change the cost of the service as this was a different issue that related to level of service. However, comments about levels should also be captured.

Participants would be given \$2.5million less than the total cost of all non-mandatory services to 'force' prioritisation.

The Process

To ensure considered and informed input from a broad and representative group, the City chose to hold a Community Summit and invite participation from four groups of people via a targeted recruitment process which is outlined later in this report.

Summit participants were responsible for reviewing 98 non-mandatory services provided by the City, and then choosing to either fund or not fund the service. Participants were offered the following tools to assist them in their task.

Tools

1. Key strategic documents for background reading;
2. Non-mandatory activities descriptions booklet;
3. Spreadsheet detailing revenue, expense and net impact of the services;
4. Community developed assessment criteria;
5. Ready reckoner to assist in calculating impact of services on rates; and
6. Secure log in to Particibudget software for making service selections.

Given the amount of background information involved, it was determined to run the Summit in two parts;

Part One on 4 March 2015, was a 3.5 hour session to provide background information and context, to outline the process and to demonstrate the Particibudget software. Participants were asked to study the service descriptions and costs and to make their preliminary service selections on the Particibudget, prior to attending Part Two of the Summit ten days later.

Part Two was originally scheduled for Saturday 14 March; however the Greater Geraldton area was put on Yellow Alert on Friday 13 March as the result of a cyclone. The difficult decision to postpone Part Two was made. All participants were reached by phone and offered the new date of Sunday 22 March. 19 participants were unable to attend and withdrew from the process.

Part Two offered participants a full day of deliberations with each other and the opportunity to seek further information about services from the Executive Team and Managers.

Recruitment

Group A – Self-selecting residents

The City widely advertised the Community Summit via local media, social media and posters/flyers, inviting residents to register their interest in attending the Summit. Upon

registering, participants were asked for some basic personal demographic information (e.g. gender, age range, ethnicity).

57 people registered via this process;

48 from this group attended on 4 March; and

35 from this group attended on 22 March.

Group B – Randomly selected participants

The City engaged the Western Australian Combined Centre for Rural Health (WACHR) to recruit participants via a random selection process using a qualified statistician to ensure suitable independence and statistical rigour to the process. The aim was to recruit a sample group selected in a random manner, noting that minority groups such as the residents of the Mullewa community required special consideration to ensure appropriate representation. A report from WACHR on the recruitment process is attached. (See attachment one.)

33 people registered via this process;

18 from this group attended on 4 March; and

14 from this group attended on 22 March.

Group C – Previous Panel Members

The City invited participants from the two previous Community Panels to attend given their prior understanding of participatory budgeting and of City services. Their participation provided some continuity to the work of the previous panels and recognised the commitment of this group of residents.

15 people registered via this process;

11 from this group attended on 4 March; and

11 from this group attended on 22 March.

Group D – Invited Stakeholders

The City works with many partners in the community (e.g. other tiers of government, NGOs, community groups and the business sector). In recognition of their understanding of the specific needs of various sectors within the community and of the role of City services in meeting community need, representatives from key partner agencies and organisations were invited.

33 people registered via this process;
16 from this group attended on 4 March; and
13 from this group attended on 22 March.

Incentives

The City covered reasonable expenses associated with attendance at the workshops such as travel and childcare and provided all meals during workshops. All participants were eligible for a raffle of prizes of donated goods and services, and received recognition with a formal certificate of participation. All participants also received a bag containing complimentary items from the City.

Pre - summit

Soon after registering, participants were sent a welcome pack including a welcome letter from the CEO and logistical information about the Summit.

One week prior to Part One, participants were sent an agenda pack; this pack included an agenda for Part One (attachment two); key strategic documents for background reading; a set of assessment criteria developed and used by the Community Panel reviewing the level of services in 2014 (attachment three); and an explanation of the difference between mandatory and non-mandatory (attachment four).

Part One - 4 March 2015, 5.15pm – 8.30pm

Objectives

- To provide background information to better inform participants about the City's financial circumstances;
- To clarify the role and responsibility of participants in the Summit; and
- To introduce tools designed to assist participants with their task;

Process

Participants were allocated seating at one of 15 tables. Each table was supported by a table facilitator.

The CEO provided a 30 minute overview of the City's financial situation after which participants were given 20 minutes to discuss what they had heard at their tables and to jot down any questions they had for the CEO. The commitment was made that as many questions would be answered as possible in 10 minutes but that all questions would be answered in writing within two working days. Questions were collected and the CEO responded immediately to five questions and written responses to all questions were sent to all participants within 48 hours.

Participants were introduced to a set of six assessment criteria developed by the Community Panel reviewing the City's service levels in 2014. They were provided with background to the criteria and offered the criteria as a tool to assist them to review services, to put structure around their deliberations on services and to assist them to think broadly of community need. Participants were given 30 minutes to review the criteria at their tables focussing on three questions;

1. Did they understand the assessment criteria or did they need any further clarification?
2. Did they think the assessment criteria would help them do their job? If not, what changes would they suggest?
3. Was anything missing? If so, what changes would they suggest?

The following amendments to the criteria were requested by participants;

- Better recognition of disability access and inclusion;
- Recognition of remote communities;
- Protection of iconic infrastructure;
- Recognition of youth;
- Adding health and sport; and
- Intergenerational connections.

The assessment criteria were amended to reflect these suggestions and distributed to participants the following day. (See attachment five.)

Participants were given a demonstration of Particibudget, an online tool for making their services selections. Particibudget calculated budgets, kept track spending for each participant and automated the collation of all participants' service selections.

Participants were given their homework packs at the end of the evening. Included in their homework packs were descriptions of the 99 non-mandatory services from which they were going to have to make their selections. (See attachment six for a sample page.)

The total cost of the 99 services was \$8,589,061 and participants were given \$6million to spend; thereby forcing prioritisation.

Participants were asked to make preliminary selections and advised that these selections were preliminary because Part Two of the Summit would allow them to learn more about services, discuss, deliberate and debate the services and then make changes to their service selections if they chose. They were asked to make preliminary selections by Thursday 12

March. (NB: the date was extended until Thursday 19 March when Part Two was postponed.)

Output

Revised criteria as per attachment five.

Observations and Outcomes

Of the 92 participants, 91 completed their homework before the deadline.

Some participants did not agree with the restriction of not allowing participants to change the funding they could allocate to services. The City considered this feedback but determined that allowing participants to make changes to the funding for services would add a layer of complexity regarding levels of service, that could not be managed in a one-day Summit and potentially compromise the ability to achieve the primary output of a prioritised list of services at their current cost.

Descriptions for three services were found to be too vague and the City issued revised service descriptions.

One service was withdrawn from the process as it was confirmed to be fully funded from a Trust, subject to an agreement and delivered at no cost to ratepayers. As a result, the final list for consideration consisted of 98 services that had a total cost of \$8,509,601.

Part Two - 14 March 2015

Objectives

- To provide facilitated opportunities for participants to learn more about services from staff and from each other, deliberate on services with each other and to champion services to their fellow participants;
- To allow changes to service selections and comments on Particibudget;
- To understand participants willingness to pay more rates for services;
- To capture recommendations participants would like the City and Council to consider.

Process

Participants were allocated seating at one of 11 tables. Each table was supported by a table facilitator.

Following a recap of the outcomes of Part One, the CEO provided more detailed responses to questions that had been submitted from participants regarding the City's budget. (See attachment seven.)

Participants were given the preliminary list of prioritised services that had been collated from their collective service selections on Particibudget. (See attachment eight.) Table facilitators led table deliberations on services and called on staff to provide further information about services at the request of participants. Following two hours of deliberations, participants were given an extended lunch and an opportunity to make changes to their service selections in Particibudget.

Participants were advised that Particibudget would remain open for them to make changes to their service selections for 24 hours after the Summit offering them more time to consider their selections.

Participants were asked to complete a poll seeking information regarding the services, if any, they would be willing to pay more rates to keep. This poll was important and very useful as the process of prioritisation meant participants may have had to exclude services they wanted to keep but could not afford within a fixed and limited budget. The poll enabled participants to express their desire to keep services, even if it meant paying more rates.

Participants were invited to consider other recommendations they would like the City and Council to consider. Table facilitators captured draft recommendations at each table and submitted them to a theme team. The theme team grouped similar recommendations together and drafted 29 recommendations from the 60 table submissions. Recommendations were presented to participants who were able to vote on each recommendation. The recommendations and result of voting are attached. (See attachment nine.)

All participants were invited to have one minute to address the room on a service or matter of their choosing. 14 participants took the opportunity and spoke on a variety of subjects. (See attachment ten.)

Participants were thanked by the CEO for their contributions and advised that their work would assist the Executive Team in preparing the 2015/16 budget for Council to consider.

The CEO committed to inviting all participants back for a presentation on how their input was used in developing the budget after the 2015/16 budget is adopted by Council.

Outputs

The primary output was the following prioritised list of services which includes the results of the poll regarding willingness to pay more rates to ensure services continue to be provided. The list is based on the collective selections and votes of the 73 participants who attended both Part One and Part Two of the Community Summit.

Priority List of Non-Mandatory Services
Collective result of selections made by 73 participants in the Community Summit

| | | | | | | Willingness to pay more rates to keep a service | |
|-------------|---|------------|------------|------------|------------------|---|-------------|
| AREA | SERVICE | VOTES (72) | % OF VOTES | NET IMPACT | CUMULATIVE TOTAL | No. of People (71) | % of People |
| SOCIAL | 75. Parking Operations | 71 | 99% | -\$197,151 | -\$197,151 | 27 | 38% |
| SOCIAL | 78. Queen Elizabeth II Community Centre | 70 | 97% | \$104,894 | -\$92,257 | 33 | 46% |
| SOCIAL | 41. Aquarena Swimming Pool and Associated Activities | 69 | 96% | \$880,756 | \$788,499 | 35 | 49% |
| SOCIAL | 61. Library: Client Services: Sales, Services and Room Hire | 67 | 93% | -\$23,104 | \$765,395 | 24 | 34% |
| CULTURE | 21. Mullewa: Branch Library Services | 66 | 92% | \$23,877 | \$789,272 | 28 | 39% |
| SOCIAL | 46. CCTV Operations | 65 | 90% | \$50,747 | \$840,019 | 34 | 48% |
| CULTURE | 25. Queens Park Theatre | 64 | 89% | \$505,881 | \$1,345,900 | 34 | 48% |
| SOCIAL | 71. Mullewa: Swimming Pool and Associated Activities | 64 | 89% | \$106,235 | \$1,452,135 | 30 | 42% |
| ECONOMY | 97. Mullewa: Local Airfield Management | 64 | 89% | \$13,526 | \$1,465,661 | 27 | 38% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 36. Parks: Graffiti Removal | 61 | 85% | \$8,500 | \$1,474,161 | 21 | 30% |
| SOCIAL | 73. Mullewa: Youth Centre and Related Services | 61 | 85% | \$126,807 | \$1,600,968 | 27 | 38% |
| ECONOMY | 95. Geraldton Visitor Centre | 61 | 85% | \$646,164 | \$2,247,132 | 24 | 34% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 39. Renewable Energy and Efficiency Program | 59 | 82% | \$50,000 | \$2,297,132 | 33 | 46% |
| SOCIAL | 68. Mullewa: Community Services Support | 59 | 82% | \$71,391 | \$2,368,523 | 23 | 32% |
| SOCIAL | 87. Summer Surf Patrol | 59 | 82% | \$48,774 | \$2,417,297 | 26 | 37% |
| CULTURE | 02. Anzac Day Commemorative Services | 58 | 81% | \$14,554 | \$2,431,851 | 25 | 35% |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|----|-----|-----------|-------------|----|-----|
| SOCIAL | 60. Library: Client Services: Housebound and Outreach Service | 58 | 81% | \$23,479 | \$2,455,330 | 23 | 32% |
| CULTURE | 23. Mullewa: Cemetery Service | 57 | 79% | \$18,700 | \$2,474,030 | 25 | 35% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 28. Community Nursery | 57 | 79% | \$52,000 | \$2,526,030 | 25 | 35% |
| CULTURE | 15. Heritage: Support 3 External Community Museums | 56 | 78% | \$33,950 | \$2,559,980 | 25 | 35% |
| SOCIAL | 56. Crime Prevention Projects | 56 | 78% | \$30,878 | \$2,590,858 | 26 | 37% |
| SOCIAL | 65. Mullewa: Caravan Park and Associated Facilities | 55 | 76% | \$16,474 | \$2,607,332 | 19 | 27% |
| SOCIAL | 70. Mullewa: Customer Service | 55 | 76% | \$319,432 | \$2,926,764 | 24 | 34% |
| SOCIAL | 54. Community Grants | 54 | 75% | \$371,979 | \$3,298,743 | 28 | 39% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 29. Community Revegetation Program | 53 | 74% | \$51,000 | \$3,349,743 | 30 | 42% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 40. Water Smart Programme | 52 | 72% | \$25,000 | \$3,374,743 | 28 | 39% |
| SOCIAL | 66. Mullewa: Community Events | 52 | 72% | \$85,150 | \$3,459,893 | 19 | 27% |
| CULTURE | 03. Art Gallery: Exhibitions and Collection | 51 | 71% | \$261,000 | \$3,720,893 | 16 | 23% |
| SOCIAL | 42. Australia Day Event | 51 | 71% | \$139,214 | \$3,860,107 | 15 | 21% |
| SOCIAL | 58. Family Day Care | 51 | 71% | \$140,107 | \$4,000,214 | 20 | 28% |
| SOCIAL | 90. Youth N Motion | 51 | 71% | \$26,818 | \$4,027,032 | 18 | 25% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 34. Meru Waste Disposal Facility: Business Opportunity Development | 50 | 69% | \$7,000 | \$4,034,032 | 19 | 27% |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|----|-----|-----------|-------------|----|-----|
| ENVIRONMENT | 35. Meru Waste Disposal Facility: Techniques and Technologies | 50 | 69% | \$10,000 | \$4,044,032 | 20 | 28% |
| CULTURE | 19. Library: Young Peoples Services: Randolph Stow Young Writers Awards | 49 | 68% | \$28,405 | \$4,072,437 | 20 | 28% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 37. Recycling | 49 | 68% | \$327,000 | \$4,399,437 | 33 | 46% |
| SOCIAL | 67. Mullewa: Community Groups Support | 49 | 68% | \$46,800 | \$4,446,237 | 23 | 32% |
| SOCIAL | 59. Grounds Bookings | 48 | 67% | \$41,012 | \$4,487,249 | 15 | |
| ENVIRONMENT | 32. Health: Projects | 47 | 65% | \$55,140 | \$4,542,389 | 18 | 25% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 38. Refuse Collection: Annual Bulk Kerbside Collection | 47 | 65% | \$220,000 | \$4,762,389 | 30 | 42% |
| SOCIAL | 72. Mullewa: Vehicle and Driver Licensing (Dept of Transport Agency) | 47 | 65% | \$36,648 | \$4,799,037 | 19 | 27% |
| SOCIAL | 77. Parks: Pontoon Placement and Maintenance | 47 | 65% | \$20,000 | \$4,819,037 | 15 | 21% |
| CULTURE | 07. Civic Function: HMAS Sydney II | 46 | 64% | \$15,367 | \$4,834,404 | 16 | 23% |
| ECONOMY | 92. City Public Wi-Fi and Public Internet | 46 | 64% | \$75,000 | \$4,909,404 | 18 | 25% |
| SOCIAL | 81. Recurrent Grants: Geraldton Cemetery Board | 45 | 63% | \$35,200 | \$4,944,604 | 24 | 34% |
| SOCIAL | 82. Recurrent Grants: Health, Community Support and Social Groups | 45 | 63% | \$93,606 | \$5,038,210 | 23 | 32% |
| CULTURE | 08. Community Development Urban Projects | 44 | 61% | \$25,522 | \$5,063,732 | 21 | 30% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 33. Horticulture: Tree Planting and Coastal Planting | 44 | 61% | \$169,000 | \$5,232,732 | 28 | 39% |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|----|-----|-----------|-------------|----|-----|
| SOCIAL | 88. Your City Your Say | 44 | 61% | \$20,000 | \$5,252,732 | 16 | 23% |
| CULTURE | 17. Library: Better Beginnings Early Literacy Program | 43 | 60% | \$79,622 | \$5,332,354 | 25 | 35% |
| CULTURE | 10. Health: Aboriginal Initiatives | 42 | 58% | \$12,000 | \$5,344,354 | 20 | 28% |
| CULTURE | 18. Library: Client Services: General and special events | 42 | 58% | \$120,891 | \$5,465,245 | 24 | 34% |
| SOCIAL | 49. Civic Function: Mayors Seniors Bus Tour | 42 | 58% | \$10,676 | \$5,475,921 | 12 | 17% |
| CULTURE | 01. Annual Scholarship: Geraldton University | 41 | 57% | \$4,000 | \$5,479,921 | 21 | 30% |
| CULTURE | 16. Indigenous Affairs | 41 | 57% | \$39,129 | \$5,519,050 | 15 | 21% |
| SOCIAL | 47. Christmas Decorations | 41 | 57% | \$34,554 | \$5,553,604 | 15 | 21% |
| SOCIAL | 91. Youth Projects | 41 | 57% | \$60,334 | \$5,613,938 | 15 | 21% |
| CULTURE | 09. Cultural Celebrations | 40 | 56% | \$67,321 | \$5,681,259 | 19 | 27% |
| CULTURE | 12. Heritage: Oral History Program | 40 | 56% | \$40,956 | \$5,722,215 | 20 | 28% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 30. Community Sustainability Programs | 40 | 56% | \$182,893 | \$5,905,108 | 30 | 42% |
| SOCIAL | 50. Civic Function: Thank A Volunteer | 40 | 56% | \$10,069 | \$5,915,177 | 14 | 20% |
| SOCIAL | 62. Mayoral Discretionary Funds | 39 | 54% | \$31,000 | \$5,946,177 | 12 | 17% |
| CULTURE | 24. Mullewa: Community and Cultural Workshops | 38 | 53% | \$109,300 | \$6,055,477 | 12 | 17% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 31. Geraldton Community Artificial Reef Committee (GCARC) Representation | 38 | 53% | \$7,000 | \$6,062,477 | 9 | 13% |
| SOCIAL | 52. Community Engagement Projects | 38 | 53% | \$51,000 | \$6,113,477 | 24 | 34% |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|----|-----|-----------|-------------|----|-----|
| SOCIAL | 64. Mullewa Muster and Rodeo Signature Event | 38 | 53% | \$67,000 | \$6,180,477 | 13 | 18% |
| ECONOMY | 94. Events Strategy and Attraction | 38 | 53% | \$79,000 | \$6,259,477 | 20 | 28% |
| SOCIAL | 53. Community Events Support | 37 | 51% | \$132,429 | \$6,391,906 | 20 | 28% |
| SOCIAL | 51. Civic Functions: Miscellaneous | 36 | 50% | \$60,483 | \$6,452,389 | 10 | 14% |
| SOCIAL | 63. Midnight Basketball | 36 | 50% | \$82,991 | \$6,535,380 | 21 | 30% |
| CULTURE | 22. Mullewa: Cemetery Aerial Image Map Updating | 35 | 49% | \$5,707 | \$6,541,087 | 12 | 17% |
| SOCIAL | 44. Banners: Mall Design and Production | 35 | 49% | \$18,000 | \$6,559,087 | 7 | 10% |
| SOCIAL | 48. Civic Function: Council Meetings Catering | 35 | 49% | \$27,473 | \$6,586,560 | 9 | 13% |
| SOCIAL | 83. Recurrent Grants: Signature Events | 35 | 49% | \$100,576 | \$6,687,136 | 19 | 27% |
| CULTURE | 06. Artist Opportunities Program | 34 | 47% | \$32,158 | \$6,719,294 | 14 | 20% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 27. Climate Change Projects | 34 | 47% | \$80,000 | \$6,799,294 | 29 | 41% |
| ECONOMY | 99. Vibrancy Strategies | 34 | 47% | \$280,000 | \$7,079,294 | 20 | 28% |
| CULTURE | 13. Heritage: Projects | 33 | 46% | \$93,537 | \$7,172,831 | 21 | 30% |
| CULTURE | 14. Heritage: Publishing Program and Bookshop | 32 | 44% | \$25,777 | \$7,198,608 | 19 | 27% |
| SOCIAL | 45. Banners: Mall Installation | 32 | 44% | \$14,000 | \$7,212,608 | 10 | 14% |
| SOCIAL | 76. Parks: Line Marking | 32 | 44% | \$7,100 | \$7,219,708 | 11 | 15% |
| SOCIAL | 89. Youth Community Collaboration Events | 32 | 44% | \$38,334 | \$7,258,042 | 18 | 25% |
| CULTURE | 11. Heritage: Implementation of Heritage Services | 31 | 43% | \$291,413 | \$7,549,455 | 22 | 31% |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|---|----|-----|-----------|-------------|----|-----|
| CULTURE | 20. Library: Young Peoples Services: Special Promotional Events | 31 | 43% | \$53,557 | \$7,603,012 | 13 | 18% |
| CULTURE | 26.Reconciliation Committee and Associated Activities | 31 | 43% | \$71,413 | \$7,674,425 | 16 | 23% |
| SOCIAL | 57. Events: Stage Delivery and Set-up | 31 | 43% | \$22,200 | \$7,696,625 | 13 | 18% |
| SOCIAL | 79. Recurrent Donations: Arts, Culture and Heritage Groups | 31 | 43% | \$86,143 | \$7,782,768 | 17 | 24% |
| SOCIAL | 74. Our Home Our Streets | 30 | 42% | \$100,907 | \$7,883,675 | 16 | 23% |
| SOCIAL | 84. Recurrent Grants: Sporting | 30 | 42% | \$66,551 | \$7,950,226 | 16 | 23% |
| SOCIAL | 80. Recurrent Grants: Education | 28 | 39% | \$18,104 | \$7,968,330 | 21 | 30% |
| ECONOMY | 93. Economic Development Administration and Management Costs | 27 | 38% | \$138,738 | \$8,107,068 | 20 | 28% |
| CULTURE | 04. Art Gallery: Mid West Art Prize | 26 | 36% | \$35,000 | \$8,142,068 | 10 | 14% |
| SOCIAL | 85. Spalding Place Making | 26 | 36% | \$20,000 | \$8,162,068 | 12 | 17% |
| ECONOMY | 96. Investment: Promotion, Attraction and Facilitation | 26 | 36% | \$145,000 | \$8,307,068 | 20 | 28% |
| SOCIAL | 86. Sporting Organisations Engagement | 25 | 35% | \$31,495 | \$8,338,563 | 14 | 20% |
| SOCIAL | 43. Banners: Maitland Park and Eadon Clarke Installation | 24 | 33% | \$15,340 | \$8,353,903 | 8 | 11% |
| SOCIAL | 55. Cricket Wicket Maintenance | 23 | 32% | \$70,000 | \$8,423,903 | 10 | 14% |
| CULTURE | 05. Artist in Residence Program | 19 | 26% | \$22,158 | \$8,446,061 | 9 | 13% |
| ECONOMY | 98. Sister Cities | 14 | 19% | \$63,000 | \$8,509,061 | 6 | 8% |
| SOCIAL | 69. Mullewa: Community Trust | 10 | 14% | \$80,988 | \$8,590,049 | 0 | 0% |

NB: Particibudget provided an opportunity for participants to make comments about each service. Some 100 pages of comments were submitted. These included questions, statements, suggestions and general feedback. Comments were provided to participants to assist them in their final deliberations and decision making. Comments are also being considered by the City and will be provided to Council. In the interests of brevity, the 100 pages of comments are not included in this report; however they have been formally recorded and can be supplied on request.

Outcomes and observations

On leaving the Summit, most participants said they were pleased to have the opportunity to be involved and to have their voice heard. Results of a formal survey of participants' views of the Summit will be discussed later in this report.

Some participants commented that they would have liked more time to discuss and deliberate on services.

Some participants felt the information on services should have been expanded to include speculation on what would happen if the service was withdrawn.

There was some concern from some participants about services that fell below the funding line.

It was felt that some participants were selecting services only to 'spend' all their allocated \$6million dollars. In essence, as a result of the finite budget, if participants did not have sufficient funding for a service, they were choosing other services they could afford, even if the services were not their preferred priorities.

Formal Review

To enable the City to improve its public participation processes, participants were asked to complete a pre and post Summit survey. Some findings from the surveys were;

1. Although 29% were unsure or couldn't say how it would go at the onset, by the end of Part Two more than 78% thought the Summit went quite well or very well.
2. At the end of Part Two the number of participants who had a better understanding of services by the City increased overall.
3. Some participants noted the following limitations of the process; insufficient time to deliberate; limited options to change the budget for services; and under representation from youth and Aboriginal people.

Full results of the surveys are attached. (See attachment 11.)

It should be noted that comparing the results of the pre and post surveys is somewhat problematic given the number of people who were unable to participate in Part Two of the Summit.

Summary

Despite the challenges of a last minute date change and conducting this process within very tight timeframes, the City's aim to seek community input into decisions about which services should or should not be continued via facilitating a process for the community to develop a prioritised list of services, was achieved. While a perceived limitation of the process was the lack of youth and Aboriginal community representation; it should be noted that participation by the Aboriginal community was quite strong with 8% of participants identifying as Aboriginal and that 7% of participants were within the 18-30 age range.

In summary, the process has provided the City with valuable information on community views and will assist the Executive Team in developing the 2014/15 budget for Council to consider.

Acknowledgements

The City of Greater Geraldton acknowledges all participants for their commitment and time. Their efforts on behalf of the Greater Geraldton community is valued and appreciated. The efforts of people who had to travel long distances, up to 250kms for the round trip, is further acknowledged.

The support of the team at the Western Australian Combined Centre for Rural Health (WACHR) is sincerely appreciated. Their involvement ensured the City could demonstrate every effort was made to include people who would otherwise not choose to participate in such processes.

To all staff at the City of Greater Geraldton who assisted in a wide variety of ways to support this important process; you exhibited the City's STARS values and your hard work is sincerely appreciated.

Thank you.