



AGENDA FORUM
MINUTES

19 MARCH 2013

Departmental Guideline for Agenda Forums

Council Forums

Local government forums range from a once-only event to discuss and explore a particular issue, a number of sessions to address matters such as a specific project or the compilation of a report for internal or external use, through to forums held at regular intervals with a consistent structure and objectives.

Regular forums run in local governments exhibit two broad categories which we have titled *agenda* and *concept*. They are differentiated by the stage of development of issues which are discussed by elected members and staff. The two types are described below along with the variations in procedural controls and processes suggested for each.

Agenda Forums

For proper decision-making, elected members must have the opportunity to gain maximum knowledge and understanding of any issue presented to the Council on which they must vote. It is reasonable for elected members to expect that they will be provided with all the relevant information they need to understand issues listed on the agenda for the next or following ordinary Council meetings. The complexity of many items means that elected members may need to be given information additional to that in a staff report and/or they may need an opportunity to ask questions of relevant staff members.

Many local governments have determined that this can be achieved by the elected members convening as a body to become better informed on issues listed for council decision. Such assemblies have been termed *agenda forums*. It is considered they are much more efficient and effective than elected members meeting staff on an individual basis for such a purpose with the added benefit that all elected members hear the same questions and answers.

To protect the integrity of the decision-making process it is essential that *agenda forums* are run with strict procedures.

There must be no opportunity for a collective council decision or implied decision that binds the local government to be made during a forum.

Agenda forums should be for staff presenting information and elected members asking questions, not opportunities to debate the issues. A council should have clearly stated rules that prohibit debate or vigorous discussion between elected members that could be interpreted as debate. Rules such as questions through the chair and no free-flowing discussion between elected members should be applied.

Procedures Applying to Both Concept and Agenda Forums

The Department recommends that councils adopt a set of procedures for both types of forums which include the following:

- Dates and times for forums should be set well in advance where practical;

- The CEO will ensure timely written notice and the agenda for each forum is provided to all members;
- Forum papers should be distributed to members at least three days prior to the meeting;
- The mayor/president or other designated elected member is to be the presiding member at all forums;
- Elected members, employees, consultants and other participants shall disclose their financial and conflicts of interest in matters to be discussed;
- Interests are to be disclosed in accordance with the provisions of the Act as they apply to ordinary council meetings. Persons disclosing a financial interest will not participate in that part of a forum relating to their interest and leave the meeting room;
- There is to be no opportunity for a person with an interest to request that they continue in the forum; and
- A record should be kept of all forums. As no decisions will be made, the record need only be a general record of items covered but should record disclosures of interest with appropriate departures/returns.

Procedures Specific to Agenda Forums

The Department recommends that councils adopt specific procedures for *agenda forums* which include the following:

- Agenda forums should be open to the public unless the forum is being briefed on a matter for which a formal council meeting may be closed; and
- Items to be addressed will be limited to matters listed on the forthcoming agenda or completed and scheduled to be listed within the next two meetings (or period deemed appropriate).

Meeting Record

Meeting Name	Agenda Forum	Meeting No.	3 - 2013
Meeting Date	19 March 2013		
Meeting Time	7.35pm		
Meeting Location	Chambers, Cathedral Avenue		
Attendees	Mayor I Carpenter Cr N McIlwaine Cr R Ashplant Cr N Bennett Cr D Brick Cr J Clune Cr R deTrafford Cr P Fiorenza Cr C Gabelish Cr R Hall Cr N Messina Cr I Middleton Cr R Ramage Cr T Thomas Officers: A Brun, Chief Executive Officer C Wood, Director of Organisational Performance P Melling, Director of Sustainable Communities B Davis, Director of Treasury & Finance A Selvey, Acting Director of Creative Communities N Arbuthnot, Director of Community Infrastructure P Radalj, Manager Strategic Business Planning S Smith, Manger Geraldton Regional Library M Chadwick, Manager Environmental Health and Sustainability C Budhan, Manager Arts Culture and Events S Smith, Manager Libraries and Heritage M Connell, Manager Urban and Regional Development M Adam, <i>Meeting Secretary</i>	By Invitation	
		Member of Public Press	4 1
		Leave of Absence	Cr S Van Styn
		Apologies	
		Absent	Cr Ramage
	Distribution		

1 Declaration of opening

The Presiding member opened the meeting at 7.35pm

2 Apologies/leave of absence (previously approved)

Existing Approved Leave

Councillor	From	To (inclusive)
Cr N McIlwaine	9 March 2013	16 March 2013
Cr C Gabelish	27 March 2013	15 April 2013

3 Declarations of conflicts of interest

Cr R deTrafford declared a direct financial interest in Item SC091 Geraldton Health, Education & Training Precinct Master plan as he is employed by CUCRH.

P Melling declared an indirect financial interest in Item TF048 Lease portion of Reserve 17001 to the Batavia Miniature Railway Society as he is a member of the club.

4 Review of the Agenda Items for the forthcoming Ordinary Meeting of Council dated 26 March 2013

Please Note that this forum does not allow for debate or decision making on any item within this agenda. Briefings will be given by staff or consultants for the purpose of ensuring that elected members and the public are more fully informed

The Presiding Member will call each Report in the Agenda and open the floor to deputation, questions and statements.

Members of the public may verbally ask make presentations or ask questions on the item relating to the Draft Report to Council, subject to the provision in writing of the statement or question on the prescribed form.

Councillors may ask questions (strictly no debating) relating to each item as it is called the Presiding member.

There is no general public questions or statements permitted on matters not contained in the set agenda Council Agenda Forum. Any Questions relating to general matters or matters not in the agenda of the current Council Agenda Forum should be asked at Public Question time at an Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Petitions, Deputations Or Presentations

Presentation : SC094 Final Adoption of the South Greenough to Cape Burney Coastal Planning Strategy

Mr Tayne Evershed, Planning Solutions

The report was provided on behalf of Planning Solutions for the owner No.2 Company Road Greenough. Main points: The client's site is not in the Lucy's

beach surf node, but identified as abutting the area. The proposed node does not allow for overnight accommodation. Mr Evershed requested that Council consider the information provided and review an alternative recommendation to include overnight accommodation.

Put the necessary strategic framework in place.

Question

Cr Middleton asked whether the client would like to put a hotel on the property? And were there any plans to offer the customers four wheeling type activities - What are the nature of the activities in addition of overnight accommodation.

Response

Mr Evershed advised that the purpose of the submission is to “keep the door open” in terms of an agreement for the nature of the activities of the area. He would not expect that there would be four wheel vehicles on the site.

Question

Cr Gabelish -Land that maybe useable. Comment about the useability of the land and suitability for development.

Response

Mr Evershed noted the view that amended proposals for consideration would seek to be kept within the developable/stable areas.

Question

Cr Bennett to Mr Melling – Should there be applicants that want to do developments, can they put an application for a Town Planning Scheme amendment at any time.

Response

Mr Melling advised yes.

Question

Cr Bennett asked if applications be considered on their merits.

Response

Mr Melling referred to the town planning scheme. The City will be guided by and the suitability on a case by case basis within the policy framework.

Question

Cr Hall asked whether the property extends to the high water mark?

Response:

Mr Evershed was not able to respond. In relation to access in the front of the beach from the side it won't change.

Question

Cr Gabelish asked whether there is a strategy in place – if difficult for the officers to support

Response

Mr Melling – There is a lot of focus on the land capability – which is the main concern at this time, and the scale of the development.

The views from the presentation will be taken into account.

Significant Strategic Matters

SC091 Geraldton Health, Education & Training Precinct Master Plan

Cr R deTrafford declared a direct financial interest in Item SC091 Geraldton Health, Education & Training Precinct Master plan as he is employed by CUCRH.

Nil

SC094 Final Adoption Of The South Greenough To Cape Burney Coastal Planning Strategy

Nil

Audit and Risk Management

Nil.

Strategic & Policy Matters

OP0032 Greater Geraldton Futures Governance Alliance CommitteeQuestion

Cr Mcilwaine asked why does the recommendation still include the GPA representatives given they have declined to participate.

Response

The CEO advised that the Executive believe it is valuable to hold the spot should the GPA change their mind.

OP0033 Amendments To CP015 Code Of Conduct For Elected Members

Nil

OP0034 CP057 Smarter City Policy & IBM Smarter Cities Report 2012**Jason Smith, Everything Geraldton**Question

Regarding items OP0034 and OP0035 submissions were made that were broadly supportive but also had specific recommendation for amendments or changes to the strategies and policy. Some of these recommended changes were based on factual omissions, others were suggestions of how the strategies of their implementation could be improved. The agenda item doesn't clearly state whether the strategies or policies will be amended based on our recommendations. Can you please clarify if and how the strategies or policies would be amended to reflect the recommendations?

Response

The CEO advised that the submissions are attached to the officers report. The intent is that the feedback provided will go to the proposed governance groups which will take ownership of these policies and will incorporate the ideas in the submissions into their process of implementing the policy .

OP0035 CP056 Greater Geraldton Digital First Policy & Strategy

Nil

TF047 Self-Supporting Loan PolicyQuestion

Cr Clune asked how many individuals (groups) are included for the total of the loan amount listed?

Response

Mr Radalj advised that there are seven or eight groups with very small loans and two main loans. The most significant loan is to the Geraldton hockey association.

Question

Cr Clune asked whether any loans become bad loans?

Response

Mr Radalj answered no.

Response

The Mayor advised that there was one a long time ago, it was to the Geraldton Sportsman Club.

Response

The CEO advised that the intent is not to withdraw the service but to put a policy framework in place to prioritise applications. If a case is put to the City it

will be considered. Consideration of applications will be framed within the changed guidelines for loans to the City from Treasury.

Question

Cr Clune commented that sporting clubs may not have assets to support borrowings.

Response

The CEO advised that the Hockey Association for example is able to access funding due to proven revenue streams.

Question

Cr McIlwaine asked whether we normally advertise to seek comments on new Policies before they are given approval and can the Council do this?

Response

The CEO advised that there is no statutory requirements to advertise this type of policy however the Council has the right to change the recommendation and advertise for public comment.

Question

Cr Gabelish commented on Section C and asked whether the City would have to be convinced that the self-supporting loan will deliver benefits to the Community?

Response:

Mr Davis advised that the Budget process sets down new loans that will be included in the budget. A policy guides what the council will approve. For example if you look at the Capital works program –the Council decide on community benefits and cost the borrowings. The policy refers to the decision regarding whether the City would fund a self-supporting loan or use the loan funding available for roads. The borrowing capacity for the City is limited to a percentage of investments and the percentage is set down by Treasury Corp.

SC090 Proposed Model Kardaloo Community

Question

Cr McIlwaine asked for clarification on the meaning of Option D – of the Executive recommendation

Response:

Mr Melling advised that the option acknowledged the potential to accommodate future growth in the Mullewa area and not in the isolated community.

Response:

The CEO commented that the Council can provide advice to the Department of Local Government. This item is about setting a policy decision that any

further accommodation would be in the Mullewa Town site – The Council is giving Advice and direction to the Department.

Response

The Mayor commented that there is a finite amount of funding available– If there were more people living at Kardaloo, who would pay for it?

Question

Cr Messina commented that the Kardaloo Community is over 100 km from Geraldton not 98 km as stated in the attachment. He asked -with reference to the upkeep of the road is the City talking about the Mullewa-Carnarvon road? And commented that this is the City's responsibility.

Note: extract from attachment reads “The Aboriginal community of Kardaloo Farm, also known as Wandanooka is located 26kms north east of the townsite of Mullewa and 98kms from Geraldton.”

Response

The CEO commented that it is the preferred option that there is no future growth at Kardaloo and that the City is responsible for maintaining the road.

Question

Cr Hall enquired -who has the overarching control for growth and development of the community?

Response

Mr Chadwick answered that the land is owned freehold by the Aboriginal Land Trust – who have a lease arrangement with the Kardaloo Aboriginal Corporation. The Aboriginal Land trust is ultimately responsible for the use of the land. The land is currently used as a residential settlement – however it may be used as a pastoral lease in the future.

Note extract from agenda attachment: “The community is a freehold parcel of land held in trust with the Aboriginal Lands Trust under title number 1981/166 to Kardaloo Aboriginal Corporation, managed by the Department of Indigenous Affairs on behalf of the land owners, the Department of Regional Development and Lands. There may be future scope for the community to be declassified as Aboriginal Lands Trust land and returned to freehold to a particular owner, offering the City the option of providing services to the land owner to the standard delivered to other similarly located landowners and charge appropriate value of rates.”

Question

Cr De Trafford asked about the long term effects of moving or burying the land fill?

Response

Mr Chadwick answered that Option 1 is to remove waste to a licensed landfill and Option 2 is to bury the waste on site which may mean that the site is classified as contaminated. The classification will depend on the DEC

(Department of Environment and Conservation) classification. The preferred option will depend on the type of waste on site. The City would like to make the site look more presentable and safer for the children.

Note from agenda attachment; "The City has identified two options for the decommissioning of community landfills:

- a. *Close the sites by covering and list as contaminated sites.*
This would require the sites to be buried and maintained by the land owner (DIA) as contaminated sites. The City may be required to perform water table sampling and other activities. This option would involve heavy earth moving machinery to bury the sites. The City would be required to hire machinery and labour to perform the burial.
- b. *Remove the landfill items from the community and close the sites.*
This option would require the current volume [1000m³] of waste to be transported to Geraldton landfill site and the community landfill to be covered with earth and closed. The City would need to tender for a contractor to carry out these works, including the transport and disposal of the waste. Disposal fees would need to be estimated by the City and covered in any funding arrangements.

The City recommends pursuing option a, closing of the community landfill site by burial as this option has a minimum impact on the City's funding requirements and capacity of the Geraldton landfill site."

Question

Cr De Trafford asked whether the cost for cartage of apparatus and fire fighting equipment is included in the Emergency services levy.

Response

Mr Chadwick advised that the Emergency Management plans for Mullewa – included Kardaloo. What is being proposed for Kardaloo is mitigation – a water tank for response to a fire. The model proposed the City install and maintain fire breaks a per the Bush Fire Act.

Note extract from agenda attachment; "There is the potential for the City to install response infrastructure, in the form of a water tank available for any fire fighting emergencies. The tank would be a capital item approximately \$15,000 required to be held by either the community or the City. As the land owners are legally responsible for this equipment, the community may be willing to purchase and manage this asset.

The City would be responsible for fire mitigation activities, including maintaining a 3 meter mineral earth firebreak around the perimeter of the community, a 20 meter firebreak around houses and buildings and a 100 meter fuel separation zone. These activities are estimated at \$3,000 per year.

It is also proposed that the community be included in the City's broader emergency management arrangements and that educational activities with community residents are coordinated with FESA. "

Response

Cr Messina advised that the decision to locate the water tank on a neighbouring pastoral lease was made taking into consideration the following- If the tank was placed at the community it could have been a danger to children (drowning) or the tank may have been vandalised.

Response

The Mayor commented that this is a case study to determine the costs (scoping studies) for sustaining the community – the City will fund in the first instance and the Commonwealth will refund the money.

Question

Cr Gabelish asked about the level of ongoing funding for the Council to provide services – he commented that the funding mentioned appeared to be one off

Response

Mr Chadwick advised that the model is funded for the first two years with the existing funding through FaHCSIA, the Department of Local government have funding and following this the land owner pays.

Note extract from agenda attachment; "This model has determined the current levels of funding and sources provided for Kardaloo community municipal service delivery is primarily through MUNS and RAESP funding from both the Commonwealth and State governments.

The expectation of WA Government for future funding arrangements for the City is to capture these current funding sources and include a component of the Emergency Services Levy (ESL) and a rate equivalent payment from the community. There would also be opportunities to align current WA Government funding, such as the Environmental Health program, Indigenous Roads and Emergency management, to ensure activities delivered by the City are funded accordingly.

Both the ESL and rate equivalent would need to be determined at the time of commitment to deliver services. It is anticipated the City would apply a rate equivalent of that charged to the Walkaway Township, which offers a general comparison of distance and services."

Question

Cr Gabelish asked whether the City has had conversations with the Aboriginal land trust.

Response

M Chadwick advised that following the study the Commonwealth will have conversations with the land owners. There are other steps which need to

happen before actions detailed in the report will occur. The decision made next week will be taken to the Department of Local Government which will then take the information to the other Government bodies.

Note from response by DLG 20 March 2013 "this model is a preparatory step towards the City participating in a transfer of responsibility for municipal services – not a commitment to deliver at any point in time. That the Yr 1 + 2. Scenario is a potential pilot testing the delivery of services, allowing community engagement and coordination of services with the City provided funding to deliver." Discussions with ALT continues between DLG on the City's behalf.

Response

The CEO commented that the objective is to obtain the mandate from Council and this would enable refinement of the decisions by Federal agencies and State (who are providing the funding). In principal the item does not commit the Council over the long term. All The City is committing to is the trial phase (This can be capped at a limited time). The item can be amended – It is to enable Council to develop a model with State and Federal Government Departments- There are strong advantages to the model. The Council appears to have concerns that we are buying into a long term deal that we can't get out of.

Question

Cr Hall asked for confirmation that there is a Guaranteed backstop , that if the pilot falls over the Council has an escape clause.

Response

The CEO replied that he must highlight that the City did incur a cost (resources staff/ in kind/ capacity). He noted that the Kardaloo Community is a part of the Greater Geraldton Community and that Federal governments had given notice it no longer intended to fund municipal services in the communities. He advised that not all users of Council services are in a position to pay for services. This could be a model which could work and provide an opportunity for Local Government to be compensated for the provision of Council services

Question

Cr Clune asked The CEO to confirm that there were no rates received from the property.

Response

Mr Chadwick advised that the property is currently categorised at classification 6 which is rates exempt. The ALT website says that the Aboriginal organisation could pay rates and the Council decision next week is only one step in moving forward towards changing the rates classification.

Note: see ALT website at;
<http://dia.wa.gov.au/Documents/ALT/ALT%20Policy,%20Local%20Government%20Charges%20on%20the%20ALT%20Estate,%20V2.pdf>

DLG informed the City on 20 March 2013 it is clarifying this aspect through the State Solicitors Office regarding legal access and rateability.

Response

The CEO posed the question “how can we encourage change” and commented that this model encouraged and sought to obtain payment for services. He commented that the Kardaloo Community and Aboriginal Land Trust would have the opportunity to question the value received for services and consider the best option for the location of a community (in existing townsites such as Mullewa)

Statement

Cr Bennett referred to the City’s reconciliation policy in relation to the item

Question

Cr Messina commented that this land is private and the Council must not commit ratepayer’s money where it shouldn’t be committed.

Question

Cr Gabelish asked what was meant by “formalised land use” he commented that it was not formalised tenure, rather a formalised agreement. He asked whether the conversation was about responsibility under the lease and for clarification on the objectives being discussed. He commented that he could not see anything in the report which referred to objectives of the incorporated body. Cr Gabelish asked if there had been consultation with the chairperson of MEEDAC or with the chairperson of the Kardaloo community ? He noted that he could not see anything in the report that supported the recommendation on behalf of MEEDAC. He asked that the City seek confirmation from MEEDAC that they support this model.

Note: The land use agreement if decided as the appropriate mechanism would support the City to deliver services and charge fees. The objectives of the community and Corporation are separate issues and would need to be discussed as part of service agreement negotiations. As stated in the model if the community didn’t support delivery of a particular service the City would not be required to deliver. Formal communication of these arrangements have not occurred with the community as this point, the model is a depiction of what the City could do and for how much, both pieces of information important to have before discussing with the community.

Response

Mr Chadwick responded that the Kardaloo Community may decide that they do not want certain services. The report refers to previous council minutes - It indicates that the next step is to discuss and understand what the objectives of the Aboriginal Lands Trust are – He advised that he would provide clarification of objectives. The question is taken on notice and a briefing note will be provided. Mr Chadwick advised that the CEO of MEEDAC advised verbally that it is logical that Local government provide Municipal services to the community. The services provided currently by MEEDAC are unsustainable and loss of the work will not have a negative impact.

Note: a written letter was received by MEEDAC Inc on 20 March 2012 following further request. The agenda report contained the verbal comments the City received from MEEDAC Inc as no written feedback was forthcoming prior. Mr Chadwick has spoken with the current chairperson of Kardaloo Aboriginal Community Mr Robert Lockyer explaining to him the scheduled meeting and purpose. No discussion has been had directly with the Community as the City intends to develop the model first which if accepted by the Commonwealth will then be presented to the Community and if accepted by the Community a service agreement would be discussed. It is considered premature to discuss the model with the community when the current service provider has not yet decided the model is suitable to transfer its responsibility to the City or any other LGA in the State.

Response

Mr Davis advised that the uncertain tenure of Kardaloo – needs to be formalised

Operational Matters

OP0030 Appointment of Auditors

Nil

OP0031 Compliance Audit Return 2012

Nil

TF048 Lease Portion Of Reserve 17001 To The Batavia Miniature Railway Society

P Melling declared an indirect financial interest in Item TF048 Lease portion of Reserve 17001 to the Batavia Miniature Railway Society, as he is a member of the club, but was not required to leave Chambers as there was no discussion.

Nil

TF049 Mullewa Community Trust – Allocation Of Funds 2013 TF050 Request By Drug Arm (Wa) Inc For Rates Exemption Under Section 6.26 (2) (G) Of The Local Government Act 1995.

Question

Cr McIlwaine questioned the total listed on page 66 the funding disbursement. He advised that he couldn't tally up the total with the amounts for the applicants listed.

Response

Cr Messina advised that there is \$63,000 available annually and the funds are only allocated to the applications which are approved. He suggested the wording should be changed to “\$63,000 requested- rather than available “ He suggested obtaining the details of the applications which were rejected.

Question

Cr Gabelish commented on the Community Grants scheme which is signed off by CEO via Delegation and asked why the Mullewa Grants scheme could not be signed off in the same way.

Response

The CEO advised that the delegation granted did not extend to the Mullewa Trust however there could be an amendment to include it.

TF051 Mid Year Budget ReviewQuestion

Cr Mcilwaine asked -What period does the review cover? Why aren't the CDO funds mentioned in the review and what is happening with Meru? Will Cell 3 funding be a deferment be until next year?

Response

Paul Radalj advised that it covers up to February 2013.

Response

Mr Davis advised that the CDOs went back to cash not into the operating budget. He advised that the CDOs could be mentioned in a briefing note if required

Response

Mr Arbuthnot advised that Tenders were called for cell three and two tenders were received from local providers. During the process he asked staff to go back and review the profile of the cell 3. Geo technical information has now been obtained and the finding is that the City can recover more tipping space out of cell 3. Construction of cell 3 will be delayed as we are coming into a wet period and moisture will cause damage to the new lining. There is sufficient volume in the current cell to be able to operate for a further period – beyond the wet period.

Question

Cr Middleton asked about the revision of closing figure.

Response

Mr Radalj advised that the opening deficit from last year was greater than anticipated. The position for this year in isolation is better than expected.

SC092 Final Adoption Of Town Planning Scheme Amendment – ‘Recreation Active’ Additional Use, Rangeway

Nil

SC093 Final Adoption Of Town Planning Scheme Amendment – Mixed Use Rezoning, Geraldton

Nil

CC098 Addition Of Community Member Positions To The Public Arts Advisory Committee

Nil

CC099 Cramer Shed Project Funding

Nil

CC100 Proposed North Road Stock Route Drive Trail

Nil

CC106 Retail Trading Hours (Late Item)

Question

Cr McIlwaine commented that he had read in a briefing note that the City position was that the survey should have been more robust. He asked whether the City was intending to speak to the new CEO of the Chamber Rob Jefferies

Response

The CEO responded that there is a requirement for the City to run a survey. The City was hoping that the chamber would participate. The time frame for the City survey was not sufficient to demonstrate to the Minister that the survey was beyond reproach. The City required consultants to ethically test the survey prior to implementation. The City will talk to Rob Jefferies.

Question

Cr Messina asked whether the City had received the survey results from the Chamber.

Response

The Mayor advised that the results have been published on website.

CI041 RFT 43/1213 - Chemical Weed SprayQuestion

Cr Mcillwaine asked for the likely expense for this work, what was spent in 11/12 and what is budgeted for 12/13?

Response

N Arbuthnot advised that he did not have figures however he would confirm prior to next week's meeting(briefing note)

Reports To Be Received

<i>Office of the CEO</i>	
CEO021	Minutes for the WARCA Meeting 8 February 2013
CEO022	Minutes for the WARCA Meeting 2 August 2012
CEO023	Minutes for the WARCA Meeting 19 June 2012
CEO024	Report - Council Resolutions to 26 February 2013
<i>Reports of Organisational Performance</i>	
OP0036	Audit Committee Meeting Minutes 8 March 2013
<i>Reports of Sustainable Communities</i>	
SCDD072	Delegated Determination
<i>Reports of Creative Communities</i>	
CC101	Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes 12 December 2012
CC102	Heritage Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes 19 February 2013
CC103	HMAS Sydney II Memorial Committee Meeting Minutes 19 February 2013
CC104	Public Arts Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes 30 January 2013
CC105	Reconciliation Committee Meeting Minutes 1 February 2013
<i>Reports of Treasury and Finance</i>	
TF052	Statement of Financial Activity Period Ending 28 February 2013
TF053	Confidential Report – List of Accounts to be Paid Under Delegation

Question

Cr Mcillwaine referred to the report on progress / actions for Council resolutions. He asked about the process for amending inaccuracies

Response

The CEO advised that an email could be forwarded to the relevant officer with a 'c.c' to Councillor help desk.

5 Councillor Questions Without Notice**6 Confidential Business****7 Meeting closure**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.41pm

APPENDIX 1 – ATTACHMENTS AND REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

Attachments and Reports to be Received are available on the City of Greater Geraldton website at: <http://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/your-council/meetings>

FOR PUBLIC REVIEW - NOT FINAL COUNCIL AGENDA