

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Sheila Ferguson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 February 2022 4:37 PM  
**To:** DLGSC Act Review  
**Subject:** Local Government reform

I wish to make the following comments on the proposed reforms:

### **2.6 Standardised Meeting Procedures, Including Public Question Time.**

I strongly support the proposals under this section. I further request that in the minutes, a standard procedure be adopted for recording questions and deputations by the public. Some Councils record questions, including explanatory preamble, verbatim and record deputations in full, thereby truly giving the public a voice. Others, for example Harvey Shire, “summarise” questions, often distorting the meaning, and for deputations, only record the name of the speaker, the agenda item and whether for or against. These practices barely give the public a voice.

### **3.3 Clearer Guidance for Meeting Items that may be Confidential.**

I strongly support the proposals under this section. The need for this is clearly demonstrated by the fact that Harvey Shire’s 2020-21 Annual Report states that 9 FOI applications were made in the period, 8 of which were successful. They go behind closed doors FAR too often.

### **3.5 Chief Executive Officer Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) be Published**

I strongly support the proposals under this section. It may do something towards making CEO’s a little more accountable to the public. Information on bonus payments, and the basis on which they are made, should also be provided to the public.

### **4.5 Tiered Limits on the Number of Councillors**

I strongly support limiting the number of Councillors. Harvey Shire has **13** Councillors and a population of 28,299. This is a conspicuous waste of rate-payers’ money.

### **4.8 Reform of Candidate Profiles**

I believe candidates should not only be allowed to provide longer profiles but that they should be **required** to. The position of Councillor is important and the voting public should have a reasonable amount of information on which to base their decision. The current length of profiles is totally inadequate.

### **5.7 Remove WALGA from the Act**

I strongly support getting WALGA out of the Act.

### **6.3 Rates and Revenue Policy**

I strongly support the proposals under this section. Local Governments often seem to regard rate-payers as a bottomless honey pot, deciding what they want to do first then setting rates to suit. These changes may encourage them to give more thought to those who are paying for it all.

I am strongly against **6.7 Building Upgrade Finance** as I believe it is inappropriate for local governments to be lending rate-payers' money.

Sheila Ferguson

