Description of Councill Service	ed Cost for MVCC	l Grant Funding 2022/23	Cost Shifting Costs	Total Actual Cost 2022/23	
Waste Services (landfill levy)	\$ 906,900.00	 	\$ 3,700,900.00		Council pays a landfill levy on every tonne of incentivise waste reduction and fund waste p commensurate re-investment of this money b Further, Councils understand that this funding supporting EPA and other state government an The cost to Council for State Government Lan to landfill (including the landfill levy) was \$4, State Government Landfill Levy accounts for a
School Crossing Supervision (reduction in grant funding)	\$ 1,163,000.00	\$ 502,000.00	\$ 159,000.00	\$ 1,322,000.00	The School Crossing Supervision Program was State (Department of Transport formally VicR contribution of the State Government was hig dropped to approximately 30% in recent year expected (approximate) 50/50 split although future years. Under the program Councils were required to currently has 65 funding school crossings. O conditions and cost of hiring contractors, due For 2022/23, the Victorian Government is con leaving a cost to Council of \$820,627 (62%). F as Senior Management support and heighten
Electrical Line Clearance (MVCC cutting branches under power lines that MVCC doesn't own)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 517,244.00	\$ 517,244.00	Tree pruning around powerlines is required b Clearance) Regulations 2020 which were intre The extent of pruning depends on the voltage Bushfire Risk Areas (HBRA) or Low Bushfire Ri around Low Voltage (LV) conductors and require canopy cover. It is considered that applying the considerable amount of tree pruning to rema power outages. should be reviewed to allow the pruning require specific risk assessments. The trees at Moone pruned by our contractors on a 2 year cycle. plus the cost of auditing of these trees which regulations is \$517,244.
Urban Planning (out of pocket costs for staff providing advice on matters where MVCC is not the responsible authority)	\$ 408,000.00	\$ -	\$ 21,430.00	\$ 429,430.00	The fees and charges available to Councils for deliver the full suite of planning services to th by the State Government. involvement of Council as primary decision m work in a referral capacity— there are no fees urban planning teamstem from the team bein traditionally funded through the collection of
Building Services (out of pocket costs for staff providing advice on matters where MVCC is not the responsible authority)	\$ 190,000.00	\$ -	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 210,000.00	Since the initial deregulation of the building in responsibility to Councils as part of the buildi has resulted in greater inspection and oversig Essential Services Inspections, Swimming Poo Council has however, been given additional ta additional tasks and responsibilities for Coun- enforcement, Orphaned Building Permits etc. pressure to maintain expected levels of servic increase of approximately 10% to the overall
Libraries and Learning Centres (reduction in grant funding)	\$ 4,040,061.50	\$ 844,934.00	\$ 2,350,193.50	\$ 6,390,255.00	It has been reported that 1975, public librarie Government. Victorian Government funding to MVCC has s council now contributing 87 per cent of the to
Maternal Child Health (reduction in grant funding)	\$ 2,019,730.00	\$ 907,210.00	\$ 205,310.00	\$ 2,225,040.00	Local Governments and the State Government costs to deliver the Victorian Maternal and CP currently contributing 64% of the costs of ser This is due to the funding model not keeping vulnerability and family complexity in all com rather than projected population.

Officer comment

of waste disposed at landfill. The purpose of the landfill levy is to the prevention initiatives in Victoria. Councils have not seen a ey back into local resource recovery.

ding has been invested in the establishment of regulatory bodies, nt agencies, rather than on ground, sector-based action. Landfill Levy was \$3,700,962, and the total cost to Council to send waste \$4,607,795. Therefore the

or almost 70% of the cost of sending waste to landfill.

was introduced in 1975 under a joint funding arrangement between the /icRoads) and Councils. Although at the outset of the program, the funding s higher, the funding has diminished over a number of years and has ears. A recent injection of funding has brought the funding back to an igh there is no commitment that this funding level will be maintained in

d to appropriately staff the funding crossings. For 2022/23, MVCC Over the years Council's cost have significantly increased due to pay due to a workforce shortage.

contributing \$502,316 (38%) of the \$1,322,943 expense for the service, b). However, this does not include many of the indirect service costs such tened recruitment needs.

d by Councils in accordance with the Electricity Safety (Electric Line ntroduced by the State Government in response to bushfire concerns. age and the type of lines regardless of whether they are within High e Risk Areas (LBRA). This approach results in excessive pruning in LBRA requires extensive additional resourcing given the extent of mature tree ig this approach around LV in LBRA is overly simplistic and requires a main compliant, irrespective of the actual risk of electrocution, fire, or The electrical line clearance regulations

equirements around LV conductors to be based on a site and scenario onee Valley within the vicinity of overhead conductors are currently le. In 2022/23 the cost of these works has been \$477,389 ich amounted to \$39,855. So the total cost for complying with the

for Planning Applications provides only a small proportion of the cost to o the municipality. As an example, planning permit application fees are set Planning reform has reduced the

n maker in some types of applications, but still expect Council to undertake ees or funding for this. The additional, unplanned pressures placed on the peing assigned tasks that do not align with their regular services, which are n of fees.

ng industry in the early 1990's there has been an incremental shift in ilding system. This has come about primarily from legislative change which irsight for Municipal Building Surveyors (MBS) including in relation to Pool and Barrier Compliance and combustible cladding reviews. al tasks in relation to Pool Safety regulations. These changes resulted in puncils regarding pool safety and fences. The concerns regarding cladding, etc. are therefore very evident and Moonee Valley Council will be under revice. The pool safety work has required an millung cladding for the purification.

rall workload of the Building unit.

aries were funded 50:50 by the Victorian Government and Local

as since declined to just 13 per cent of public library operating costs, with e total cost.

nent have an agreed partnership to that is intended to be a 50:50 split of d Child Health Service. MVCC is

service delivery in our municipality.

ng pace with increased costs of service delivery, that relate to increasing ommunities, and funding being based on historical demand for the service

\$ 115,000.00	\$ 26,000.00	\$	63,000.00	\$ 178,000.00	The Kindergarten Central Registration Schem
					kindergartens across the municipality. Counc
					Council, not-for-profit kindergartens in Moor
					is experienced due to the funding model not I
					•Funding is based on the maximum enrolmen
					registrations received to compete for those en
					kindergarten places than the number of child
					•The base rate per registration is inadequate.
					•Council is required to process all registration
					This is to ensure an equitable opportunity for
					change their preferences or drop out of the s
\$ 179,960.00	\$ 84,960.00	\$	10,040.00	\$ 190,000.00	The Immunisation Service provides vaccines in
					•Childhood (six weeks to four years old) immu
					 School age (year 7 and year 10) immunisation
					•Vaccines for population groups identified as
					for pregnant women and people over 65 year
					covered approximately 48% of the actual bud
					Overall, the growing funding gap means that
					levels, otherwise the level of service would ne
\$ -	\$ -	\$			
\$ 9,022,652	\$ 2,365,104	\$	7,101,118	\$ 16,123,769	
\$\$	\$ 179,960.00	\$ 179,960.00 \$ 84,960.00 \$ - \$ -	\$ 179,960.00 \$ 84,960.00 \$ \$ - \$ - \$	\$ 179,960.00 \$ 84,960.00 \$ 10,040.00 \$ 179,960.00 \$ 54,000.00 \$ - \$ - \$ 54,000.00	\$ 179,960.00 \$ 84,960.00 \$ 10,040.00 \$ 190,000.00 \$ 179,960.00 \$ 84,960.00 \$ 10,040.00 \$ 190,000.00 \$ 179,960.00 \$ 84,960.00 \$ 10,040.00 \$ 190,000.00 \$ 179,960.00 \$ 5 10,040.00 \$ 190,000.00 \$ 179,960.00 \$ 5 10,040.00 \$ 190,000.00 \$ 179,960.00 \$ 5 10,040.00 \$ 190,000.00

- eme provides a one stop shop for families to enrol in multiple uncil administers a central registration scheme for 14 Council and 4 nonoonee Valley. Cost shifting
- not being reflective of the extent and scope of the program: ment places the scheme can offer, rather than the actual number of se enrolment places. Where a council receives more registrations for hildren it can enrol, this results in a shortfall of funding. ate.
- tions received regardless of how many registrations become enrolments. for all residents and to maintain sustainable services should families ne scheme.

es in accordance with the National Immunisation Schedule including: nmunisation program for the community.

- ation program.
- l as more vulnerable to infectious diseases for example, Influenza vaccines years of age. Funding received
- budget, resulting in a shortfall of \$99K to Council.
- hat Council is responsible for additional funding in order to maintain service d need to be reduced.