



**COFFS HARBOUR CITY COUNCIL**  
**ORDINARY MEETING**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**  
**COFF AND CASTLE STREETS, COFFS HARBOUR**  
**12 MAY 2011**

**Contents**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>LAND USE HEALTH &amp; DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT REPORTS</b>		
L11/10	COFFS HARBOUR BUSINESS CENTRES HIERARCHY REVIEW	1
L11/11	PROVISION OF ANIMAL POUND FACILITES AGREEMENT RENEWAL WITH THE ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS	5
<b>CORPORATE BUSINESS DEPARTMENT REPORTS</b>		
CB11/23	QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW FOR MARCH 2011	10
CB11/24	SECURITY TRAINING INTERNATIONAL TRIP	14



## COFFS HARBOUR CITY COUNCIL

### ORDINARY MEETING

12 MAY 2011

Mayor and Councillors

#### LAND USE HEALTH & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT REPORTS

---

#### L11/10 COFFS HARBOUR BUSINESS CENTRES HIERARCHY REVIEW

---

##### **Purpose:**

The purpose of this report is to outline the process to review the existing Coffs Harbour Business Centres Hierarchy.

The report recommends that Council confirm the budget vote and engage an appropriate consultancy service to undertake the Coffs Harbour Business Centres Hierarchy Review.

##### **Background:**

Coffs Harbour City Council (CHCC) resolved at its Ordinary Meeting of 24 March 2011:

1. *That Council instruct staff to immediately review the intent of the centre's hierarchy and the resultant zoning and planning controls contained within the proposed B6 zoning within the draft City Centre LEP and DCP.*
2. *The outcomes of this review to be reported back to Council through the City-wide Standard Instrument LEP process."*

It is considered that this review of the Business Centres Hierarchy needs to be conducted across all proposed business zones throughout the local government area (LGA), with special emphasis given to the City Centre Local Environmental Plan (LEP) study area.

##### **Description of Item:**

It is recommended that Council engage consultancy service to assist with this review process. It is proposed to seek quotes from companies who would have relevant land use planning and economics experience relative to a growing regional city. Bringing in external expertise will strengthen the credibility of the process and generate a fresh perspective.

---

Cont'd

This review of Council's Business Centres Hierarchy aims to:

- identify whether the existing hierarchy, which protects the Coffs Harbour City Centre CBD as the primary retail and commercial centre of the LGA, is appropriate for future growth of Coffs Harbour as a regional city,
- recommend modifications to the existing Business Centres Hierarchy as appropriate,
- analyse how the new Standard Instrument business zones should best be applied to the recommended Business Centres Hierarchy for various business zone locations throughout the LGA, and
- provide recommendations as to resultant zoning and built form controls for all B6 Enterprise Corridor zones within both the City Centre Plan area and the wider LGA.

In order to achieve the consultancy objectives, it is anticipated that the scope of work will include the following:

- Determination of points of difference between the Standard Instrument B2 Local Centre, the B3 Commercial Core and the B4 Mixed Use zones within the LGA, particularly in terms of zone objectives, permissibilities and DCP controls, and how this can best be applied in a regional city setting.
- Recommendations of appropriate application of the different Standard Instrument business zones for the various business centres around the LGA.
- Analysis of the objectives, permissibilities and intent of the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone, both in the City Centre Plan area and for the wider LGA.
- Recommendations for zoning and built form controls for the B6 zone in both the City Centre Plan area and for the wider LGA.
- Assessment of floor space bonus provisions contained within the City Centre LEP.

It is proposed to exhibit the final Business Centres Hierarchy Discussion Paper concurrently with draft Coffs Harbour Local Environmental Plan 2011 (CHLEP 2011) and the comprehensive Development Control Plan (DCP) in late 2011. Outcomes from the exhibition of all documents will then be reported to Council, with the intent of using the Business Centres Hierarchy review to inform changes to the draft LEP and DCP before sending it to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure for gazettal.

**Sustainability Assessment:**

- **Environment**

A review of the Business Centres Hierarchy will not result in any deterioration of environmental protection measures. Any recommendations to amend the LEP as a result of the findings of the Business Centres Hierarchy review will be put to Council.

**Cont'd**

- **Social**

The public exhibition process to be conducted as part of this review will ensure the community interest is considered.

- **Civic Leadership**

This review will provide clear direction to the elected Council as governing body and for staff in administering the final adopted hierarchy.

- **Economic**

The review aims to establish the most appropriate mechanisms to distinguish between business zones in draft CHLEP 2011 and to identify whether the existing Business Centres Hierarchy is appropriate for future growth of Coffs Harbour as a regional city.

- **Delivery Program/Operational Plan Implications**

The preparation of draft CHLEP 2011 is endorsed in the current Operational Plan. This review process is intended to inform the zones in the new draft LEP.

A total budget of \$40,000 is required to complete the Business Centres Hierarchy Review, which is able to be sourced through savings realised in the Land Use Planning Branch's salary budget for the 2010/2011 financial year. It is intended to advertise the consultancy for \$35,000, with the remaining \$5,000 to be used as internal office expense resource toward the project.

**Consultation:**

Informal discussion has occurred with landowners, potentially impacted by this review, on the preferred process to address the business hierarchy concerns.

Once the consultants have completed the review process, results will be written up into a Business Centres Hierarchy Discussion Paper, which will be placed on public exhibition concurrently with draft CHLEP 2011 and the associated DCP.

**Related Policy and / or Precedents:**

Council is preparing draft CHLEP 2011 in accordance with the Standard Instrument (LEPs) Orders 2006 and the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and Regulations. All statutory requirements of these planning instruments have been complied with.

**Statutory Requirements:**

- The Department of Planning Standard Instrument (LEPs) Orders (gazetted March 2006, amended September 2006, July 2008 and February 2011).
- The Mid North Coast Regional Strategy.
- State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs).
- Various Ministerial 117 Directions.
- Planning Practice Notes issued by the Department of Planning.
- The Coffs Harbour 2030 Plan.

**Cont'd**

- Coffs Harbour City Council's adopted Growth Management Strategies, consisting of the Our Living City Settlement Strategy, the Coffs Harbour Industrial Lands Strategy, the Coffs Harbour Rural Residential Strategy and the Coffs Harbour Business Lands Strategy.

**Issues:**

The zoning and planning controls proposed for the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone in the draft City Centre LEP and DCP have generated community interest and industry debate. It has been questioned as to whether the existing Business Centres Hierarchy is still appropriate for growth of Coffs Harbour as a regional city, and whether it should be modified to accommodate growth.

Recent amendments to the Standard Instrument LEP in February 2011 have mandated identical commercial permissible uses across the B2 Local Centre, B3 Commercial Core and B4 Mixed Use zones. Council is keen to establish the most appropriate mechanisms to distinguish between these zones for a regional city.

**Implementation Date / Priority:**

The Standard LEP project timeframe has been determined by the Department of Planning. Council is required to have draft CHLEP 2011 ready for exhibition from late September to early November 2011. In order for this Business Centres Hierarchy review to be able to inform the draft LEP before it is made, it is intended to exhibit the Business Centres Hierarchy Discussion Paper concurrently with draft CHLEP 2011 and the associated DCP.

**Recommendation:**

- 1. That Coffs Harbour City Council reallocate \$40,000 from it's Land Use Planning Branch's salary budget to enable the Review of the Coffs Harbour Business Centres Hierarchy.**
- 2. That Coffs Harbour City Council engage an appropriate consultancy service to conduct a review of the Coffs Harbour Business Centres Hierarchy.**

---

**L11/11 PROVISION OF ANIMAL POUND FACILITIES AGREEMENT RENEWAL WITH THE ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS**

---

**Purpose:**

To approve the execution of the revised agreement for the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA), provision of pound facilities for Companion Animals within the Coffs Harbour City Council's area of operations.

**Description of Item:**

The Coffs Harbour RSPCA's shelter has been under contract with the Coffs Harbour City Council for the provision of holding facilities for dogs and cats which have been seized in accordance with the Companion Animals Act 1998. These contractual arrangements have been in place since 1994 and have been renewed on a number of occasions, which have involved fee increases in line with the cost of running such facilities. The current agreement is due for renewal and requires Council's endorsement having regard to the value of the two year contract agreement.

In brief the current agreement requires the RSPCA to take charge of impounded dogs and cats as Council's Agent and look after these animals for the term of their impounding. This can be as long as 14 days. This requires accommodation, feeding and veterinary care of the animals.

The agreement also requires that the RSPCA act as registration agents on Council's behalf in that staff at the pound can microchip and register animals before they are released back to their owners.

During the last 12 months in excess of 880 companion animals have been taken to the pound, with approximately 35% of these returned to their owners. It is the current practice of the Coffs Harbour City Council Rangers to return dogs and cats to their owners in the first instant rather than taking animals to the pound. The remainder are either rehomed or destroyed, the cost of which is borne by the RSPCA.

**Sustainability Assessment:**

- **Environment**

It is well documented that domestic animal faeces are a common cause for pollution and affect aquatic eco systems. Impounding facilities are an essential part of animal control as it helps keep domestic animals off the street, hence reducing the amount of faeces which may end up in the waterways. Control of roaming domestic animals is also an important strategy in protecting native wildlife.

- **Social**

Under the Companion Animals Act, Council has a legally binding obligation to accept stray companion animals from persons who may find them wandering the streets. Although the legislation does not require Council to actively look for strays, it is a service provided in order to keep the general public safe from dog attack and other situations whereby dogs or cats cause public nuisances.

**Cont'd**

**L11/11 Provision of Animal Pound Facilities Agreement Renewal with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals ...(Cont'd)**

---

- **Civic Leadership**

The Companion Animals Act places a responsibility on Local Government to ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place to satisfy the obligations associated with Companion Animals. Providing good quality services and facilities for impounded companion animals, whilst providing good financial support for the local RSPCA shelter is considered as sound civic leadership for the community.

- **Economic**

**Broader Economic Implications**

At the present time Council is limited in its options in providing impounding facilities as required under the Companion Animals Act. There are currently no other organisations or businesses within the district which are geared to handle impounded companion animals in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Companion Animals Act.

Council at its meeting of 22 July 2009 (when the contract agreement was last considered) incorporated a part of the determination that staff investigate the feasibility of impounding animals elsewhere.

A review of existing service provider capability has identified that there are no providers with the currently ability to provide the facilities and services required to equal those required and provided under the current contract arrangements.

A feasibility assessment was also undertaken with regard to the costs associated with Council's construction and operation of its own facility. The assessment incorporated the identification of several potential sites on Council owned land and included a costing review for the construction and operational requirements needed to satisfy Council's Companion Animals management obligations.

After consideration of the difficulties to locate and secure a suitable site and consideration of the funding costs associated with the construction and operational requirements it was determined that the current contract arrangement provides a cost effective solution to satisfy Council's requirements.

This, coupled with the lack of competitors in the market able to provide the facilities required by the Companion Animals Act, leaves Council with little option but to negotiate with the one supplier.

**Delivery Program/Operational Plan Implications**

The current 2010/2011 Operational Plan has an annual budget of \$175,705 for RSPCA impounding expenses.

**Cont'd**

**L11/11 Provision of Animal Pound Facilities Agreement Renewal with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals ...(Cont'd)**

---

Should Council resolve to enter the new agreement with the RSPCA, a budget adjustment for the 2011/12 period would need to allow for the following annual costs:

Contract Service Fee:	\$180,767
Ancillary costs:	
Vet services.	
Feral Animals disposal	
Miscellaneous contract charges	\$10,000
Total	\$190,767

The current 2011/12 draft Operational Plan has factored in likely costs of this quantum.

The proposed total cost for the ensuing contract equates to an estimated cost per animal of \$216.

In respect to income, the system established by the New South Wales State Government does not allow Council to increase fees and income for registration of animals. Thus there is limited means for Council to recoup any extra costs, except by increasing impounding fees.

Fees and charges for impounding have been recommended to increase to \$120 per animal for up to 2 days impounding and on third and subsequent days the fees increase to \$25 per day. This fee falls inline with costs associated with boarding of animals at this facility.

Estimated income from impounding fees and associated dog fines and registrations will be \$105,000.

This will leave a net cost to Council for this program in the vicinity of \$85,767.

**Consultation:**

Consultation has been undertaken with private boarding establishments within the Coffs Harbour area and is ongoing between the parties to this agreement, namely the RSPCA and Council.

**Related Policy and / or Precedents:**

Council is currently utilising the Coffs Harbour RSPCA Shelter at Dowsett Drive, Coffs Harbour for its impounding facility under an existing contract which is due to expire on the 30 June 2011. The renewal of this agreement will see impounding services secured for the next two years, with a further two year option available to the RSPCA.

**Statutory Requirements:**

Section 55 of the Local Government Act requires Councils to tender for services under certain conditions. The nature of the service and associated cost of the agreement would place Council in a position that would normally require a tender to be called. However Section 55 (3) does provide exceptions to that rule.

**Cont'd**

**L11/11 Provision of Animal Pound Facilities Agreement Renewal with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals ...(Cont'd)**

---

(3) *This section does not apply to the following contracts:*

- *a contract where, because of extenuating circumstances, remoteness of locality or the unavailability of competitive or reliable tenderers, a council decides by resolution (which states the reasons for the decision) that a satisfactory result would not be achieved by inviting tenders.*

The NSW Companion Animals Act 1998 – No 87 (seized animals to be returned to owner or taken to a Council Pound) is also applicable. This Act is relevant to the current situation in so far as animal impounding is applicable in that:

- a) A person who seizes an animal under the authority of this Act must cause it to be delivered as soon as possible to its owner if the owner can be identified or otherwise to any duly authorised employee or agent of the Council of the area in which the animal was seized at a Council pound.
- b) A person who seizes an animal and does not comply with the requirements of this section is guilty of an offence. Maximum penalty \$2,200.

**Issues:**

In assessing the proposed RSPCA agreement a brief study was undertaken of other options available to Council. These included using private boarding kennels within the Coffs Harbour area and Council building and operating its own pound facility.

Private Boarding - although available within Coffs Harbour area, posed a number of problems. Firstly, services such as microchipping and registration would not be available, ready access to veterinary treatment would be limited and the facilities in a number of establishments would not equal the facilities provided by the RSPCA. Further it has been identified that the current private facilities would need considerable expansion of their facilities to meet the criteria set down in the NSW Animal Welfare Code of Practice No 5 – Dogs and Cats in animal boarding establishments primarily being the separation of pound animals to boarding animals.

There would be the further issue of having to deal with unclaimed animals and the problems of rehoming as opposed to the destruction of unwanted pets.

Establishment of a Council Pound – investigations into the possibility of establishing a Council owned and operated pound have determined that the difficulties and costs associated with securing a suitable site and constructing and operating a facility are currently considered to be less cost effective than using the services being offered by the RSPCA.

**Implementation Date / Priority:**

The effective commencement date of the new agreement would be the 1 August 2011.

**Cont'd**

**L11/11 Provision of Animal Pound Facilities Agreement Renewal with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals ...(Cont'd)**

---

**Recommendation:**

- 1. That Council, in accordance with Section 55(3) of the Local Government Act, resolve not to call tenders for the proposed impounding services contract due to there being an unavailability of providers within the local area to provide the services to the degree required.**
- 2. That the 2011/12 Operational Plan allow for sufficient funds to cover the cost of the impounding program, including all ancillary costs and the agreement at an amount of \$190,767.**
- 3. That subject to the adoption of the 2011/2012 Operational Plan, Council enter into a 24 month agreement with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals for the provision of Companion Animal Impounding facilities at Dowsett Drive, Coffs Harbour.**
- 4. At the expiration of the initial 24 month contract period Council, upon satisfactory negotiation with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, seek to activate the further 24 month option within the agreement.**

**Chris Chapman  
Director  
Land Use, Health & Development**

## CORPORATE BUSINESS DEPARTMENT REPORTS

### CB11/23 QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW FOR MARCH 2011

#### Purpose:

To report on the estimated budget position as at 31 March 2011.

#### Description of Item:

Estimated Budget Position as at 31 March 2011:

	<b>General Account \$</b>	<b>Water Account \$</b>	<b>Sewer Account \$</b>
Original Budget adopted 30 June 2010	667,506 (D)	5,257,469 (D)	4,124,558 (D)
Approved Variations to 28 February 2011	(230,389) (S)	399,154 (D)	(218,042) (S)
Recommended variations for March 2011	Nil	(22,295) (S)	(1,216,535) (S)
Estimated result 2010/11 as at 31 March 2011	<u>437,117 (D)</u>	<u>5,634,328 (D)</u>	<u>2,689,981 (D)</u>

#### General Account

**Deficit/  
(Surplus)**

#### Total

**Nil**

#### Water Account

Pumping stations budget into line with actual	(60,000) (S)
Water treatment expenses budget into line with actual	140,000 (D)
Mains maintenance budget into line with actual	240,000 (D)
Country Energy – Nymboida Infrastructure maintenance budget into line with actual	53,000 (D)
Water quality monitoring budget into line with actual	20,805 (D)
RWS – River monitoring budget into line with actual	(24,946) (S)
RWS – Flow gauging budget into line with actual	(56,385) (S)
RWS – Habitat & heritage monitoring budget into line with actual	(178,000) (S)
RWS – Pump station operation & maintenance budget into line with actual	(200,902) (S)
RWS – Shannon Creek Dam/Land management budget into line with actual	138,000 (D)
Meter repairs budget into line with actual	(30,000) (S)
Telemetry budget into line with actual	8,000 (D)
Contributions to works budget into line with actual	20,000 (D)
Mains locations other authorities budget into line with actual	1,500 (D)
Backflow prevention budget into line with actual	6,000 (D)
Meter testing consumer requests budget into line with actual	(1,000) (S)
Standpipe water budget into line with actual	(33,000) (S)

**Cont'd**

**CB11/23 Quarterly Budget Review for March 2011 ...(Cont'd)**

---

Pressure test fees revenue budget into line with actual	(800) (S)
Water backflow prevention licenses & testing revenue budget into line with actual	(5,500) (S)
Mains locations other authorities revenue budget into line with actual	(1,300) (S)
Contributions to works revenue budget into line with actual	(10,000) (S)
Sale of telemetry revenue budget into line with actual	(25,000) (S)
Reduction in revenue revotes	437,233 (D)
Asset register budget into line with actual	(46,713) (S)
Reduction in revenue revotes	36,713 (D)
Reservoir renewals budget into line with actual	103,000 (D)
Reservoir renewals funded from S64 Headworks reserve	(103,000) (S)
Shepherds Lane reservoirs (Land) S64 budget in line with actual	(200,000) (S)
Shepherds Lane reservoirs (Land) S64 funded from S64 Headworks reserve	200,000 (D)
Reticulation mains from strategy S64 budget in line with actual	(901,405) (S)
Reticulation mains from strategy S64 from S64 Headworks reserve	901,405 (D)
Karangı Water Treatment Plant – SID budget in line with actual	(304,361) (S)
Karangı Water Treatment Plant – SID funded from unexpended loan funds	304,361 (D)
Telemetry equipment & meters budget in line with actual	(216,147) (S)
Telemetry equipment & meters funded from unexpended loan funds	216,147 (D)
Coramba water main budget in line with actual	(1,495,000) (S)
Coramba water main funded from unexpended loan funds	1,495,000 (D)
Construction dam & access road budget in line with actual	(900,000) (S)
Construction dam & access road funded from unexpended loan funds	900,000 (D)
Coffs Office – legal, etc budget in line with actual	(30,000) (S)
Coffs Office – legal, etc funded from unexpended loan funds	30,000 (D)
Interest on investments revenue budget in line with actual	(450,000) (S)
Interest on investments reserves budget in line with actual	(260,000) (S)
Interest on investments reserves funded by future works & services reserve	260,000 (D)
Interest on investments Sec 64 budget in line with actual	22,000 (D)
Interest on investments Sec 64 funded by S64 reticulation reserve	(22,000) (S)
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>(22,295) (S)</u></b>

**Sewer Account**

Developer contributions plan review budget in line with actual	(9,669) (S)
Reduction in revenue revotes	9,669 (D)
IWCM strategic plans and financial plan budget in line with actual	10,000 (D)
Treatment works budget in line with actual	174,000 (D)
Reuse pipework budget in line with actual	(9,000) (S)
Pumping stations budget in line with actual	179,000 (D)
External works budget in line with actual	(10,000) (S)
Mobile sludge dewatering plant expense budget in line with actual	(15,000) (S)
Trade waste inspection budget in line with actual	(30,000) (S)
Trade waste for Bellingen council budget in line with actual	(9,000) (S)
Reuse management operating budget in line with actual	(40,000) (S)
Morgans Rd farm budget in line with actual	35,000 (D)
Ocean outfall budget in line with actual	(45,000) (S)
Trade waste application fees budget in line with actual	(7,400) (S)
Trade waste for Bellingen council budget in line with actual	12,000 (D)

**Cont'd**

**CB11/23 Quarterly Budget Review for March 2011 ...(Cont'd)**

---

Sullage collection charges budget in line with actual	(320) (S)
Effluent disposal charge contractor budget in line with actual	(92,000) (S)
Contribution to external works budget in line with actual	5,000 (D)
Banana sales from Morgans Rd farm budget in line with actual	(10,000) (S)
Payroll tax budget in line with actual	15,000 (D)
Professional development/seminars subsidy budget in line with actual	3,238 (D)
Coffs sewer strategy EIS budget in line with actual	(6,840) (S)
Coffs sewer strategy EIS funded by unexpended loan funds	6,840 (D)
Sewer rehabilitation budget in line with actual	(300,000) (S)
Sewer rehabilitation funded by unexpended loan funds	300,000 (D)
Coffs Harbour WRP – stage 2 budget in line with actual	(2,311,582) (S)
Coffs Harbour WRP – stage 2 grant funding reduced	1,852,000 (D)
Coffs Harbour WRP – stage 2 funded partly by unexpended loan funds	459,582 (D)
Pumps, mechanical equipment renewals budget in line with actual	(3,248,827) (S)
Pumps, mechanical equipment renewals funded by unexpended loan funds	3,248,827 (D)
Reclaimed water pipeline – stage 1 budget in line with actual	(100,000) (S)
Reclaimed water pipeline – stage 1 funded by unexpended loan funds	100,000 (D)
Woolgoolga treatment works upgrade budget in line with actual	(1,420,000) (S)
Woolgoolga treatment works upgrade funded by unexpended loan funds	1,420,000 (D)
Effluent reuse stage 2 budget in line with actual	(337,772) (S)
Effluent reuse stage 2 funded by unexpended loan funds	337,772 (D)
Sawtell pump station & pipework budget in line with actual	(16,999,800) (S)
Sawtell pump station & pipework funded by unexpended loan funds	16,999,800 (D)
New vehicle budget in line with actual	(50,000) (S)
New vehicle funded by unexpended loan funds	50,000 (D)
Network analysis budget in line with actual	(29,468) (S)
Network analysis funded by unexpended loan funds	29,468 (D)
S64 works general budget in line with actual	(737,045) (S)
S64 works general funded by unexpended loan funds	737,045 (D)
Interest on investments revenue budget in line with actual	(1,430,000) (S)
Interest on investments reserves budget in line with actual	(410,000) (S)
Interest on investments reserves funded by	410,000 (D)
Loan 469 – change to principal repayment for 2010/11	179,491 (D)
Loan 469 – change to interest repayment for 2010/11	(131,544) (S)
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>(1,216,535) (S)</u></b>

**Sustainability Assessment:**

- **Environment**

There are no perceived short or long-term environmental impacts.

- **Social**

There are no perceived short or long term social impacts.

Cont'd

- **Civic Leadership**

Council strives to reach a balanced budget position by June 30 each year in conjunction with meeting its short term priorities.

- **Economic**

**Delivery Program/Operational Plan Implications**

The Original budget for the General Account adopted on the 24 June 2010 provided for a deficit of \$667,506.

For substantial budget adjustments the associated council reports have addressed the triple bottom line factors independently in 2010/11.

**Consultation:**

Managers and their relevant staff have been provided with electronic budget reports for each program on a monthly basis. Requested variations and variations adopted by Council have been included in the report.

**Statutory Requirements:**

Under local government regulations Council is required to submit a quarterly budget review to Council. Therefore Council is under no obligation to provide monthly reviews but has recommended they be completed as part of prudent financial management.

The Responsible Accounting Officer believes this report indicates the financial position of the Council is satisfactory, having regard to the original estimate of Income and Expenditure.

**Recommendation:**

**That the budget adjustments be approved and the current budget position be noted.**

**Estimated Budget Position as at 31 March 2011:**

	General Account \$	Water Account \$	Sewer Account \$
Original Budget adopted 30 June 2010	667,506 (D)	5,257,469 (D)	4,124,558 (D)
Approved Variations to 28 February 2011	(230,389) (S)	399,154 (D)	(218,042) (S)
Recommended variations for March 2011	Nil	(22,295) (S)	(1,216,535) (S)
Estimated result 2010/11 as at 31 March 2011	<u>437,117 (D)</u>	<u>5,634,328 (D)</u>	<u>2,689,981 (D)</u>

---

**CB11/24 SECURITY TRAINING INTERNATIONAL TRIP**

---

**Purpose:**

To inform Council that the Manager Telecommunications and New Technology will be attending the Australian Control Systems Cyber Security Advanced Training in Idaho Falls Idaho, United States of America in June 2011. The purpose of this course, which is funded up to \$5,000 by the Commonwealth Government Attorney-General's Department, is to train industry staff that are associated with providing IT security for infrastructure such as sewerage and water infrastructure.

**Description of Item:**

The Government of the United States of America has invited the Australian Government to nominate a number of persons to attend the Idaho National Laboratories (INL) Industrial Control Systems Advanced Cyber Security Training - to be held from 20 to 24 June 2011.

The course is offered to those who are nominated by CERT Australia (a division of the Attorney General's Department), and approved by the Department of Homeland Security on behalf of the United States Government free of cost and CERT Australia may offer a number of grants to assist with travel and accommodation costs incurred by attendees. CERT Australia is managing this project for those involved in the operation of Australian Critical Infrastructure.

In particular this training course is designed for those directly involved in IT, SCADA and Process Control as Owners / Operators.

Participants will spend:

- Five days in Idaho Falls training against hacking of infrastructure by the USA Department of Homeland Security.
- Hacking scenarios and team hacking practical sessions will be carried out.

**Sustainability Assessment:**

- **Environment**

Participation in the Industrial Control Systems Advanced Cyber Security Training will enhance Council's professional staff development in better securing Council's major infrastructure assets from being hacked or compromised.

Coffs Harbour is already recognised as a leader in Australia in providing and producing state of the art infrastructure for:

- SCADA networks for sewerage pump station switchboards
- SCADA networks for water booster pump station switchboards
- Fiber networks
- State of the art CCTV etc.

The training will provide opportunities to improve Council's security as well as to help other councils and IT security peers on how to best protect their infrastructure from being hacked.

**Cont'd**

- **Social**

It is to be expected that participation in the training will better equip Council to help tackle the challenges of the possibility of Council's infrastructure being hacked.

- **Civic Leadership**

Participation in the training will again make Coffs Harbour City Council one of the leaders in this field.

- **Economic**

**Broader Economic Implications**

Hacking of infrastructure is on the increase and the implications and economic risk to the community and Council could be very high if this occurred.

This training will assist in enhancing Council's security and create a more secure and resilient city.

**Delivery Program/Operational Plan Implications**

The following costs will be covered by the Commonwealth government for the overseas fellowship program:

- international flights and local transfers;
- relevant visas;
- insurance; and
- accommodation and meals.

Up to an amount of \$5,000.00

It is intended that Council support the Manager for Telecommunications and New Technology in this professional training by way of paid professional development leave for one week for the duration of the course.

**Related Policy and / or Precedents:**

It has been the practice in the past to refer matters to Council that involve staff overseas travel for noting, although this is not a legal or current policy requirement.

**Cont'd**

**Statutory Requirements:**

It is a requirement under the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 that information about overseas travel be included as follows:

- (1) *For the purposes of section 428 (4) (b) of the Act, an annual report of a council is to include the following information:*
  - (a) *details (including the purpose) of overseas visits undertaken during the year by councillors, council staff or other persons while representing the council (including visits sponsored by other organisations),*

**Issues:**

The security of Council's IT system is always at risk of being compromised (hacked, etc). Council has a high level of processes in place to ensure this risk is minimized. Training of the nature being proposed will assist Council in ensuring that it keeps up to date with the needs of the industry in this important area.

Recent examples of major hacking include the Sony Playstation site where 77 million personal files were accessed and a water treatment plant in the USA was hacked via a staff member's laptop computer.

As an IT infrastructure security professional, the Manager Telecommunications and New Technology will be in a place to share his experience and training via presentations of papers to other groups and councils to increase their infrastructure security. He will also review Council's IT infrastructure security with best practices learnt in the USA.

**Implementation Date / Priority:**

The Manager Telecommunication and New Technology is required to be in Idaho commencing 20 June 2011.

**Recommendation:**

**That Council note the acceptance of the Commonwealth Government Attorney-General's Department (CERT) training course that has been awarded to the Manager Telecommunications and New Technology, with his overseas travel and living costs being met by the Commonwealth Government of up to \$5000.00.**

**Craig Milburn  
Director  
Corporate Business**