NOTICE OF MEETING

Pursuant to Section 83 of the Local Government Act 1999 notice is hereby given that the following meeting will be held in the Council Chambers, Mount Barker Homemaker Centre, 6 Dutton Road, Mount Barker on Tuesday 3 April 2018.

7.00 pm Council Meeting

A. Stuart
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

28 March 2018

Further information on Council's meeting procedures can be found on Council's website - www.mountbarker.sa.gov.au Council / Documents / Code of Practice for Meeting Procedures
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. COUNCIL OPENING
   - Expression of Faith
   - Acknowledgement of Land
   - Apologies or Leave of Absence - Councillor Keen

2. QUESTIONS FROM THE GALLERY

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
   3.1 5 March 2018
   3.2 26 March 2018

4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION

5. DEPUTATIONS
   5.1 Mr Ron Bellchamber, Proposed Fast Rail

6. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE

7. QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

8. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

9. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

10. PETITIONS
   10.1 Receive Petition – Request to Reduce Speed and Weight Limit on Ambleside Road, Hahndorf

11. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

12. REPORTS
   12.1 Regional Sports Hub – Stage 1 Project - Site Layout

To present to Council a petition received from Mr Andrew Treglown regarding a request to lower the speed limit to 50kmph on Ambleside Road, Hahndorf, from the main road coming into Hahndorf, and to lower the weight limits on the corresponding section of road.

To present the recommended site layout to Council for approval to enable design documentation and development application to proceed.
12.2. **Delegation of Authority to Award Cleaning Services Contract**

To meet time constraints associated with the acceptance of tenders, this report seeks gain Council’s authority for the Chief Executive Officer or his delegate being the General Manager Corporate Services to accept a recommendation of Council Solutions to enter into a contract with a Preferred Tenderer for the supply of cleaning services.

12.3. **Tender Award for Chief Executive Officer’s Performance Review**

To gain Council’s support for a recommendation from the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Panel to award contract 2017.063 CEO Performance Review to Corpor8solutions ("Preferred Tenderer") for a term of four (4) years commencing in 2018, consisting of a lump sum of $41,000 over the term of the contract.

12.4. **Environmental Services Centre Stage 1 - Volunteer Hub - Tender Award**

To seek Council’s authority to award contract 2017.061 for the Environmental Services Centre (ESC) Stage 1 Construction to Fusco Constructions Pty Ltd ("Preferred Tenderer") for the lump sum amount of $1,226,412.34 excluding GST.

12.5. **Delegations Review**

To conduct the annual review of Council’s Delegations register following some minor changes to legislation.

12.6. **Write Off of Fines and Interest – Long Term Debt, Limited Titles Victoria Street, Hahndorf**

To consider write off of fines and interest for limited title properties located at Victoria Street, Hahndorf.

12.7. **Portion of Unmade Road Closure and Disposal – Settlement of Encroachment over Unmade Road adjoining DP43647**

To seek Council approval to make a Road Process Order to close a portion of unmade road, at the rear of a Brukunga property in order to settle an encroachment over the unmade road.

12.8. **Ozwater Conference – Councillor Grosser**

To determine attendance of Councillor Grosser at the Ozwater18 conference, 8-10 May 2018 in Brisbane.

12.9. **Management of Little Corellas**

To provide an update of the impacts of the Little Corella and to outline a proposed management approach for when the Little Corellas are due to return in October 2018.
12.10. **Dry Area Application 2018** ............................................................... 220
To seek Council endorsement for the application to the Minister for a continuous Dry Area licence for identified areas within Hahndorf, Keith Stephenson Park and Nairne (attachments 1, 2 and 3) per Section 131 of the Liquor Licencing Act 1997.

12.11. **Ward Donations**...................................................................................... 228
To allocate ward donation funds to individuals or organisations.

13. **INFORMATION REPORTS** .............................................................................. 232

14. **QUARTERLY REPORTS** .............................................................................. 233

14.1. **Adelaide Hills Region Waste Management Authority** .......................... 233
To provide a quarterly report on the outcomes of Adelaide Hills Region Waste Management Authority Board.

15. **MAYOR’S REPORT** ..................................................................................... 237

16. **MEMBERS’ REPORTS** .............................................................................. 237

17. **QUESTIONS ARISING FROM COUNCIL MEETING** ................................. 237
1. **COUNCIL OPENING**
   
   **EXPRESSION OF FAITH**
   
   **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF LAND**
   
   **APOLOGIES OR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**
   
   1.1 Leave of Absence
   
   1.2 Apologies
      
      Councillor Keen

2. **QUESTIONS FROM THE GALLERY (15 MINUTES)**

3. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

   3.1 Recommendation
      
      That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2018 as circulated to members be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

   3.2 Recommendation
      
      That the minutes of the special meeting held on 26 March 2018 as circulated to members be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

4. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION**

   Council Members are reminded of the requirements for disclosure by Members of material, actual or perceived conflicts of interest in relation to items listed for consideration on the agenda.

5. **DEPUTATIONS**

   5.1 Mr Ron Bellchamber, Proposed Fast Rail

6. **QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE – COUNCILLORS**

   NIL

7. **QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE – COUNCILLORS**

   Return to Order of Business
8. **MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

NIL

9. **MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

For
- requesting a report
- a simple matter with minor impact
- an urgent matter that without consideration by Council would result in a detriment to Council
10. PETITIONS

10.1 REPORT TITLE: RECEIVE PETITION: REQUEST TO REDUCE SPEED AND WEIGHT LIMIT ON AMBLESIDE ROAD, HAHNDORF

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/26847

ATTACHMENTS: ATTACHMENT NO. 1 DOC/18/24868

Key Contact
Manager/Sponsor
Sue Miller, Executive Assistant to CEO & Mayor
Andrew Stuart, Chief Executive Officer

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:
5. Governance and Leadership
GL2: Corporate capacity and leadership
GL2.1 Demonstrate accountability through clear, relevant and easily accessible policies and corporate reporting.

Purpose:
To present to Council a petition received from Mr Andrew Treglown regarding a request to lower the speed limit to 50kmph on Ambleside Road, Hahndorf, from the main road coming into Hahndorf, and to lower the weight limits on the corresponding section of road

Summary – Key Issues:
1. A petition was received by Council from Mr Andrew Treglown on 6 March 2018 on behalf of 24 signatories regarding a request to lower the speed limit to 50kmph on Ambleside Road, Hahndorf, from the main road coming into Hahndorf, together with a request to lower the weight limits.
2. The petition is required to be received by Council at the next Council meeting following the date of receipt of the petition.

Recommendation:
That Council:
1. receives the petition;
2. notes that the State Government is the decision making body regarding the setting of speed limits, and
3. notes that Council staff will respond to the petitioners, and if so determined by staff, a further report may be prepared for consideration at a future Council meeting.

Return to Order of Business
**Background:**
1. A petition was received by Council from Mr Andrew Treglown on 6 March 2018 on behalf of 24 signatories regarding a request to lower the speed limit to 50kmph on Ambleside Road, Hahndorf, from the main road coming into Hahndorf, along with a request for the weight limit to be lowered.
2. The petition contains 24 signatories, all being residents of Hahndorf.
3. As per Council’s Code of Practice for Meeting Procedures, the first page of the petition is provided as attachment 1. A copy of the full petition will be made available to all council members upon request, and will be provided at the Council meeting for perusal.
4. Correspondence, including a copy of the petition, was received from Mr Mark Goldsworthy MP, former Member for Kavel, and Ms Rebekha Sharkie MP, Federal Member for Mayo.
5. Mr Andrew Treglown, Mr Mark Goldsworthy MP, Member for Kavel, and Ms Rebekha Sharkie MP, Federal Member for Mayo have been advised in writing that the petition will be presented to Council at the meeting to be held on 3 April 2018.

**Discussion:**
1. A petition received by Council is placed on the agenda for the next ordinary meeting of the Council as per Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations under the Local Government Act 1999.
2. A copy of the first page of the petition, including a statement as to the nature of the request is provided as Attachment 1 to this report.
3. Normal practice is that a petition is simply received (not debated) to satisfy legal requirements. Council officers then assess the request and provide further information to Council at a later date, if required.
4. The State Government is the decision making body regarding the setting of speed limits. Council has an advocacy role only.
5. A letter advising what action will be taken (if any) will be provided to the head petitioner post the council meeting.

**Policy:**
There is no policy applicable.

**Budget:**
There is no budget impact associated with receiving the petition and assessing the request.
**Statutory/Legal:**
Petitions are received by Council as per Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations under the Local Government Act 1999.

**Staff Resource Requirements:**
Existing staff will assess the request.

**Environmental:**
N/A

**Social:**
A petition enables members of the community to draw Council’s attention to issues they believe require addressing.

**Risk Assessment:**
N/A

**Asset Management:**
N/A

**Conclusion:**
The petition is to be received to satisfy legal requirements.

---

**Previous Decisions By Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>DOC/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To whom it may concern,

I am currently living at 22 Ambleside road Hahndorf. I am writing asking for the speed limit on Ambleside road to be lowered to 50 kmph from the main road coming into Hahndorf along with the weight tonnage to be lowered. It makes sense to me to reduce the speed limit back to 50 kmph up to Heysen road as there is a couple of sharp bends in the road.

I have lived here since 2013 and noticed not only an increase in traffic including heavy vehicles that should not be on the road as well as an increase in speeding traffic using the road as a race track including 1 serious crash outside number 24 Ambleside road not long after I moved in.

I am a walker and often need to stay well clear of the road as I have nearly been hit by speeding traffic. I have put together neighbor’s names signatures and address who also live in the area who support this letter.

Andrew Treglown
22 Ambleside road
Hahndorf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Koch</td>
<td>6 Ambleside Rd Hahndorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Alicia Barnett</td>
<td>24 Ambleside Road, Hahndorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Bruce with S.B.</td>
<td>2 Paul Road Hahndorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Newbury</td>
<td>9 Selma Ave Hahndorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Haggard</td>
<td>16 Ambleside Rd Hahndorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Gilchrist</td>
<td>12/14 Ambleside Rd Hahndorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew &amp; Deb Krieg</td>
<td>81 Ambleside Rd, Hahndorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew &amp; Grace Hambling</td>
<td>1 Selma Avenue, Hahndorf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES
NIL
12. REPORTS

12.1 REPORT TITLE: REGIONAL SPORTS HUB – STAGE 1 PROJECT – SITE LAYOUT

DATE OF MEETING: 3 April 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/27539

ATTACHMENTS: 12.1.1 DOC/18/30884 RECOMMENDED REGIONAL SPORTS HUB SITE LAYOUT AS AT 26 MARCH 2018
                      12.1.2 DOC/18/30882 EXTRACT - REGIONAL SPORTS HUB STAGE 1 PROJECT STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT

Key Contact
Kate Jessep, Project Leader, Regional Hub Delivery

Manager/Sponsor
Brian Clancy, Project Sponsor, Deputy CEO/General Manager Infrastructure & Projects

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:
The Regional Sports Hub Stage 1 Project assists Council to deliver Community Wellbeing Objective 5. Recreation and physical activity development
For the community to have access to sport recreation and leisure opportunities
In particular, community wellbeing strategies:
5.1 Promote and support recreation and sport
High Priority: To significantly advance the establishment of new recreation and sport facilities
5.2 Provide facilities and space that encourages physical activity.

Annual Business Plan 2017/2018:
1.1 Capital Project – Regional Sports Hub Stage 1.

Purpose:
To present the recommended site layout to Council for approval to enable design documentation and development application to proceed.

Summary – Key Issues:
Key Points:
1. Council’s project team and contracted design team, Oxigen Pty Ltd and subcontractors, have undertaken an extensive review of the project requirements including thorough stakeholder consultation.
2. Council endorsement of the recommended site layout (attachment 12.1.1) is important to enable documentation of the proposed stage 1 to commence.
3. Once detailed design of stage 1 commences a detailed cost estimate will be prepared to further inform stage 1 scope and budget for Council decision (future report to Council).
Recommendation:

That Council:
1. Endorse the Regional Sports Hub site layout dated 26 March 2018 attachment 12.1.1 DOC/18/30884.
2. Delegates authority to the CEO or CEO’s nominee to authorise minor variations to the site layout that may be required to achieve the project’s outcomes.

Background:
2. Concept plans were prepared with key stakeholder engagement in 2015. A further concept plan was prepared in 2017.
3. Detailed project preparation commenced in mid-August 2017 and extensive stakeholder engagement has been ongoing since.
4. At the February 2018 Council meeting Oxgien Pty Ltd and sub-contractors including Enzo Caroscio Architecture & Design, and Wallbridge, Gilbert and Aztec Engineering were engaged to review and prepare the whole of the Regional Sports Hub site layout and undertake detailed design of stage 1 of the project.
5. Elected Members were provided an opportunity to participate in the review of site layout considerations at an informal gathering workshop on 26 February 2018 and were provided the slides from the workshop via the extranet.
6. Elected Members were also invited to the Community Information Session on 7 March 2018.
7. Elected Members were provided a briefing at an informal gathering on 26 March 2018 to provide an update on the progress of the stakeholder engagement and design development process.

Discussion:
8. The review of the site layout by the design team, led by Oxgien Pty Ltd, involved detailed consideration of the site opportunities and constraints including:
   a. 2015 and 2017 concept plans
   b. November 2017 preliminary cost estimate
   c. sports field dimensions and supporting maintenance and amenity requirements (regional standards as supplied by each sporting code) and fund raising activities (ticketing, canteen etc)
   d. sports field orientation requirements
   e. 0.1m site contour survey
   f. local climate/weather including prevailing winds
   g. site environmental and cultural heritage
   h. adjacent site services
   i. access points (current [Springs Road] and future [Heysen Blvd, Bald Hills Rd, Laratinga Trail])
   j. current, and possible future, adjacent site development
k. future development opportunities within the site
l. constructability including storm water and civil earthworks
m. staging implications
n. active and passive recreation uses including player, spectator and volunteer considerations
o. alternate and flexible uses of the facilities such as events and carnivals
p. future proofing considerations, such as future upgrades to the facilities like space for the addition of grand-stand seating
q. fencing, security, lighting, signage, parking, pathway and landscaping requirements including local level play ground.

9. During the process of reviewing the site layout extensive stakeholder consultation was undertaken – see an extract from the Stakeholder Engagement Summary Report at attachment 12.1.2 (full copy available on request). Engagements included elected members, peak sporting bodies, funding partners, neighbouring land owners, cultural heritage via Peramangk representatives, relevant staff and the broader community via a community reference group and a community information session.

10. The site layout review process resulted in the development of the following framing principles (further details in attachment 12.1.2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Context</th>
<th>Access + Connections</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Design</td>
<td>Shared Use + Flexibility</td>
<td>Civic Pride + Atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect + Views</td>
<td>Community Focus</td>
<td>Quality Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive Character</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Management + Maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Feedback from key stakeholders and the community information session confirmed that the framing principles were appropriate. Stakeholder feedback is noted in the attached stakeholder engagement report and is summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Feel Usage</th>
<th>Safety + Access</th>
<th>Planting Sustainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Proof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Ultimately, the key drivers that emerged from the site layout review process and substantially influenced the recommended design include:

a. Building locations – in particular that the buildings overlook the premier oval/pitch to the East and that the second oval/pitch is on the Western side of the building
b. Site access from Springs Rd, Heyson Blvd and Bald Hills Rd and connectivity to future adjacent development
c. Site contours and sports field orientation requirements – in particular noting that the flatter part of the site is the southern portion of the site
d. Minimising the extent and location of retaining walls to reduce construction cost and create a safer and more attractive outcome
e. Use of the slope to create elevated viewing terraces around ovals/pitches (where possible)
f. Retention of significant trees where possible
g. Staging of the project so that the completed stage 1 has a ‘completed’ feel given the timing and components of future stages are not yet known

Return to Order of Business
h. Traffic, car parking including overflow and bus drop, and pedestrian movement and connectivity to adjacent sites.

i. Future development opportunities within the site (possible commercial/residential) including ‘future proofing’ for possible future development of the facilities where possible.

j. Fencing/event ticketing requirements.

k. Views within the site and from the site to Wooma Mu Kurta (Mount Barker Summit).

13. **Next Steps.** The project schedule aims to commence construction of stage 1 in Spring 2018. The next key step for Council will be a decision on the stage 1 funding strategy, scope and budget.

**Community Engagement:**

See an extract from the **Stakeholder Engagement Summary Report at attachment 12.1.2 (full copy available on request).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project’s mailing list, including all internal and external key stakeholders, will be advised that the webpage has been updated with the finalised site layout and the detailed design, costing and documentation of stage 1 has commenced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:** Nil

**Budget:**

The detailed design phase of the project is within the 2017/18 budget.

**Statutory/Legal:**

Development Approval under the Development Act 1993 will be required.

**Staff Resource Requirements:**

No change – full-time project leader with input from numerous other staff across a range of disciplines.

**Environmental:**

The site layout endorsed by Council in 2015 required the removal of some significant trees. Following the review of the site layout, as shown in attachment 12.1.1, it is anticipated that 3-4 significant trees will be retained; however, approval will be sought through the Development Application process for removal of 3-4 significant trees in stage 1. The fourth tree relates to design of the upgrading of Springs Rd which is yet to occur. During detailed design and documentation landscaping, storm water and energy efficiency aspects will be designed.

**Social:**

The Regional Sports Hub Project Business Case includes an assessment of the positive social impact of the proposed Regional Sports Hub facilities on the community.
**Risk Assessment:**

**Project Quality.** Given thorough review process by relevant experts with extensive stakeholder, including community, input it is considered unlikely that elements of the project will not meet original design requirements – *Low risk.*

**Asset Management:**

Endorsing the site layout is NOT a decision to construct (this is subject to further Council reports and decisions); however, it should be noted that the Business Case considers the whole of life costs and long term financial implication of creating new community sporting infrastructure and should assist Council with future Regional Sports Hub project decisions including governance and management arrangements.

**Conclusion:**

Endorsement of the site layout will enable the project to proceed to detailed documentation, costing and value management processes and prepare a further report to Council to consider funding strategy, scope and budget for stage 1.

---

**Previous Decisions By Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HP Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 March 2018</td>
<td>DOC/18/6815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 February 2018</td>
<td>DOC/17/129100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 January 2018</td>
<td>DOC/17/128516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2017</td>
<td>DOC/17/116696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November 2017</td>
<td>DOC/17/97943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HP Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 March 2018</td>
<td>6815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 February 2018</td>
<td>129100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 January 2018</td>
<td>128516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2017</td>
<td>116696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November 2017</td>
<td>97943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August 2017</td>
<td>Regional Sports Hub Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May 2017</td>
<td>Regional Sports Hub Delivery of Inaugural Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 September 2015</td>
<td>Mount Barker Regional Recreation Facility – Detailed Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 April 2015</td>
<td>Springs Road Regional Recreation/Sports Hub – Project Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November 2010</td>
<td>Update on Stephenson Land Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 February 2009</td>
<td>Stephenson Land Parcel – Stephenson Land Prudential Report and Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>7 October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Confidential Report – Strategic Land Parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>1. To brief Council on the essential conditions of offer (refer to attachments 1 and 2) from Kevin, Malcolm and Yvonne Stephenson (The Stephenson Family) to sell two parcels of land on Bald Hills Road to Council (refer to attachment 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To seek authority to execute conditional contracts to purchase the two parcels of land from the Stephenson Family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To update Council on the most recent discussions held with representatives of the St Francis De Sales College (the College) and seek authority to enter into negotiations with the College regarding Council land adjacent to the College.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Site Layout

Building
Premier Oval (Two)
Gray (Synthetic/Turf)
Soccer Pitch (Synthetic)
Netball Courts/Stage 1
Netball Courts/Stage 2
Open Space
New Soccer
Pizza Space
Viewing area
Protection Flaps
Memorial Board
Road
Car parking
Turf/walls
Synthetic hockey
Lyndwen /-stage foot ball
Parade four-metre observation
Proposed stage four
Potential four-metre observation
Regional Hub Precinct
Golf Club
Murray Barker Regional Sports Hub

DRAFT
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SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Sports Requirements

Detailed requirements on sport fields and amenity including player, coaching, volunteering, fundraising and spectator requirements have been scoped with representatives of the peak sporting bodies. In addition to technical specifications for the sporting fields, the following general feedback was provided:

- likely participation numbers and growth
- future proofing considerations
- likely crowd attendance and amenity requirements - sport viewing requirements
- opportunities for regional, state and national competitions
- importance of atmosphere
- male and female sport and umpire change facility requirements
- technology requirements
- opportunities to share facilities
- maintenance requirements
- equipment storage requirements
- landscaping and fencing
- site access/egress (parking, cycling, walking, drop off / pick up)
- office space requirements, officials’ rooms (timekeeping, umpiring/referee)
- club administration/social/fund raising activities (canteen, internal open space)

Framing Principles and Stakeholder Feedback

The site layout review process resulted in the development of the following framing principles:

01 Strategic Context
Locate future commercial use sites to fit into the broader precinct, including other future recreation and sports facilities.

02 Site Design
Balance cut and fill over the site to minimise retaining walls. Generally, adopt a ‘soft’ engineering approach to site development.

DOC/18/28463  Mount Barker Regional Sports Hub Stage 1 Project – Design and Documentation phase – site layout and stage 1 design - Stakeholder Engagement Summary Report 19 March 2018
03 Prospect + Views
Maximise views across and outside of the site, locating the major ovals to enable players and spectators to take advantage of the long distance views.

04 Distinctive Character
Define a distinctive ‘Mt Barker’ character that is peri-urban, acting as a transition between the built-up Mt Barker urban areas and rural landscape preservation zones visually leading up to Mt Barker.

05 Access + Connections
Achieve public access points to the site – for public vehicles, maintenance vehicles, and pedestrians and cyclists. Consider integration of linear trails and paths.

06 Shared Use + Flexibility
Consider opportunities to share hospitality, service, infrastructure and maintenance facilities with adjacent land uses such as the golf club.

07 Community Focus
Design for open access into the site to maximise community use for non-sport activities. Consideration of diverse users, including access and design for all ages.

08 Safety
Separate internal site circulation for pedestrians and cyclists from vehicle circulation.

09 Sustainability
Maximise opportunities and integration of best practice environmental, social and economic sustainability.

10 Civic Pride + Atmosphere
Create a vibrant and viable precinct that considers the ‘sense of place’ and generating atmosphere to create an attractive place for people to be involved.

11 Quality Design
Quality design of all elements that ensure a distinct and recognisable precinct that provides benefit for more than the direct users.

12 Management + Maintenance
Consideration of the whole of life costs, ongoing maintenance requirements and a management model that delivers community benefit.
Feedback from key stakeholders and the community information session confirmed that the framing principles were appropriate. Stakeholder feedback is summarised as follows:

**Country Feel**
- Sense of Place
- Mt Barker
- Not Adelaide Oval + $10 drinks
- Open to all community
- Minimising fencing

**Safety + Access**
- Paths to the town and surroundings
- Connections to Laratinga
- Pedestrian movement very important with access roads
- Access to the sporting hub out of peak times
- Several access roads a good idea

**Planting**
- Planting of new trees
- Distinct vegetation
- Buffer planting
- Mount Barker character

**Usage**
- A place for other user groups to book such as RSL, APEX, Lions etc.
- Not just a sporting complex, others uses like nature play and trails for general public
- Bus drop-off / Park ‘n’ Ride / Kiss and drop

**Future Proof**
- Consideration of the long term plan and future Mt Barker
- Attract large events
- Available for many different user groups, not allocated to one sporting club(s)

**Sustainable**
- Buildings to be multi-purpose and not just for sport
- Buildings to work with surrounding facilities - eg. don’t need 3 cafés
- Sustainable design for stormwater + electricity

*back to contents page*
FEEDBACK CONCLUSION

Ultimately, the key drivers that emerged from the site layout review process and substantially influenced the recommended design include:

- Growth of the sports and regional community growth
- Building locations – in particular that the buildings overlook the premier oval/pitch to the east and that the second oval/pitch is on the western side of the building
- Site access from Springs Rd, Heyson Blvd and Bald Hills Rd and connectivity to future adjacent development
- Site contours and sports field orientation requirements – in particular noting that the flatter part of the site is the southern portion of the site
- Minimising the extent and location of retaining walls to reduce construction cost and create a safer and more attractive outcome
- Use of the slope to create elevated viewing terraces around ovals/pitches (where possible)
- Retention of significant trees where possible
- Staging of the project so that the completed stage 1 has a ‘completed’ feel given the timing and components of future stages is not yet known
- Traffic, car parking including overflow and bus drop, and pedestrian movement
- Fencing/event ticketing requirements
- Views within the site and from the site to Wooma Mu Kurta (Mount Barker Summit).

back to contents page
12.2 REPORT TITLE: DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO AWARD CLEANING SERVICES CONTRACT

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/16113

ATTACHMENTS: NONE

Key Contact Erin Gillespie, Administration Officer Procurement, Corporate Services

Manager/Sponsor David Peters, General Manager, Corporate Services

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:

Governance & Leadership

GL:2 Objective: Corporate Capacity & Leadership
GL 2.6 Foster strategic alliances to deliver key projects and initiatives in partnership with key stakeholders
GL 2.10 Ensure compliance with legislative requirements
GL 4.1 Manage assets and liabilities through a planned, long term approach
GL 4.3 Strive for efficiencies, collaboration and partnerships to reduce the cost of delivering services.

Purpose:
To meet time constraints associated with the acceptance of tenders, this report seeks gain Council's authority for the Chief Executive Officer or his delegate being the General Manager Corporate Services to accept a recommendation of Council Solutions to enter into a contract with a Preferred Tenderer for the supply of cleaning services.

Summary – Key Issues:
1. Existing contract for cleaning services is due to expire at the end of June 2018.
2. There is a limited window for Council to accept offers to award contract for cleaning services to commence on 1 July 2018.
3. A strategic tender call is being coordinated by Council Solutions ("COSOL") on behalf of Mount Barker District Council and five other participating Councils.
**Recommendation:**
That Council:
Delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer or his delegate (being the General Manager Corporate Services) to:

1. Accept a recommendation from Council Solutions to enter into a contract with the Preferred Tenderer for the supply of cleaning & hygiene services;
2. Make, vary and discharge contracts; and
3. Sign all relevant documentation related to this matter.

**Background:**
1. In May 2013 Council agreed to accede the COSOL contract for cleaning services, which followed a formal competitive tender process on behalf of participating G6 Councils. This contract is due to expire on 30 June 2018. There have been no significant issues with this arrangement.

2. In October 2017 Council agreed to participate in a fresh tender process to select a Preferred Tenderer to commence cleaning services on 1 July 2018.

**Scope of Works**
3. The scope of the works is to provide cleaning services for all of Council’s offices, wastewater treatment facilities and public toilets.

4. The new contract is proposed for an initial term of three years commencing on 1 July 2018 with an option to extend for one further term of two years, after formal review with COSOL and participating Councils.

**Procurement Strategy/Process**
5. COSOL provides specialist procurement services to six (6) metropolitan Councils and MBDC has been successful in acceding the cleaning services and several other COSOL contracts. Benefits to MBDC under these arrangements include (a) bulk buying power; (b) reduced administration costs; (c) legal advice etc. There is no cost to Council for participating in the tender. The successful tenderer pays COSOL a contract administration fee). The administration fee contributes to the cost of COSOL performing the following aspects of contract management:

   a) Negotiating price reviews/extensions/variations;
   b) Facilitating contract performance review meetings;
   c) Acting as escalation point for ongoing disputes;

Council is under no obligation to accept COSOL’s recommendation.
Council’s Procurement policy includes an option to undertake procurement through contracts already established and administered by other organisations such as COSOL. With the exception of Council staff evaluating tenders, there is no other cost to Council for participating in the tender process. The Request for Tender process closed on 13 March 2018 and evaluation of tenders received has commenced. A shortlist of tenderers will be identified by 13 April 2018 with a final recommendation for the preferred tenderer planned for 9 May 2018. At the request of COSOL, Councils need to be in a position to respond quickly once negotiations are underway.

6. As the anticipated expenditure is in excess of Council staff’s financial delegation Council needs to delegate authority to accept the COSOL recommendation and subsequently enter into a contract. The General Manager Corporate Services is the Chief Executive Officer’s nominated delegate for this matter.

**Community Engagement:**

| Informing only | Council minutes |

**Policy:**
The tender process is being undertaken in accordance with Council’s Procurement Policy in that the procurement is undertaken through contracts arrangements already established and administered by other organisations such as Council Solutions Regarding the policy’s encouragement of the development of local business and industry, historically it has been the practice for the Contractor to engage local cleaners.

**Budget:**
Council budgets approximately $240,000 annually for cleaning services for:

- a) Offices
- b) Wastewater treatment facilities
- c) Public toilets.

**Statutory/Legal:**
A formal contract (prepared by COSOL) will be established between Council and the successful tenderer.

**Staff Resource Requirements:**
A Council staff member will participate in the evaluation of the tenders.

**Environmental:**
The Recommended Tenderer will be required to have sound environmental principles.
**Social:**
Facilities that are sanitary for the promotion of health and safety.

**Risk Assessment:**
Should Council choose not to accept COSOL's recommendation Council would be required to undertake its own tender process. This would be likely to result in significantly higher costs to Council including:

a) Tender/contract preparation and evaluation  
b) Limited buying power  
c) Ongoing contract administration.

**Asset Management:**
Cleaning of Council facilities.

**Conclusion:**
Council realises significant benefits through arrangements with COSOL's specialist procurement services hence in anticipation should delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer or his delegate to accept COSOL’s recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Decisions By Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HPRM Reference 13/039386
12.3 REPORT TITLE: TENDER AWARD FOR CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S PERFORMANCE REVIEW

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/20401

ATTACHMENTS: Nil

Key Contact Ros McDougall, Risk and Governance Officer, Infrastructure and Projects

Manager/Sponsor Brian Clancey, Deputy CEO / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:

Governance & Leadership

GL:2 Objective: Corporate Capacity & Leadership.

GL 2.2 Maintain a highly skilled and effective workforce that applies a work ethic of confident and responsive action.

Purpose:
To gain Council’s support for a recommendation from the Chief Executive Officer Performance Review Panel to award contract 2017.063 CEO Performance Review to Corpor8Solutions (“Preferred Tenderer”) for a term of four (4) years commencing in 2018, consisting of a lump sum of $41,000 over the term of the contract.

Summary – Key Issues:
The current contract for the CEO performance review has expired. The CEO Performance Review panel (Panel) selected by Council at its meeting of 15 January 2018 has undertaken a tender process and is recommending the appointment of the preferred consultant.

Recommendation:
That Council:

1. In accordance with the recommendation of the CEO Performance Review Panel, authorise the award of the contract 2017.063 for the CEO Performance Review programme to Corpor8Solutions (“Preferred Tenderer”) for a term of four (4) years commencing in 2018, consisting of a lump sum of $41,000 over the term of the contract.

2. Authorises the Deputy CEO / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects to execute relevant contract documents between Council and the Preferred Tenderer.
**Background:**

1. On 15 January 2018 Council appointed the CEO’s Performance Review Advisory Panel for 2018. The Panel consists of the following:
   - Mayor Ferguson
   - Cr Bailey
   - Cr Seager
   - Mr Michael Bails (Chairperson of the Audit Committee)

2. As advised in that report a tender process was to be conducted to secure a suitably qualified consultant for a 4 year period 2018 – 2021.

3. The objective was to complete the CEO’s Performance Review by Council’s September meeting, as is required by the CEO’s contract and the elections caretaker period.

**Tender Strategy/Process**

4. Pursuant to Council’s Procurement policy, a request for quotation process was undertaken to secure a suitably qualified Management Consultant, to undertake the annual review of the CEO’s performance in conjunction with the Performance Review Advisory Panel.

5. A project brief was prepared by Council’s Risk and Governance Officer, in conjunction with the Panel and the CEO.

6. A total of 4 Consultants as chosen by the Panel, were invited to submit quotations. In their quotations, the Consultants were required to elaborate on the following:
   a) the methodology to be undertaken and reports that would be provided to Council that demonstrate a 360 degree feedback;
   b) an assessment against agreed performance evaluation criteria;
   c) the process for they would undertake to review the CEO’s performance over the previous 12 months; and
   d) setting new performance objectives.

Three (3) quotations were received.

**Evaluation Overview**

5. The evaluation process comprised assessment of the following weighted criteria as agreed upon by the Panel:
   a) Pricing (35%)
   b) Project Management and Experience (30%)
   c) Methodology (35%)
**Basis of Decision**

6. Following the comprehensive evaluation process and consideration of the views of the Panel, the Preferred Tenderer has been selected by the Panel on the basis of the considerable previous experience in local government and private sector CEO performance reviews of the Principal Consultant, Dr Wayne Coonan of Corpor8Solutions.

**Community Engagement:**

| Informing only | Information is provided via the Agenda on Council website. |

**Policy:**

The request for quote process has been undertaken in accordance with Council’s Procurement Policy and associated procedures.

**Budget:**

Council will need to budget an annual amount of $10,000 subject to CPI per annum for the 4 year term.

**Statutory/Legal:**

An annual review is included in the CEO’s contract.

**Staff Resource Requirements:**

There is no impact on staff resources.

**Environmental:**

N/A.

**Social:**

The community are informed about the CEO’s review outcomes following the Council resolution.

**Risk Assessment:**

Nil.

**Asset Management:**

N/A

**Conclusion:**

The Preferred Tenderer is the recommended Tenderer by the Panel on the basis that their Principal Consultant has extensive experience in performing similar reviews in local government.

---

Return to Order of Business
Previous Decisions By Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 January 2018</td>
<td>DOC/18/652</td>
<td>To inform the Council Members of the process to appoint a new consultant to undertake the CEO’s Performance Review and to consider appointing the Audit Committee Chairperson to the CEO’s Performance Review Panel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.4 REPORT TITLE: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CENTRE STAGE 1 – VOLUNTEER HUB - TENDER AWARD (CONSTRUCTION)

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/29046

ATTACHMENTS: 1. ESC OVERALL PLAN – STAGE 1 HIGHLIGHTED (DOC/18/30009)
2. ESC STAGE 1 - VOLUNTEER HUB OCCUPANCY PLAN (DOC/17/66053)

Key Contact
Scott Balmer, Project Officer Community Assets

Manager/Sponsor
Andrew Stuart, Chief Executive Officer

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:

UE: 3 Quality Built Environment
CW: 1.3 Deliver, facilitate and support volunteering facilities
GL: 4.3 Strive for efficiencies, collaboration and partnerships to reduce the cost of delivering services.

Annual Business Plan 2017/2018:
Environmental Services Centre and Volunteer Hub.

Purpose:
To seek Council’s authority to award contract 2017.061 for the Environmental Services Centre (ESC) Stage 1 Construction to Fusco Constructions Pty Ltd (“Preferred Tenderer”) for the lump sum amount of $1,226,412.34 excluding GST.

Summary – Key Issues:
- Council has a budget of $1,110,000 in 2017/18 to commence construction of stage 1 of the Environmental Services Centre.
- Stage 1 construction was tendered on 22 February 2018 and evaluated by two Council staff members and Beyond Ink.
- It is recommended to award the tender to an Adelaide Hills based company, Fusco Constructions, at a total value of $1,226,412.34 excluding GST.
- Construction is anticipated to commence in early May and be completed by December 2018.
Recommendation:

That Council:

1. Authorises the award of the contract 2017.061 for the construction of the Environmental Services Centre (ESC) Stage 1 – Volunteer Hub to Fusco Constructions Pty Ltd (“Preferred Tenderer”) for the lump sum amount of $1,226,412.34 excluding GST.

2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer or nominee to execute contract documents between Council and the Preferred Tenderer.

Background:

1. Council has previously undertaken development of the land to the south of the Waste Water Treatment Plant on Springs Rd, Mount Barker over a number of years with construction and planting of the Springs Wetlands and most recently construction of an access road (with a contribution from St Francis de Sales College).

2. The next stage of development on this site is the Environmental Services Centre, the delivery of which has been split into two stages.

3. Stage 1 of the Environmental Services Centre is the Volunteer Hub portion which will provide community storage and workshops along with shared amenities.

4. Stage 2 of the Environmental Services Centre will include a depot, staff accommodation and an interpretive centre. Detailed design is underway and construction is planned for 2019.

5. The detailed concept design of the Environmental Services Centre was presented to Council in July 2017.

6. Beyond Ink has been engaged to provide design and project management services.

7. Council has a budget of $1,110,000 in 2017/18 to commence construction of stage 1 of the Environmental Services Centre.

8. A prudential report was completed in November 2017 and presented to Council on 4 December 2017.

9. Civil works were completed on the site on 30 January 2018 in preparation for Stage 1 construction.
Scope of Works
10. Construction of Stage 1 of the ESC – Volunteer Hub includes storage space, workshops and shared kitchen and toilet facilities. This tender also includes construction of fire protection tanks and a pump room which will have capacity to cater for Stage 2 of the ESC. The footprint of this proposed building is highlighted in attachment 1.

11. Council received a pre-tender cost estimate for the works prepared by an independent quantity surveyor anticipating a tender range of $1.5 - $1.8 million (excl. GST).

Procurement Strategy/Process
12. This competitive Request for Tender (“RFT”) process was preceded by an open market Expression of Interest (“EOI”) process resulting in the shortlisting of eight (8) suitable building contractors.

13. Prior to the EOI Council (again via competitive process) had completed the site preparation civil works associated with this stage of the project.

14. The RFT was issued on 22 February 2018 and closed on 15 March 2018. Six (6) tenders were received.

Evaluation Overview
15. The evaluation of tenders process comprised of assessment of the following weighted criteria:
   a) Lump sum price (50%);
   b) Organisation Structure/Management & Technical Skills/Resources (20%);
   c) Methodology/Capacity to Deliver on time (20%) and
   d) Local business support (10%).

16. The tenders were evaluated by an evaluation panel (“Panel”) consisting of two Council staff members and Beyond Ink.

17. Tendered prices for five (5) of the tenders ranged from $1.25 million - $1.34 million, averaging $1.28 million. The other tendered amount was $2.24 million.

18. Following an initial assessment, the Panel shortlisted two tenderers who were requested to clarify some aspects of their tender and given an opportunity to identify any cost savings. Both tenderers responded.
Basis of Decision
19. Following the comprehensive evaluation process and consideration of the views of the Panel, the Preferred Tenderer has been chosen on the following basis:

a. Very competitive price that compared favourably with pre-tender estimates;
b. Superiority in quality to the other shortlisted tenderer for organisation structure/management and technical skills/resources that demonstrated ability to complete the work to a high standard;
c. Superiority in quality to the other shortlisted tenderer for proposed methodology and a demonstrated capacity to deliver on time;
d. Commitment in its tender in nominating local sub-contractors with the potential to increase local involvement.

Community Engagement:

| Informing only | Council minutes |

Policy:
The tender process has been undertaken in accordance with Council’s Procurement Policy and associated procedures.

Budget:
The 2017/18 Annual Business Plan has an allocation of $1,110,000 for stage 1.

The $1.1 million budget was based on a previous design iteration and the project scope has increased since. The final design has been estimated by independent Quantity Surveyors, Rider Levett Bucknall who anticipated tender pricing ranging from $1.5 million to $1.8 million.

Year-to-date expenditure for stage 1 is $434,127 which are costs relating to the civil works completed recently and the consultancy fees for detailed design.

Due to the timing of construction it is expected that less than $740,000 total will be expended in the 2017/18 year. The remainder of stage 1 construction expenditure will occur in financial year 2018/19.

The Draft Annual Business Plan for 2018/19 has included a further $4,100,000 for construction of stage 2. As the stage 2 detailed design is progressed over coming months, the construction cost estimates for stage 2 will be revisited.

Council has received a $1.0 million grant from the State Local Government Infrastructure Partnership toward the Environmental Services Centre and Volunteer Hub project.
**Statutory/Legal:**
The proposed development complies with the site specific Community Land Management Plan which was approved in December 2013. Full Development Approval for this stage of the project has been granted.

**Staff Resource Requirements:**
Council has engaged Beyond Ink (consultant) as the lead designer and project manager for the Environmental Services Centre project. Beyond Ink have extensive experience in the building industry and have been engaged by Council to drive a competitive commercial outcome.

In-house project management resources will be working collaboratively with the consultant and implementing Council’s project management framework.

**Environmental:**
The Preferred Tenderer has a formal Environmental Management System in place that complies with international standard ISO 14001-2004.

The proposed development is consistent with the original environmental objectives and will direct storm water runoff into the Springs Wetlands.

**Social:**
This stage of the project will have a positive community impact by creating a permanent and secure location for community groups including the Mt Barker Men’s Shed and the Mt Barker Christmas Festival Committee Inc.

The Preferred Tenderer has nominated to engage a number of trades and suppliers based within the Council district. To further enhance the benefit to the region, the Preferred Tenderer has offered to place an advertisement in the local newspaper providing other local companies the opportunity to price sections of the work. This could also open opportunities for these local companies to gain exposure working on other significant projects around the State.

**Risk Assessment:**
Council maintains a detailed Risk Management Matrix covering all aspects of the Environmental Services Centre project. The Prudential Report reviewed this documentation and made recommendations which will be incorporated in the project risk register.

The Preferred Tenderer is highly experienced in construction of this nature and prior to commencement will complete a detailed Risk Management Plan specific to this site and construction process. The Preferred Tenderer is an accredited and certified holder of the Australia Standard in Work Health and Safety, OHSAS 18001:2007.

---

*Return to Order of Business*
In addition, there is a project schedule risk associated with non-award of this contract due to the extended manufacturing time for the structural steel which if delayed would prevent the progression of other project elements.

**Asset Management:**
This project will result in a new Council building asset with ongoing whole of life costs. The Asset Management Plan (Buildings) is currently in development and will include provision for the additional expenditure and the expected income from the eventual disposal of the existing Field Services Depot on Alexandrina Road.

Furthermore, Council is currently paying rent for a commercial premises to house the Christmas Pageant Floats and this will cease upon completion of stage one, resulting in a cost saving of up to $40,000 per annum.

**Conclusion:**
The Preferred Tenderer is recommended on the basis that they offer the best value for money and maximum community benefit.

The procurement strategy of running an EOI process to vet contractors prior to the RFT has provided significant benefit to Council. This strategy has resulted in a more commercially orientated process that is reflected in the tender pricing being significantly lower than the Quantity Surveyors cost estimate.

---

**Previous Decisions by Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2017</td>
<td>DOC/17/119073</td>
<td>ESC Prudential Report</td>
<td>To seek Council endorsement for the Section 48 Prudential Report prepared on the Environmental Services Centre (ESC) Stages 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 March 2015</td>
<td>DOC/16/12931</td>
<td>ESC Access Road – Tender Award</td>
<td>To gain Council’s approval to award tender 2015.047, Environmental Services Centre Access Road &amp; Car Parking Construction to CAMCO (SA) Pty Ltd for an amount of $574,054 (exc. GST) subject to final negotiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 March 2014</td>
<td>DOC/14/01374</td>
<td>ESC Wetlands – Tender Award</td>
<td>To seek Council’s approval to award Tender 2013.045 – Mount Barker Environmental Services Centre - Wetlands Construction to S.E.M Civil for the contract sum of $880,425 (exc. GST) subject to final contract negotiations and the execution of relevant contract documents by Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 2 to Item 12.4
**Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:**
5. Governance and Leadership
   GL2: Corporate capacity and leadership
   GL2.10 Ensure compliance with legislative requirements.

**Annual Business Plan 2017/18:**
5.3.2 Review policies, procedures and delegations.

**Purpose:**
To conduct the annual review of Council’s Delegations register following some minor changes to legislation.

**Summary – Key Issues:**
- Council last undertook a review of its Delegations in September 2017
- The delegations are required to be updated following changes to some legislation and additional legislation to take effect from 30 April 2018
- The instruments of delegation are available on Council’s website.

**Recommendation:**
That having conducted its annual review of the Council’s Delegations Register in accordance with Section 44(6) of the Local Government Act 1999, the Council:

1. **Revocations**

   1.1 Hereby revokes its previous delegations to the Chief Executive Officer of those powers and functions under the following:

      1.1.1 Development Act 1993 and Development Regulations 2008
1.1.2 Expiation of Offences Act 1996 (with effect from 30 April 2018)
1.1.3 Food Act 2001
1.1.4 Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013
1.1.5 Local Government Act 1999
1.1.6 Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016
1.1.7 Road Traffic Act 1961 (SA), Road Traffic (Miscellaneous) Regulations 2014 and Road Traffic (Road Rules – Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2014
1.1.8 Safe Drinking Water Act 2011
1.1.9 Work Health and Safety Act 2012.
1.1.10 Council Policies and Authorisations

2. Delegations made under Local Government Act 1999

2.1 In exercise of the power contained in Section 44 of the Local Government Act 1999 the powers and functions under the following Acts and specified in the proposed Instruments of Delegation contained in Attachment 2 (each of which is individually identified as indicated below) are hereby delegated this 3 day of April 2018 to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer subject to the conditions and/or limitations specified herein or in the Schedule of Conditions in each such proposed Instrument of Delegation - Attachment 2 – separately attached.

2.1.1 Expiation of Offences Act 1996 (with effect from 30 April 2018)
2.1.2 Local Government Act 1999
2.1.3 Work Health and Safety Act 2012
2.1.4 Road Traffic Act 1961 (SA), Road Traffic (Miscellaneous) Regulations 2014 and Road Traffic (Road Rules – Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2014
2.1.5 Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016
2.1.6 Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 (with effect from 30 April 2018)
2.1.7 Council Policy and Authorised Signatories.
2.2 Such powers and functions may be further delegated by the Chief Executive Officer in accordance with Sections 44 and 101 of the Local Government Act 1999 as the Chief Executive Officer sees fit, unless otherwise indicated herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in each such proposed Instrument of Delegation.

3. Delegations made under Development Act 1993

3.1 In exercise of the powers contained in Section 20 and 34(23) of the Development Act 1993, the powers and functions under the Development Act 1993 and the Development Regulations 2008 contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation (annexed to the Report dated 3 April 2018 and separately attached – Attachment 2) are hereby delegated this 3 day of April 2018 to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer, subject to the conditions or limitations indicated herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Development Act 1993.

3.2 Such powers and functions may be further delegated by the Chief Executive Officer as the Chief Executive Officer sees fit and in accordance with the relevant legislation unless otherwise indicated herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Development Act 1993.

3.3 In exercise of the powers contained in Section 20 and 34(23) of the Development Act 1993 the powers and functions under the Development Act 1993 and the Development Regulations 2008 contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation (annexed to the Report dated 3 April 2018 and separately attached – Attachment 2) which are hereby delegated to the Council’s Assessment Panel as of 1 October 2017, subject to any conditions specified herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Development Act 1993.

Act:

6(3), 33, 33 (1)(d), 33(3), 35(2), 37AA, 37(5)(a), 37AA(2)(e), 37A(5), 38(3a)(b), 38(3a)(c), 38(10)(a), 38(10)(b), 38(11), 38(17), 38(18), 39(3)(b), 40(3), 41(1), 42(1), 43, 45A(2), 45A(14), 45A912), 49(4a), 49(5), 49(9), 49A(5), 49A(9), 50(1), 50(3), 50(3a), 50(11), 50A(5)(c), 50A(5)(d), 50A(5), 50A(6), 51(2), 52(4),

Regulations:

16(1), 16(2), 17(3), 17(4), 17(6), 20(5), 23(2), 30(4), 34(1)(b), 34(1)(b)(iv), 39, 42, 45(2), 46(1), 55(4),
Schedule 8
3, 5(1), 7, 10(b), 15, 1, 2(1)(g), 3, 5, 11, 17

4. **Delegations made under the Food Act 2001**

4.1 In exercise of the powers contained in Section 91 of the Food Act 2001, the powers and functions under the Food Act 2001 contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation (annexed to the Report dated 3 April 2018 and separately attached – Attachment 2) are hereby delegated this 3 day of April 2018 to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer ('the head of the enforcement agency' for the purposes of the Food Act 2001), subject to the conditions or limitations indicated herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Food Act 2001.

4.2 Such powers and functions may be further delegated by the Chief Executive Officer as the Chief Executive Officer sees fit and in accordance with the relevant legislation unless otherwise indicated herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Food Act 2001.

5. **Authorisations and Subdelegation under the Road Traffic Act 1961**

5.1 In accordance with the Instrument of General Approval and Delegation to Council dated 22 August 2013 from the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (the 'Instrument') the Council authorises the person(s) in the following positions pursuant to Clause A.7 of the Instrument to endorse Traffic Impact Statements for the purposes of Clause A of the Instrument provided that such person(s) shall take into account the matters specified in Clause A.7 of the Instrument in respect of Traffic Impact Statements:

- Group Manager Infrastructure
- Manager Infrastructure Delivery*
- Manager Infrastructure Planning*
- Acting Team Leader Projects and Technical Services
- Transport Planner*
- Project Manager Development.

(* position yet to be filled)

5.2 In accordance with Clause A.7 of the Instrument, the Council is of the opinion that the person/s in the following positions is/are experienced traffic engineering practitioner(s) for the purposes of preparing a Traffic Impact Statement as required by Clause A.7 of the Instrument:
Manager Infrastructure Planning*
Acting Team Leader Projects and Technical Services
Senior Project Manager
Project Manager Development
Transport Planner*
Technical Officer – Traffic.

5.3 In exercise of the power contained in, and in accordance with, Clause G.1 of the Instrument, the power contained in Section 33(1) of the Road Traffic Act 1961 and delegated to the Council pursuant to Clause G of the Instrument and contained in the proposed Instrument of Subdelegation (annexed to the Report dated 3 April 2018 and separately attached – Attachment 2) is hereby sub-delegated this 3 day of April 2018 to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer of the Council subject to:

(i) the conditions contained in the Instrument; and

(ii) any conditions contained in this Resolution or in the Instrument of Subdelegation; and

(iii) the creation of a separate instrument in writing reflecting such subdelegation under the Instrument and this Resolution.

5.4 In accordance with Clause E.2 of the Instrument, the Council is of the opinion that the person(s) in the following positions has (have) an appropriate level of knowledge and expertise in the preparation of traffic management Plans:

Manager Strategic Planning and Economic Development
Tourism Development Manager.

6. Delegations under the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011 (of enforcement agency)

6.1 In exercise of the power contained in Section 43 of the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011 the powers and functions of the Council as a relevant authority under the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011 contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation (annexed to the Report dated 3 April 2018 and separately attached – Attachment 2) are hereby delegated this 3 day of April 2018 to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer, subject to the conditions or limitations indicated herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011.

6.2 Such powers and functions may be further delegated by the Chief Executive Officer as the Chief Executive Officer sees fit and in accordance with the relevant legislation unless otherwise indicated herein or in the Schedule of

Return to Order of Business
Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Safe Drinking Water Act 2011.

7. **Delegations under the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013**

7.1 In exercise of the powers contained in Section 44 of the Local Government Act 1999 and Section 22B of the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013 (as relevant) the powers and functions under the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013 contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation (annexed to the Report dated 3 April 2018 and separately attached – Attachment 2) are hereby delegated this 3 day of April 2018 to the person occupying the office of Chief Executive Officer subject to the conditions or limitations indicated herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013.

7.2 Such powers and functions may be further delegated by the Chief Executive Officer as the Chief Executive Officer sees fit and in accordance with the relevant legislation unless otherwise indicated herein or in the Schedule of Conditions contained in the proposed Instrument of Delegation under the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013.

7.3 In exercise of the power contained in Section 44 of the Local Government Act 1999 the powers and functions under the following Acts and specified in below maintain the existing delegation to the Chief Executive Officer.

2. Community Titles Act 1996
4. Electronic Conveyancing National Law (South Australia) Act 2013
6. Fences Act 1975
7. Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005 and Fire and Emergency Services Regulations 2005
10. Liquor Licensing Act 1997
11. Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016 and Local Nuisance and Litter Control Regulations 2017
13. Private Parking Areas Act 1986
13. Real Property Act 1886
16. South Australian Public Health Act 2011, South Australian Public Health (Legionella) Regulations 2013, South Australian Public Health (Wastewater) Regulations 2013 and South Australian Public Health (General) Regulations 2013
17. Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992

Background:
1. The most recent review of Council’s delegations was undertaken in September 2017.
2. Since that review legislative changes have been made to legislation, with new legislation under the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017.
3. As it is not practical for the Council (via Council meetings) to undertake the day to day management of multiple pieces of legislation, Section 44 of the Local Government Act 1999 allows a Council to delegate some its powers and functions to Council Committees, Council Assessment Panel (CAP), subsidiaries, employees and/or authorised officers.
4. The current delegations have been reviewed following legislative changes.
5. Although all delegations have been reviewed only 12 of the delegation instruments are required to be remade.
6. Information was forwarded to Council Members by email on 16 March 2018 including a summary of the proposed changes.

Discussion:
7. The Local Government Association assists Councils by providing delegation templates developed by Norman Waterhouse Lawyers for each relevant Act.
8. Legislative changes are regularly reviewed and updated information is provided to Councils to determine if Council wishes to make those delegations to the CEO.
9. The CEO may delegate to other staff which is largely an administrative process.
10. The Attachment details a summary of the changes which are largely minor changes following legislative change other than the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act and resulting changes to the Expiation of Offences Act which will come into force after the 30 April 2018.
11. Council Policy delegations and authorised signatories have also been reviewed with an additional bank authorising signatory and an update of CAP into the Development Act Delegations Policy.
12. Attachment 2 is the full Instruments of delegations for those that have had changes as recommended above.

**Community Engagement:**

| Informing only | Delegations and sub-delegations are placed on Council’s website. |

**Policy:**
There is a Development Act Delegations Policy that was part of this review.

**Budget:**
N/A

**Statutory/Legal:**
Section 44(6) requires Council to review the delegations register at least annually. Hence the next annual review will not be due now until April 2019.

**Staff Resource Requirements:**
There is no impact on staff resources.

**Environmental:**
N/A

**Social:**
Delegations enable staff to perform the many functions required in day to day activities to ensure an efficient and effective service is provided to the community.

**Risk Assessment:**
The Delegations Register is an essential risk document as it stipulates the level of authority that staff have to undertake their duties.

**Asset Management:**
N/A

**Conclusion:**
Having conducted a review of the delegations following legislative change, Council is required to resolve on the recommended changes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 September 2017</td>
<td>DOC/17/83986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Terms of Reference and Development Act Delegations to Council’s Development Assessment Panel

Purpose: To provide Terms of Reference and Development Act 1993 delegations to the newly formed Council Assessment Panel (CAP).
Expiation of Offences Act
Changes as a result of the introduction of the Fines Enforcement Debt Recovery Act 17

8A(4) The power pursuant to Section 8A(4) of the Act to determine an application for review before issuing the Chief Recovery Officer with relevant particulars under Section 22 of the Fines Enforcement Debt Recovery Act 2017 in respect of the offence to which the application relates.

8A(6a) The power pursuant to Section 8A(6a) of the Act, if an enforcement determination made under section 22 of the Fines and Enforcement Debt Recovery Act 2017 is revoked on the ground that the alleged offender had not had a reasonable opportunity to apply for review of the notice under Section 8A of the Act, and the alleged offender makes an application under Section 8A of the Act within 14 days of being notified of the revocation, to withdraw the expiation notice under Section 8A of the Act.

11(1) The duty pursuant to Section 11(1) of the Act where an alleged offender has neither paid the expiation fee nor entered into an arrangement under Section 20 of the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 and the Council has not received a statutory declaration or other document sent to the Council by the alleged offender in accordance with a notice required by law to accompany the expiation notice, by the end of the expiation period, and before the Delegate takes any action under this Act or the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 to enforce the expiation notice, to give an expiation reminder notice in the prescribed form to the alleged offender.

11A The duty pursuant to Section 11A(1) of the Act where the Council has received a statutory declaration or other document sent to the Council by the alleged offender in accordance with a notice required by law to accompany the expiation notice or expiation reminder notice, and before the Delegate takes action under this Act or the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 to enforce the expiation notice, to give an expiation enforcement warning notice, in the prescribed form, to the alleged offender.

12. The power pursuant to Section 12 of the Act to accept late payment of the amount due under an expiation notice at any time before an enforcement determination is made under Section 22 of the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017.

16. Withdrawal of Expiation Notices

16(1) The power pursuant to Section 16(1) of the Act, to withdraw an expiation notice with respect to all or any of the alleged offences to which an expiation notice relates where:

- in the opinion of the Delegate the alleged offender did not commit the offence or offences, or that the notice should not have been given with respect to the offence or offences;
- the Council as issuing authority receives a statutory declaration or other document sent to the Council by the alleged offender in accordance with a notice required by law to accompany the expiation notice or expiation reminder notice; or
- the notice is defective; or
- in the opinion of the Delegate the alleged offender is suffering from a cognitive impairment that excuses the alleged offending; or
- the Delegate decides that the alleged offender should be prosecuted for the offence or offences.

16(6) The duty pursuant to Section 16(6) of the Act, subject to Section 16(7) of the Act, to withdraw an expiation notice if it becomes apparent that the alleged offender did not receive the notice until after the expiation period, or has never received it, as a result of error on the part of the Council as issuing authority or failure of the postal system or failure in the transmission of an email.

16(11) The duty pursuant to Section 16(11) of the Act, where an expiation notice is withdrawn under Section 16 of the Act and the notice of withdrawal does not specify that the notice is withdrawn for the purposes of prosecuting the alleged offender, and if an enforcement determination has been made under Section 22 of the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2014, to inform the Chief Recovery Officer of the withdrawal of the notice.
### Giving of Certain Notices and Certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The power pursuant to Section 18 of the Act to enter into an agreement with the Chief Recovery Officer in relation to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the manner in which the Chief Recovery Officer is to provide information to the Council in relation to action taken by the Chief Recovery Officer under the Act in respect of an expiation notice issued by the Council; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the manner in which the Council is to provide information to the Chief Recovery Officer in relation to the issuing of an expiation notice by the Council or any other action taken by the Council in respect of an expiation notice so issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Government Act 1999

**Addition:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 187(1)</th>
<th>The power pursuant to Section 187(1) of the Act to issue a certificate, on application by or on behalf of a person who has an interest in land within the area, stating that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the amount of any liability for rates or charges on the land imposed under Part 1 of Chapter 10 or Schedule 1B of the Act (including rates and charges under Part 1 of Chapter 10 or Schedule 1B of the Act that have not yet fallen due for payment, and outstanding interest or fines payable in respect of rates and charges under Part 1 of Chapter 10 or Schedule 1B of the Act); and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule 1B Building Upgrade Agreement *(May only be delegated to CEO)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 2(1)</th>
<th>The power pursuant to Clause 2(1) of Schedule 1B of the Act, subject to Clause 2 of Schedule 1B of the Act, enter into an agreement (a building upgrade agreement) under which:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the building owner agrees to undertake upgrade works in respect of the building; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a finance provider agrees to advance money to the building owner for the purpose of funding those upgrade works; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Council agrees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to levy a charge on the relevant land (a building upgrade charge), to be paid by the building owner, for the purpose of recouping the money advanced by the finance provider for the upgrade works (and any interest or other charges payable to the finance provider under the agreement); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to pay to the finance provider any money paid to the Council by way of the building upgrade charge (other than any service fee or late payment fee that the Council is permitted by the agreement to deduct and retain).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Clause 2(3) | The power pursuant to Clause 2(3) of Schedule 1B of the Act to include in a building upgrade agreement, payment to the finance provider of penalty interest on money advanced by the finance provider under the agreement, at such rate as determined in accordance with the regulations, and, if the regulations do not provide for the determination of the rate at such rate as determined in accordance with the agreement. |

| Clause 2(4) | The power pursuant to Clause 2(4) of Schedule 1B of the Act to agree that a building upgrade agreement may be entered into by any other persons that the delegate considers should be parties to the agreement. |
**Clause 4**  
**Variation or Termination of Agreement** *(May only be delegated to CEO)*

The power pursuant to Clause 4 of Schedule 1B of the Act to vary or terminate a building upgrade agreement by further agreement between the primary parties.

**Clause 5**  
**Contents of Agreement** *(May only be delegated to CEO)*

Clause 5(1) The power pursuant to Clause 5(1) of Schedule 1B of the Act to make a building upgrade agreement in writing and specify:

- the upgrade works to be undertaken by or on behalf of the building owner under the agreement; and
- the amount of money to be advanced by the finance provider under the agreement; and
- the amount of the building upgrade charge to be levied by the Council under the agreement; and
- the schedule for the payment, by the building owner, of a building upgrade charge to the Council; and
- the amount of, or a method for calculating the amount of, any service fee or late payment fee that the Council may deduct and retain; and
- any prescribed matters.

Clause 5(2) The power pursuant to Clause 5(2) of Schedule 1B of the Act to, in a building upgrade agreement:

- provide for the early repayment of any amount payable under the agreement; and
- include and agree to other provisions.

**Clause 6**  
**Declaration of Building Upgrade Charge** *(May only be delegated to CEO)*

Clause 6(1) The power pursuant to Clause 6(1) of Schedule 1B of the Act, after the Council enters into a building upgrade agreement, to, in accordance with the terms of the agreement, declare a building upgrade charge in respect of the relevant land (being a charge of the agreed amount specified in the building upgrade agreement).

Clause 6(2) The power pursuant to Clause 6(2) of Schedule 1B of the Act, if the Council or delegate declares a building upgrade charge, to, within 28 days after the declaration give the building owner written notice in accordance with Clauses 6(3) and (4) of Schedule 1B of the Act specifying:

- the name and address of the building owner; and
- a description of the relevant land in respect of which the building upgrade charge is being levied; and
- the building upgrade agreement under which the building upgrade charge is being levied; and
- the amount for which the building owner is liable; and
- the manner of payment of the amount; and
- the due date for payment of the amount, in accordance with the schedule for the payment of the building upgrade charge to the Council (specified in the building upgrade agreement); and
- the amount of, or method of calculating, any service fee of the Council authorised.
by the building upgrade agreement and any late payment fee that may be imposed by the Council if the building owner fails to pay an amount for which the building owner is liable by the due date; and
- any prescribed matters.

**Clause 6(4)** The power pursuant to Clause 6(4) of Schedule 1B of the Act, to, in relation to each payment in respect of a building upgrade charge for which a building owner is liable, give a notice under Clause 6(2) of Schedule 1B of the Act to the building owner at least 28 days before the date for payment specified in the notice.

**Clause 7 Payment of Building Upgrade Charge**

**Clause 7(2)** The power pursuant to Clause 7(2) of Schedule 1B of the Act, on payment of money in respect of a building upgrade charge to the Council, to deduct and retain any service fee and late payment fee authorised by the building upgrade agreement.

**Clause 7(3)** The power pursuant to Clause 7(3) of Schedule 1B of the Act in relation to money paid to the Council in respect of a building upgrade charge, to, other than any service fee and late payment fee retained by the Council,
- hold that money on behalf of the finance provider pending payment to the finance provider; and
- pay that money to the finance provider in accordance with the terms of the building upgrade agreement under which the charge was levied.

**Clause 9 Sale of Land for Non-payment of Building Upgrade Charge**

**Clause 9(1)** The power pursuant to Clause 9(1) of Schedule 1B of the Act, subject to clause 9 of Schedule 1B of the Act to, if an amount for which a building owner is liable in respect of a building upgrade charge remains unpaid for more than 3 years, sell the relevant land in accordance with the regulations.

**Clause 9(2)** The power pursuant to Clause 9(2) of Schedule 1B of the Act to, apply any money received by the Council in respect of the sale of land under Clause 9 of Schedule 1B of the Act as follows:
- firstly – in paying the costs of the sale and any other costs incurred in proceeding under Clause 9 of Schedule 1B of the Act;
- secondly – in discharging any liabilities to the Council in respect of the land (other than any building upgrade charge, service fee or late payment fee in relation to a building upgrade charge);
- thirdly – in discharging any liability to the Council for a building upgrade charge, service fee or late payment fee in relation to a building upgrade charge;
- fourthly – in discharging any liability to the Crown for rates, charges or taxes, or any prescribed liability to the Crown in respect of the land;
- fifthly – in discharging any liabilities secured by registered mortgages, encumbrances or charges;
- sixthly – in discharging any other mortgages, encumbrances or charges of which the Council has notice;
- seventhly – in payment to the owner of the land.

**Clause 9(3)** The power pursuant to Clause 9(3) of Schedule 1B of the Act, if the owner cannot be found after making reasonable inquiries as to his or her whereabouts, to deal with an
amount payable to the owner as unclaimed money under the Unclaimed Moneys Act 1891.

**Clause 10 Repayment of Advances to Finance Provider**

Clause 10(2) The power pursuant to Clause 10(2) of Schedule 1B of the Act, if a building upgrade agreement is terminated before all the money that the finance provider agreed to advance to the building owner is advanced, to:
- adjust the building upgrade charge to reflect the lower amount advanced to the building owner; and
- give the building owner written notice of the adjustment.

Clause 10(3) The power pursuant to Clause 10(3) of Schedule 1B of the Act, if, as a result of an adjustment being made to a building upgrade charge under clause 10 of Schedule 1B of the Act:
- the building owner has made payment in respect of the charge in excess of the adjusted amount; and
- the excess amount has been paid by the Council to the finance provider,
  to refund the building owner the excess amount paid.

**Clause 13 Register of Building Upgrade Agreements**

Clause 13(1) The power pursuant to Clause 13(1) of Schedule 1B of the Act to keep a register of building upgrade agreements in accordance with Clause 13(2) of Schedule 1B of the Act.

Clause 13(3) The power pursuant to Clause 13(3) of Schedule 1B of the Act to make available the register for inspection (without charge) by a member of the public at the principal office of the Council during ordinary office hours and to provide a person with an extract from the register (without charge).
**Work Health and Safety Act**

Change to name of authority to make an application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>65. Disqualification of health and safety representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The power pursuant to Section 65(1) of the Act, to make an application to the SAET to disqualify a health and safety representative on the ground that the representative has…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>229. Application for external review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The power pursuant to Section 229(1) of the Act, to, where the Council is an eligible person, apply to the SAET under Part 3 Division 1 of the South Australian Employment Tribunal Act 2014, in accordance with Section 229(2) of the Act, of:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Road Traffic Act**

Addition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Closing and Exemptions for Certain Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33(2) The power pursuant to Section 33(2) of the Act, to consent to an order under Section 33(1) of the Act to close a road in the Council’s area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016**

Additions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>73 Preparation and Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73(2)(b) The power pursuant to Section 73(2)(b)(iv) of the Act to initiate a proposal to amend a designated instrument with the approval of the Minister, acting on the advice of the Commissioner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73(6) The power pursuant to Section 73(6) of the Act where the Council is authorised or approved under Section 73 of the Act, and after all of the requirements of Section 73 have been satisfied:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to prepare a draft of the relevant proposal; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to comply with the Community Engagement Charter for the purposes of consultation in relation to the proposal; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to the extent that paragraph (b) of Section 73(6) of the Act does not apply, in the case of a proposed amendment to a regional plan that has been prepared by a joint planning board where the amendment is not being proposed by the joint planning board – to consult with the joint planning board; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to the extent that paragraph (b) of Section 73(6) of the Act does not apply, in the case of a proposed amendment to the Planning and Design Code that will have a specific impact on 1 or more particular pieces of land in a particular zone or subzone (rather than more generally) – to take reasonable steps to give:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an owner or occupier of the land; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an owner or occupier of each piece of adjacent land,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- a notice in accordance with the regulations; and

- to consult with any person or body specified by the Commission and any other person or body as the delegate thinks fit; and

- to carry out such investigations and obtain such information specified by the Commission; and

- to comply with any requirement prescribed by the regulations

73(8) The power pursuant to Section 73(8) of the Act to, after the Council has furnished a report to the Minister under Section 73(7) of the Act, ensure that a copy of the report is published on the SA planning portal in accordance with a practice direction that applies for the purposes of Section 73 of the Act

73(9) The power pursuant to Section 73(9) of the Act to enter into an agreement with a person for the recovery of costs incurred by the Council in relation to an amendment of the Planning and Design Code or a design standard under Section 73 of the Act (subject to the requirement to charge costs under Section 73(4)(b) of the Act (if relevant)).

74(8) Parliamentary Scrutiny

74(8) The power pursuant to Section 74(8) of the Act if the ERD Committee is proposing to suggest an amendment under Section 74(4) of the Act and the amendment is specifically relevant to the Council, to provide a comment and response within the period of 2 weeks.

82 Entities Constituting Relevant Authorities

82(d) The power pursuant to Section 82(d) of the Act, subject to the Act, to appoint an assessment panel.

83 Panels Established by Joint Planning Boards or Councils

83(1) The power pursuant to Section 83(1) of the Act in relation to an assessment panel appointed by the Council under Division 1 of Part 6 of the Act, to:

- appoint more than 1 assessment panel and if the delegate does so, to clearly specify which class of development each assessment panel is to assess;

- determine

- the membership of the assessment panel, being no more than 5 members, only 1 of which may be a member of a council, and, if the delegate thinks fit, on the basis that the assessment panel will be constituted by a different number of members depending on the particular class of development that is being assessed by the assessment panel; and

- the procedures to be followed with respect to the appointment of members; and

- the terms of office of members; and

- conditions of appointment of members, or the method by which those conditions will be determined, (including as to their remuneration) and the grounds on which, and the procedures by which, a member may be removed from office; and

- the appointment of deputy members; and
83(1)(h) The power pursuant to Section 83(1)(h) of the Act to arrange the staffing and support required for the purposes of the operations of the panel.

83(1)(i) The power pursuant to Section 83(1)(i) of the Act to substitute the existing members of the panel with new members if directed to do so by the Minister acting on recommendation of the Commission under Section 86 of the Act.

83(2) The power pursuant to Section 83(2) of the Act to form the opinion and be satisfied that a person to be appointed as a member of an assessment panel who is a member, or former member, of a council is appropriately qualified to act as a member of the assessment panel on account of the person’s experience in local government.

Panels Established by Minister

84(1)(c) The power pursuant to Section 84(1)(c)(ii)(B) of the Act to make submissions to the Minister about the constitution of a regional assessment panel in relation to the area of the Council (or part of the area).

Substitution of Local Panels

86(2)(a) The power pursuant to Section 86(2)(a) of the Act to make submissions to the Commission in relation to an inquiry.

Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017

New Legislation

9. **Amounts Due Under Expiation Notices may be Treated as Part of Pecuniary Sum**

9(2) The power pursuant to Section 9(2) of the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 (the Act) if a debtor requests the making of an aggregation determination but no enforcement determination has been made under Section 22 of the Act in relation to the expiation amount, to pay the prescribed fee.

20 **Arrangements as to Manner and Time of Payment**

20(4) The power pursuant to Section 20(4) of the Act to agree with the Chief Recovery Officer the manner in which the Chief Recovery Officer is to give the Council notice of an arrangement entered into under Section 20 of the Act.

20(18) The power pursuant to Section 20(18) of the Act to agree with the Chief Recovery Officer the manner in which, if an arrangement terminates under Sections 20(15) or (17) of the Act, the chief Recovery Officer is to give the Council notice of the termination and the amount then outstanding (taking into account, where the arrangement required the performance of community service, the number of hours of community service to be performed).

22 **Enforcement Determination**
22(1) The power pursuant to Section 22(1) of the Act to enforce an expiation notice against the alleged offender by providing to the Chief Recovery Officer the particulars determined by the Chief Recovery officer relating to:

(a) the alleged offender; and

(b) the offence or offences that remain unexpiated; and

(c) the amount due under the notice; and

(d) compliance by the council with the requirements of the Act and any other Act.

22(2) The power pursuant to Section 22(2) of the Act to pay the prescribed fee.

Development Act, Development Regulations 2008
Additions:

80(1a) Requirement to Upgrade Building in Certain Cases

The power pursuant to Regulation 80(1a) of the Regulations, if an application for a building rules consent relates to building work in the nature of an alteration to a class 2 to class 9 building constructed before 1 January 2002, to form the opinion that the building is unsafe, structurally unsound or in an unhealthy condition, and to require, as a condition of consent:

- that building work that conforms with the requirements of the Building Rules be carried out to the extent reasonably necessary to ensure that the building is safe and conforms to proper structural and health standards; or
- that the building work comply with Minister’s Specification SA: Upgrading health and safety in existing buildings (to the extent reasonably applicable to the building and its condition).

82(4) The power pursuant to Regulation 82(4) of the Regulations and subject to Regulation 82(4a) of the Regulations, to assign the appropriate classification under the Building Code to a building upon being satisfied on the basis of the owner’s application and accompanying documents that the building, in respect of the classification applied for, possesses the attributes appropriate to its present or intended use.

82(4a) The power pursuant to Regulation 82(4a) of the Regulations, if an application under Regulation 82 of the Regulations is made in respect of an existing class 2 to class 9 building, to require the applicant to satisfy the delegate that Minister’s Specification SA: Upgrading health and safety in existing buildings has been complied with (to the extent reasonably applicable to the building and its present or intended use).

Food Act
Amendments to wording

51 Review of Decision to Refuse Certificate of Clearance

51(1) The power pursuant to Section 51(1) of the Act where a person aggrieved by a decision to refuse to give a certificate of clearance under Part 5 of the Act makes application to the Tribunal under Section 34 of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013 for a review of the decision, to respond to the review body on behalf of the Council.

52 Review of Order

52(4) The power pursuant to Section 52(4) of the Act where an applicant for the payment of compensation under Section 52 of the Act is dissatisfied with a determination under Section 52(3) of the Act, as to the refusal to pay compensation or the amount of compensation and
has applied to the Tribunal under Section 34 of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013 for a review of the determination, to respond to that review body on behalf of the Council.

**Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT B  COUNCIL POLICIES AND AUTHORISED SIGNATORIES

Permits or Notices under By-laws
To issue and revoke permits, licences or notices pursuant to Council By-laws, including the power to impose, delete or vary conditions thereon, but subject to compliance with any relevant Council policy.

Delegated to:
General Manager Corporate Services
General Manager Council Services
Deputy Chief Executive Officer / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects
Manager Health & Public Safety

Public Statements – refer Media Policy
To issue public statements and press releases on behalf of Council and to authorise any other officers of the Council to do likewise in particular instances. (Note: The Mayor and Chief Executive Officer are also authorised to make official media statements on behalf of Council).

Delegated to:
General Manager Corporate Services
General Manager Council Services
Deputy Chief Executive Officer / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects

Flags Policy
To administer this Policy

Delegated to:
CEO or delegate

Hardship Policy
To make decisions regarding this Policy

Delegated to:
CEO or delegate

Recreation and Sport Infrastructure In-Kind Contribution Policy
To finalise and execute in-kind agreements with developers that are consistent with this Policy up to maximum of financial delegation

Delegated to:
CEO
Deputy Chief Executive Officer / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects
Rates & Property Officer

Road & Public Place Name Policy
To determine road names

Delegated to:
CEO
Deputy Chief Executive Officer / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects

Significant Environmental Benefit Policy
To approve significant environment benefit policy offset mechanism on a case by case basis

Delegated to:
CEO
Deputy Chief Executive Officer / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects
General Manager Council Services
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Tree Management Policy

The Council has delegated authority to the Chief Executive Officer in accordance with Section 44 of the Act and sub delegates to the following officers:

Tree Management Removal:
- to assess applications to remove trees under the Native Vegetation Act 1991 & Development Act 1993
- to make application to remove trees under the Native Vegetation Act 1991 and Development Act 1993
- to authorise tree removal under the Local Government Act 1999

Day to day tree management:
- to manage and maintain trees on public land

General Manager Planning & Development
Manager Open Space and Environment
Urban Forest Officer

Deputy Chief Executive Officer / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects
Manager Open Space and Environment
Urban Forest Officer

Deputy Chief Executive Officer / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects
Manager Field Services
Urban Forest Officer
Manager Open Space and Environment
Team Leader Horticulture

Manager Open Space and Environment
Urban Forest Officer
Manager Field Services
Team Leader Horticulture

Separate Rate Policy - Developer Contributions: Payment, Rebate, Postponement Policy

Raise, postpone and rebate the separate rate

Delegated to:
Manager Rates, Property & Records
CEO

Christmas Closure Period
The responsibility to determine appropriate opening hours during the Christmas period each year.
Infrastructure Contributions – Developer Separate Rate Relief Policy

Power for all decisions in this policy but not limited to the application of the policy, postponement, remission or payment of a separate rate.

Kerbside Waste, Recycling & Green Organics Collection Service Policy

Delegation to assess the exceptional circumstances for an additional service and may sub-delegate to other employees.
TITLE: DEVELOPMENT ACT 1993 DELEGATIONS POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE NUMBER:</th>
<th>Doc/17/7222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT:</td>
<td>Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICABLE LEGISLATION:</td>
<td>Development Act 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT BARKER 2035 DISTRICT STRATEGIC PLAN:</td>
<td>The Urban Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UE:3 : Quality Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATED POLICIES:</td>
<td>• Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING PROCEDURES:</td>
<td>• Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDORSED BY COUNCIL:</td>
<td>3 April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT REVIEW DATE:</td>
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1. POLICY STATEMENT

This policy is established pursuant to Section 34(27) of the Development Act 1993 (“the Act”).

Under the Act and the Development Regulations 1993 (“the Regulations”), the Mount Barker District Council (“the Council”) is responsible for the management of most development within this area.

2. POLICY OBJECTIVES

This Policy explains how the Council will make the various delegations required by Section 34(23) of the Act.

Under Section 34(23) of the Act the Council is required to delegate all of its powers and functions as a “relevant authority” with respect to determining whether or not to grant development plan consent. That means, the Council’s development assessment functions must be exercised by a person or body that has been given delegated authority by the Council, rather than the Council itself.

In addition, the Council has various other duties and functions under the Act and Regulations which is both impractical and administratively difficult to expect the Council sitting as a whole, to always perform.

The Council therefore delegates its powers and functions under the Act and Regulations to other persons or bodies.
3. POLICY INFORMATION

3.1 COUNCIL DELEGATION

The Council’s power to delegate its powers and functions under the Act is in Section 20 of the Act, which states:

“(1) … a Council, may delegate a power or function vested or conferred under this Act.

(2) A delegation -

(a) may be made –

(i) to a particular person or body; or

(ii) to the person for the time being occupying a particular office or position; or

(iii) to a subsidiary established under the Local Government Act 1999; and

……

(c) may be made subject to conditions and limitations specified in the instrument of appointment; and

(d) subject to any other provision of this Act or the regulations, is revocable at will and does not derogate from the power of the delegator to act in a matter; and

………..

(3) A power or function delegated under this section may, if the instrument of delegation so provides, be further delegated.”

The Council delegates all of its powers and functions under the Act and Regulations to the Chief Executive Officer of the Council (“the CEO”). The CEO is able to subdelegate those powers and functions to other Council officers.

3.2 COUNCIL ASSESSMENT PANEL (CAP) DELEGATION

Section 34(23) states:

“A Council must delegate its powers and functions as a relevant authority with respect to determining whether or not to grant development plan consent under this Act to –

(a) its council development assessment panel; or

(b) a person for the time being occupying a particular office or position (but not including a person who is a member of the council); or

(c) a regional development assessment panel (if such a delegation is consistent with the extent to which the panel may act under the provisions of the regulations constituting the panel and in addition to the operation of subsection (1)(ab))
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The Council also delegates its powers and functions as a relevant authority with respect to determining whether or not to grant development plan consent (“the development assessment powers and functions”) to the Council Assessment Panel (“the CAP). Thus the CEO and the CAP share many of powers and functions in which case these powers and functions can be exercised by either the CEO or the CAP. However, as a matter of policy it is expected that the CDAP, rather than the CEO or the CEO’s delegate, will generally exercise the powers and functions in cases whether it has delegated authority to do so.

The CAP has delegated authority to exercise the powers and functions under the Act in the circumstances listed below:

- Assessment of non-complying development applications unless the Senior Planner – City Development, Team Leader – City Development, Manager City Development or the General Manager Planning and Development has determined it to be of a minor nature.
- Assessment of all applications that are the subject of an unresolved Category 3 representation, or an unresolved Category 2 representation.
- Assessment of matters which, in the opinion of the Senior Planner – City Development, Team Leader - City Development, Manager City Development or the General Manager Planning and Development warrant consideration by the CAP because they are contentious, controversial or otherwise significant.
- Assessment of any other matters which the Chief Executive Officer or Senior Planner – City Development, Team Leader – City Development, Manager City Development or the General Manager Planning and Development considers requires a decision of the CAP.

In any other case, it will generally be the case that the powers or functions under the Act will be exercised by the CEO, or the CEO’s delegate.

4. REVIEW
This Policy will be reviewed annually or earlier in the event of changes to legislation or related Policies and Procedures or if deemed necessary by the General Manager Council Services.

5. ACCESS TO THE POLICY
The Policy is available for public inspection at the Customer Service Centre, at the Local Government Centre, 6 Dutton Road, Mount Barker, South Australia and on the Council’s website www.mountbarker.sa.gov.au.

6. FURTHER INFORMATION
For further information on this Policy, please contact:
Title: General Manager Planning & Development
Address: PO Box 54, Mount Barker
South Australia, SA, 5251
Telephone: 8393 6415
Email: gwaller@mountbarker.sa.gov.au
**PROCUREMENT DELEGATION LEVELS - CEO has delegation to alter**

Register of Delegated Authority Expenditure Limits for Purchase Orders, Contracts & invoices exclusive of GST, Corporate Card Monthly Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Position</th>
<th>Delegated Amount</th>
<th>Corporate Card Limit per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Stuart</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Clancey</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Peters</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Parker</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Waller</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Burton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu Atukorala</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Calder</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Carter</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Coetzer</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Dawkins</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Day</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Jessep</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Smith</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Jeffree</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Bell</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Gray</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Council 5 March 2012, 4 February 2013, 17 Feb 2014, 2 Feb 15, 15 Feb 2016, 6 Feb 2017, 3 July 17, 3 Apr 18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Position</th>
<th>Delegated Amount</th>
<th>Corporate Card Limit per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Planning Policy and Strategy</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Hajsza[ Manager ICT</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hildebrand[ Community Connections Manager</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hutchinson[ Project Manager Development</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Manarangi[ Technical Support Co-ordinator</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Massey[ Engineer, Civil Assets</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Morton[ Strategic Projects Manager</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Voortman[ City Development Manager</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damian Letheridge[ Wastewater Infrastructure Officer</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Balmer[ Project Officer – Community Assets</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cooney[ Manager Open Space and Environment</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa Ellks[ Team Leader – State Government Community Programs</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville Gay[ Manager Rates, Property &amp; Records</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Glen[ Tourism Development Manager</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Graham[ Team Leader Development Engineering</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Lawry[ Urban Forest Officer</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter McGinn[ Senior Community Development Officer</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelaina Eaton[ Senior Community Development Officer</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Mooney[ Manager Finance</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Overy[ Infrastructure Services Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Position</th>
<th>Delegated Amount</th>
<th>Corporate Card Limit per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Pett</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager People and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sarre</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Strategic Planning &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Stone</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA to General Manager Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Tann</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Health &amp; Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maree Barns</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Officer Corporate Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Gazzola</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Officer Field Services Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Gillespie</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Officer Procurement and Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Hesse</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Support Officer – People and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Miller</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA to CEO &amp; Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivien Pegler</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Library Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rammell</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager Communications and Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique Rutten</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Act PA to General Manager Council Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Grave</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunisation Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Head</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events and Tourism Support Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kuschert</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Support Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Ransome</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Economic Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Ward</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Administration Officer Health and Public Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limits for credit cards may temporarily be increased up to $5,000 to address short term requirements, as approved by the General Manager Corporate Services.

To Council 5 March 2012, 4 February 2013, 17 Feb 2014, 2 Feb 15, 15 Feb 2016, 6 Feb 2017, 3 July 17, 3 Apr 18
1. **AUTHORISED SIGNATORIES**

**Bank Authorisers and Signatories**

Authorising -  
- Chief Executive Officer - Andrew Stuart  
- General Manager Corporate Services - David Peters  
- Manager Finance – Anne Mooney  
- Manager Assets and Contracts – Marcus Smith  
- Risk and Governance Officer – Roslyn McDougall  
- Manager Financial Strategy - Alex Oulianoff  

Signatory -  
- Strategic Projects Manager – David Morton

**Local Government Superannuation Scheme**

For the purpose of:

(a)  supplying any notice, request, consent, certificate or list and/or
(b)  making any communication required to be given or made to the Local Government Superannuation Scheme or pursuant to the policies, proposals and other relevant forms made in conjunction with the Scheme.

Chief Executive Officer - Andrew Stuart  
General Manager Corporate Services - David Peters  
Deputy Chief Executive Officer /General Manager Infrastructure and Projects - Brian Clancy  
Payroll Officer - John Tymko

**Australian Taxation Office Documentation**

To sign any returns or other official documentation required to be lodged with the Australian Taxation Office.

Chief Executive Officer - Andrew Stuart  
General Manager Corporate Services - David Peters  
Manager Finance - Anne Mooney  
Manager Financial Strategy – Alex Oulianoff  
Payroll Officer - John Tymko – (Payroll only)

**Employment Declaration Forms**

To sign Employment Declaration forms:

General Manager Corporate Services - David Peters  
Manager Finance - Anne Mooney  
Payroll Officer - John Tymko
Investment and Loan Repayments

To authorise payments investing funds in accordance with Council’s Investment Policy and the payment of budgeted loan repayments.

Chief Executive Officer - Andrew Stuart
General Manager Corporate Services - David Peters
Manager Finance - Anne Mooney
Manager Financial Strategy – Alex Oulianoff

Claims for Funds

To sign claims for recovery of funds from government agencies for approved projects.

Chief Executive Officer - Andrew Stuart
General Manager Corporate Services - David Peters
Deputy Chief Executive Officer / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects - Brian Clancey
General Manager Council Services - Greg Parker
General Manager Planning and Development – Greg Waller
Manager Finance - Anne Mooney
Manager Financial Strategy – Alex Oulianoff

Public Lighting Tariff

To authorise any document related to public lighting tariffs:

Deputy Mayor / General Manager Infrastructure and Projects – Brian Clancey
Manager Assets & Contracts – Marcus Smith
Manager Field Services – Glen Carter
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12.6 REPORT TITLE: WRITE OFF OF FINES AND INTEREST – LONG TERM DEBT, LIMITED TITLES VICTORIA STREET, HAHNDORF

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/29326

ATTACHMENTS: ATTACHMENT 1, DOC/18/26839, ESTATE EA WITTWER, ALLOTMENT PLAN

Key Contact Neville Gay, Manager Rates, Property and Records

Manager/Sponsor David Peters, General Manager Corporate Services

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:
Governance and Leadership.
GL:4 – Effective management and financial sustainability.

Annual Business Plan 2017/2018:
5.3.7 Rates
Maintain the level of outstanding rates to 4% of total rates receivable.

Purpose:
To consider write off of fines and interest for limited title properties located at Victoria Street, Hahndorf.

Summary – Key Issues:
1. Council has limited title long term debts requiring consideration, and details provided below will assist in making a determination to resolve the matter.
2. This decision will assist Council in reducing its current rate debt and provide assistance to an adverse possession claim seeking to consolidate five small allotments into one allotment suitable for a future sale.
3. Seeking agreement that Council will not take action for recovery of outstanding rates and arrears until the newly created property is sold.

Recommendation:
That Council write off respective outstanding fines and interest totalling $17,149.21 on the following properties in Victoria Street HAHNDORF:

- ALT 43 DP 82 CT 5695/323, Assessment 177550  $5,495.63
- LOT 40 FP 157175 CT 5695/297, Assessment 57521  $5,826.79
- ALT: 46 DP: 82 CT: 5825/771, Assessment 57539  $5,826.79
- ALT: 47 DP: 82 CT: 5825/771, Assessment 57539  $5,826.79

and furthermore agree that once there is a new title in the name of EA Wittwer, the EA Wittwer Estate will be responsible for the payment of outstanding rates and arrears.

Return to Order of Business
Background:
1. At the workshop held on 1 August 2016, Council was presented with a discussion regarding specific properties that had rate debt matters requiring consideration by Council as the level of potential rate relief or remission exceeds the delegation of Council officers.
2. Australian Executor Trustee has applied to Council seeking assistance to address debts, in particular fines and interest on limited title properties in this environment, this will assist with possessory title claim on:

   ALT 43 DP 82 CT 5695/323    Estate Eliesabeth Liebelt
   LOT 40 FP 157175 CT 5695/297    Estate Johann C & Christian Jensch
   ALT: 46 DP: 82 CT: 5825/771    Estate Johann Carl August Pade
   ALT: 47 DP: 82 CT: 5825/771    Estate Johann Carl August Pade

A limited certificate of title may be a certificate of title limited as to description of land or as to title, or as to both description of land and title.

3. Council has also been requested to consider delaying collection of outstanding rates and arrears until a new allotment is created as a result of consolidating five small parcels into one marketable allotment. Outstanding debt will be paid from future proceeds of sale.

Discussion:
4. The Australian Executor Trustee is administering the EA Wittwer’s estate.
5. EA Wittwer occupied and paid rates on the properties listed above prior to his death in 2004.
6. EA Wittwer purchased Allotments 42 and 84 Victoria Street, Hahndorf in 1968.
7. The other three adjoining properties adjoins Mr Wittwer’s land and these other owners have been deceased for many years.
8. The Australian Executor Trustee has made a possessory title application to the Lands Titles Office for the Liebelt, Jensch and Pade land. If successful, these parcels will be consolidated with EA Wittwer land to create a single parcel which will then be placed on the market for sale.
9. As part of the process for granting a possessor title, the Examiner of Titles has requested confirmation from Council that all outstanding Council rates have been paid in relation to the land being claimed. (Liebelt, Jensch, Pade)
10. The Australian Executor Trustee requires Council’s assistance to achieve this goal where Council agrees to provide a written consent to the Examiner of Titles stating that whilst arrears of rates apply to the limited titles, the applicant (Australian Executor Trustee) acknowledges these rates and arrears will be paid from the proceeds of the sale of the newly created allotment.
11. Under this agreement, Council is consenting to the applications on the basis that once title is issued in the name of EA Wittwer for the Liebelt, Jensch and Pade properties the estate will become responsible for the payment of rates and arrears.
12. The Australian Executor Trustee also requests Council consider remitting fines and interest on the Liebelt, Jensch and Pade properties.
13. Total Rates, arrears, fines and interest currently outstanding on these limited titles is $40,327.60:-

Return to Order of Business
### Owner Total Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Total Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estate E Liebelt</td>
<td>$13,113.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate JCE &amp; C Jensch</td>
<td>$13,607.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate JC Pade</td>
<td>$13,607.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The total amount of fines and interest requested to be written off amount to $17,149.21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Total Fines/Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estate E Liebelt</td>
<td>$5,495.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate JCE &amp; C Jensch</td>
<td>$5,826.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate JC Pade</td>
<td>$5,826.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Land exists today as five small individual allotments (refer map), with independent owners, which makes it extremely difficult to sell. The proposal from Australian Executor Trustee is favourable to Council as it will create one allotment which will then be able to be sold in order to recover outstanding rates and to continue rating this land in an efficient manner.

**Community Engagement:**
N/A

**Policy:**
Nil

**Budget:**
Maintain the level of outstanding rates to 4% of total rates receivables Council has made provision for doubtful debts for rates, fines and interest within the 2017/18 Financial Budget. The property discussed in this report has been included in that provision.

**Statutory/Legal:**
Local Government Act 1999

**Staff Resource Requirements:**
Administration will be conducted in the day to day business of the rates department.

**Environmental:**
N/A

**Social:**
N/A

**Risk Assessment:**
In this circumstance, unless one marketable allotment is created, the debt will remain outstanding and Council may never receive future revenue.

**Asset Management:**
N/A
**Conclusion:**
To resolve this long standing rate debt and to ensure future revenues it is recommended that Council write off outstanding interest and fines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>DOC/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return to Order of Business
12.7 REPORT TITLE: PORTION OF UNMADE ROAD CLOSURE AND DISPOSAL– SETTLEMENT OF ENCROACHMENT OVER UNMADE ROAD ADJOINING DP43647

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/27277

ATTACHMENTS: 1. DOC/18/26906 - AERIAL PHOTO OF ENCROACHMENT  
2. DOC/17/26148 - PRELIMINARY PLAN 17/0021

Key Contact
Neville Gay, Manager, Rates, Property & Records

Manager/Sponsor
David Peters, General Manager Corporate Services

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:
GL 2.10 Ensure Compliance with legislative requirements.

Annual Business Plan 2017/18:
No specific applicable project / initiative.

Purpose:
To seek Council approval to make a Road Process Order to close a portion of unmade road, at the rear of a Brukunga property in order to settle an encroachment over the unmade road.

Summary – Key Issues:
- Formal process to settle an encroachment on public unmade road
- Community consultation has been conducted
- No community objections have been received.

Recommendation:

That Council:

Pursuant to Section 15 of the Roads (Opening & Closing) Act 1991 (the “Act”) makes a Road Process Order to close a portion of unmade road adjoining Lot 2 DP 43647 CT 5298/486 and marked “A” on the Preliminary Plan 17/0021 provided in attachment 2 of this report.

Background:
1. The former owners of the property at 171 Harrogate Road Brukunga, had erected a garage with adjoining tool shed, storage area and water tanks, which encroached over the unmade road at the rear of the property. The current owner Ms Lisa Hart (nee Schultz) “the applicant” was not aware of the encroachment at the time of purchase (August 2001) and was looking to extend the current garage / shed when it was revealed that the existing structures were not actually within their property boundary.
2. The applicant contacted Council to purchase the portion of land subject to the encroachment (highlighted green on Attachment 1) and also include additional land area the same distance along the property boundary (highlighted red on Attachment 1). The subject land has an area of 1,676m².

3. The practical solution to resolve the encroachment is to close the portion of the unmade road along the rear boundary of the property and merge with the adjoining property.

4. At the request of the applicant, Council initiated the commencement of a proposed road closure process via a Road Process Order on the 6 January 2017.

5. The commencement of the Road Process Order included community consultation on the proposal. Public Notices were published in The Courier, The South Australian Government Gazette and Council’s website/public notice board. Letters were also sent to neighbouring landowners and utility authorities. The consultation period was open for a period of 28 days.

**Discussion:**

6. The applicant engaged Access SDM Pty Ltd to survey the area and perform the necessary survey work required and lodge documentation with the Surveyor-General.

7. An independent valuation of the subject land was conducted by Andrea Carolan Certified Practising Valuer of Public Private Property Pty Ltd who provided a value of $8/sqm.

8. A value of $13,500 has been negotiated for the transfer of the subject land based on the size and valuation.

9. The Applicant will meet the full costs of surveying, valuing and associated conveyancing costs to prepare and lodge the necessary documentation with the Surveyor-General’s Office, Lands Titles Office and RevenueSA.

10. The consultation process concluded 3 May 2017. The Surveyor-General and Council received no objections from the community.

11. The road closure process is required to settle the encroachment.

**Community Engagement:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision to be made</th>
<th>For Council to close a portion of a public unmade road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Key factors to be considered in decision (dot points) | Portion of unmade road to be closed  
Closed portion to be merged with adjoining property  
Opportunity to object or request an Easement |
| Area of community influence         | Support for the road closure                           |
| Method of consultation, informing community & cost | Public Notice placed in The Courier  
Public Notice in the SA Government Gazette  
Council’s website / Public Notice Board  
Letters went to neighbouring owners  
Letters to public utilities |
| Feedback to stakeholders/Council    |                                                       |
| Timeframe for consultation          | Consultation period was for 28 days.                  |
| Community input                     | No Community submissions received.  
No requests from any public utilities. |
Policy:
- Community Consultation policy
- Disposal of Council Land & Other Assets policy.

Budget:
Revenue from sale of land will be $13,500. The Applicant will meet the full costs of surveying, valuing and associated conveyancing costs to prepare and lodge the necessary documentation with the Surveyor-General’s Office, Lands Titles Office and RevenueSA.

Statutory/Legal:
Roads (Opening & Closing) Act 1991

Staff Resource Requirements:
The process will be coordinated by existing staff in collaboration with the applicant’s Surveyor and Conveyancer.

Environmental:
Not applicable to this report.

Social:
Not applicable to this report.

Risk Assessment:
Settlement of an encroachment on public unmade road.

Asset Management:
Not applicable to this report.

Conclusion:
Council adopt the Road Process and subsequent sale to settle the encroachment.

---

Fig 1.1 Previous Decisions By Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
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<th>DOC/</th>
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<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12.8 REPORT TITLE: INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE REQUEST - COUNCILLOR GROSSER

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/28719

ATTACHMENTS: ATTACHMENT 1. DOC/18/29623 - TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT FORM CR GROSSER
ATTACHMENT 2. DOC/18/28749 – OZWATER18 FULL PROGRAM

Key Contact
Sue Miller, Executive Assistant to Chief Executive Officer & Mayor

Manager/Sponsor
Andrew Stuart, Chief Executive Officer

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:
5. Governance and Leadership
GL1: Active democracy and effective representation
GL2: Corporate capacity and leadership
GL2.1 Demonstrate accountability through clear, relevant and easily accessible policies and corporate reporting

Purpose:
To determine attendance of Councillor Grosser at the Ozwater18 conference, 8-10 May 2018 in Brisbane.

Summary – Key Issues:
1. Council Members are able to apply to Council to attend interstate conferences if they are not included on the Training Plan.

2. Councillor Grosser has applied to attend the Ozwater18 conference, 8-10 May 2018 in Brisbane, Queensland.

3. There are currently funds available in the Elected Member Training and Development budget however future approved conference attendance may require review.

Recommendation:
That Council support Councillor Grosser’s attendance at the Ozwater18 conference, 8-10 May 2018 in Brisbane.

Background:
1. Council has an Elected Member Training and Development Policy, Procedure and Plan which outlines Council’s priorities for training. There is an ability for Council to nominate another Conference (outside of the Plan) however budget and benefits should be taken into account.
2. The total budget for Elected Member Training and Development is $14,680.

3. The Policy ensures that activities contribute to the achievement of the strategic and good governance objectives of Council.

4. If a Council Member wishes to attend an interstate Conference that is not on the Plan they must submit an application form for a decision by Council.

**Discussion:**

5. Councillor Grosser has requested attendance at a Conference which is not in the Plan – the Ozwater18 Conference in Brisbane, Queensland 8-10 May 2018.

6. Councillor Grosser’s application form is attached (Attachment 1) which explains his anticipated benefits.

7. The conference details are provided as Attachment 2.

8. Council’s Senior Project Manager Wastewater Infrastructure Expansion, Mr Thomas Coetzer, is registered to attend this Ozwater18 Conference.

9. Below is an extract from the Training Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interstate Conferences &amp; Seminars</th>
<th>Mayor and up to one (1) Councillor</th>
<th>ALGA</th>
<th>Up to two Council Members</th>
<th>Municipal Association of Victoria</th>
<th>Up to one Council member</th>
<th>$1700 approx pp incl airfares</th>
<th>$2200 approx incl airfares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALGA National General Assembly of Local Government – held in June in Canberra</td>
<td>Mayor up to one (1) Councillor</td>
<td>ALGA</td>
<td>Up to two Council Members</td>
<td>Municipal Association of Victoria</td>
<td>Up to one Council member</td>
<td>$1700 approx pp incl airfares</td>
<td>$2200 approx incl airfares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Growth Area Alliance (NGAA) Annual Conference</td>
<td>Mayor NGAA</td>
<td>Up to $2000 approx incl airfares</td>
<td>$3100 approx pp incl airfares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of Local Government National Summit – held in June in Victoria</td>
<td>Up to two Council Members</td>
<td>Municipal Association of Victoria</td>
<td>Up to one Council member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference to be determined and subject of a Council resolution.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to one Council member</td>
<td>Up to one Council member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. At the 7 August 2017 Council meeting Councillor Bailey received approval to attend the 2017 Sustainable Communities National Summit which was not included in the Training Plan at a cost of $1147.

**Return to Order of Business**
11. At the 4 September 2017 Council meeting Councillor Morrison received approval to attend the National Local Roads & Transport Congress 2017 ‘Shaping Transport’s Future’ conference which was not included in the Training Plan at a cost of $2699.

12. At the 15 January 2018 Council meeting Mayor Ferguson received approval to attend the Cities 4.0 Summit in Melbourne 20-21 March 2018 which was not included in the Training Plan at an estimated cost of $2250.

13. The total budget for Elected Member Training and Development is $14,680. Available funds for Elected Member Training and Development is approximately $2740.

14. If approval is given for Councillor Grosser to attend this Ozwater18 Conference, estimated to cost $2735 including accommodation, airfares and registration, the budget will be exceeded.

15. Future attendance by Elected Members this financial year at the remaining two approved future conferences, ALGA National General Assembly of Local Government – held in June in Canberra, and Future of Local Government National Summit – held in May in Victoria, will further exceed the budget to an amount of $4717. Refer point 9 above.

**Community Engagement:**

| Informing only | Information on training is provided in a Register that is updated quarterly. |

**Policy:**

There is a Training and Development Policy, Procedure and Plan.

**Budget:**

16. The total budget for Elected Member Training and Development is $14,680. Available funds for Elected Member Training and Development is approximately $2740.

Estimated costs are:
- $1690 Registration Cost (day rates are available)
- Flights: $550 (subject to availability and flexibility)
- Accommodation: $165 per night (x3 subject to availability)

17. Council members can be reimbursed (upon provision of receipts) up to an amount of $25 pp for breakfast, lunch $30 pp, dinner $50 pp (all excluding alcohol), taxi fares, car parking.

18. Total cost is estimated to be $2735. This estimate excludes any reimbursement costs for meals and transfer/parking related costs referred to at item 17.
**Statutory/Legal:**
Legislation requires Council to have a Training and Development Policy and Council's Training Plan allows for one unallocated conference. Training and Development activities attended are provided in the Council report.

**Staff Resource Requirements:**
Any travel arrangements will be co-ordinated by the Executive Assistant to the CEO and Mayor.

**Environmental:**
N/A

**Social:**
N/A

**Risk Assessment:**
N/A

**Asset Management:**
N/A

**Conclusion:**
Councillor Grosser has requested Council approve his attendance at the Ozwater18 conference in May 2018.

---

**Previous Decisions By Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 January 2015</td>
<td>DOC/15/459</td>
<td>Revised Council Member Training and Development Policy, Plan and Procedure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 August 2017</td>
<td>DOC/17/64393</td>
<td>To determine attendance of Councillor Bailey at the 2017 Sustainable Communities National Summit on 6-7 September 2017 in Melbourne.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 September 2017</td>
<td>DOC/17/83307</td>
<td>To determine attendance of Councillor Morrison at the National Local Roads and Transport Congress 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 January 2018</td>
<td>DOC/18/</td>
<td>To determine attendance of Mayor Ferguson at the Cities 4.0 Summit on 20-21 March 2018 in Melbourne.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL MEMBERS’ TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FORM

Complete the required information required on this form and return to the Executive Assistant to the Chief Executive Officer and Mayor, along with a copy of the registration form / brochure for the Training & Development activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Member:</th>
<th>IAN GROSSER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name:</td>
<td>OZWATER 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider:</td>
<td>AUSTRALIAN WATER ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>BRISBANE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>QUEENSLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>8-10 MAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Cost:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flights:</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals:</td>
<td>Taxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Plan Alignment:  UE 5: RECYCLED WATER 5.4 JOB 5 RECYCLING & OPTIMIZING VALUE
Anticipated Benefits to Member Attending:  1. INCREASE PERSONAL UNDERSTANDING OF:
   - WATER RECYCLING & OPTIMIZING VALUE
   - SLUDGE MANAGEMENT, FLOATING SOLAR SYSTEMS ETC.
   - NETWORKING: I HAVE ONLY ATTENDED 1 DISCRETIONARY
   - INTERSTATE CONFERENCE IN 8 YEARS (INNOVATIVE
   - WATER MANAGEMENT) IN 2011 & HAVE MAINTAINED
   - COMMUNICATION WITH CONTACTS MADE THERE SINCE

Anticipated Benefits to the District of Mount Barker:  1. COUNCIL HAS IMMINENT DECISIONS TO MAKE OF ENORMOUS
   - FINANCIAL & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS IN SUBJECT
   - AREAS. I WILL COMMUNICATE RELEVANT INFORMATION TO ELECTED MEMBERS
   - RAPIDLY EVOLVING AREA IN TECHNIQUES, NEEDED UPATED KNOWLEDGE
   - THOMAS COSTER & ANU ATYQORALA HAVE ENCOURAGED ME

EA to CEO & Mayor to Complete  
☐ Approved By  ☐ Rejected By

Authorisation:
Officer’s Signature  Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 3 April 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Agenda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUESDAY, 8 MAY 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Item 12.8**

**Attachment 2 to Item 12.8**

**Return to Order of Business**
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**Agenda Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agenda Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Forum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Motions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor’s Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Manager’s Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerk’s Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Apologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Apologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items Dealt With Previously</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Workshops/Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undertake Routine Council Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
<th>Session 7</th>
<th>Session 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 10:15</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 - 10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 10:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 - 11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 - 11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 11:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 - 12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 12:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 - 13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 13:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15 - 13:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30 - 13:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45 - 14:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 - 14:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15 - 14:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 - 14:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45 - 15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - 15:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15 - 15:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 - 15:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45 - 16:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 - 16:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15 - 16:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 - 16:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45 - 17:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 - 17:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>3 April 2018</td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Return to Order of Business**
Return to Order of Business
12.9 REPORT TITLE: MANAGEMENT OF LITTLE CORELLAS

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/2018/27526

ATTACHMENTS: ATTACHMENT 1: DOC/18/31757 LITTLE CORELLAS, SOCIAL AND ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH FOR MANAGEMENT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Key Contact Jamie Tann, Manager Health and Public Safety, Council Services

Manager/Sponsor Greg Parker, General Manager Council Services

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:
Natural Environment and Sustainable Living:
NE 1.4 – Support Environmental research on local issues.

Governance and Leadership:
GL 4.1 – Manage assets and liabilities through a planned, long term approach
GL4.4 – Identify strategic and operational risk issues and manage accordingly.

Purpose:
To provide an update of the impacts of the Little Corella and to outline a proposed management approach for when the Little Corellas are due to return in October 2018.

Summary – Key Issues:
1. The Little Corella population has been frequenting Mount Barker for a number of years and historically their preferred location has been Keith Stephenson Park.

2. Little Corella numbers have increased rapidly in recent years and their impacts on Council’s assets, privately owned assets has been more noticeable and their noise and behaviour is a nuisance to some members of the community.

3. An integrated approach to the management of Little Corellas has been recommended in the 2016 report: Little Corellas, Social and Ecological Research for Management in South Australia.

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. Endorse the proposed approach for managing the Little Corellas when they are due to return to Mount Barker in October 2018, which is:
   a) Targeting the early arrival Little Corellas which come ahead of the main flock by lethal shooting of a small number of these birds.
   b) Commence scaring activities at key sites when the early arrival of Little Corellas are observed.
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c) Undertake public education with respect to the actions taken to manage Little Corellas.
d) Continue to implement long term management of Keith Stephenson Park to make it less attractive to Little Corellas.
e) If the main flock does arrive continue scaring activities at key sites and perform selective shooting of the birds at key sites in an attempt to move them on.
f) Approach the State Government to stress the need for a state-wide management strategy for Little Corellas.

2. Approve the Mayor writing to the State Government requesting a state-wide management strategy for the Little Corella.

---

**Background:**

1. The Little Corella (*Cacatua sanguinea*) is a small white cockatoo with body length 35-40 cm and body mass 430-580 g. They have a short upright crest, bare blue-grey skin around the eye and salmon-pink lores (the area between the eyes and nostrils). The underwing and under tail feathers are pale yellow. Little corellas are not sexually dimorphic, i.e. male and female birds are indistinguishable with external examination.

2. Little corellas are now widespread throughout inland, western and northern Australia. In South Australia little corellas are common in the eastern parts of the state, including: the Mid North, North East, Flinders Ranges, Riverland, Adelaide Plains, Fleurieu Peninsula, Kangaroo Island and the South East.

3. Little corellas often congregate along tree-lined watercourses. They have been observed in a wide variety of other habitats which include: savannah woodland, mallee, mulga, rangelands, spinifex sandhills, gibber, saltbush, native cypress, crops, stubble and mangroves.

4. Little corellas are known as “urban adaptors” as they have the ability to persist in urban areas, as well as persisting in their natural habitats. The Little Corella is able to find the resources they need amongst the urban matrix of buildings, streets and parks. Other examples of urban adaptors are the brushtail possums and grey-headed flying foxes.

5. The species has habitual roosting sites that flocks return to in successive years, this aligns with the continued presence of the birds at Keith Stephenson Park. However, the flock composition is not fixed and individual birds have been known to move among different flocks and roosts each year.

6. At their roosts Little Corellas preen and socialise. They use loud vocalisations to communicate regularly with the other members of the flock. They also defoliate their roost trees to create a clear view, increasing visibility of the site and their perceptions of safety from potential predators.
7. The defoliation of trees in Mount Barker has been a concern of a number of residents both in regard to the possible impact on the health of the trees but also the fallen material (leaves, branches and seeds) dropping onto footpaths and nearby streets. One resident has attributed a fall to the fallen material from the activities of Little Corellas.

8. A number of residents have also made contact with Council regarding the noise levels of the flocks of Little Corellas and the impact that this noise has on them. These calls have mainly been from residents living close to Keith Stephenson Park. A café in Mount Barker has commented that the Little Corellas are having a negative impact on their business as the birds are disrupting customers using the parklet outside their premises.

9. Council’s Urban Forest Officer, Mr Lawry has made the following observations: “The birds on mass are chewing through the outer canopy twigs, buds, fruit and bark of various native and exotic trees around the town. This is tolerated by any tree once or twice provided the damage is isolated to the outer canopy. However, when flocks settle on an individual routinely, the damage is more severe and includes complete defoliation of the upper canopy and bark destruction further down the stems and branches which combined with the foliage and buds being stripped above leads to permanent decline of the affected parts of the tree.”

10. In February 2018 Council engaged a contractor to use bird fright shells to scare the Little Corellas from Keith Stephenson Park, this is the first time that Council has been involved in trying proactively to unsettle the birds. The scaring program has moved the Little Corella flocks onto other areas in Mount Barker namely the eastern end of Laratinga Wetlands and the Mount Barker-Hahndorf Golf Club which is located on Bald Hills Road. As mentioned earlier the Little Corella numbers have increased significantly recently and this scaring has prevented the impacts being concentrated to just Keith Stephenson Park.

11. The scaring program has intended to unsettle the Little Corellas around the time when they settle down to roost for the evening, the timing of the scaring has been varied so that the birds do not become accustomed to the shots at a set time. The scaring has been blamed on the Little Corellas roosting in street trees within the Mount Barker CBD and the Golf Club, however the Little Corellas have frequented the Golf Club in previous seasons and their impact on the Golf Club is more noticeable this year due to the increased numbers of birds.

12. Prior to any bird scaring activity door knocks were performed at residential properties that were near or adjacent to the area and information was left at properties when no one was home. A banner is up on Council’s website and a page dedicated to Little Corellas is also on the website. Two interviews on Hills Radio have also been performed in an attempt to inform the community of the bird scaring. The Courier has also covered the impacts of the Little Corella and provided information on Council’s scaring program.

13. Many local Council areas have a history of problems with little corellas, and they have invested significant resources into developing strategies for their management. Some examples are:
a) City of Playford have used a range of scaring tactics such as: stock whips, guns, short burst pyrotechnics and sirens. This is accompanied by other passive measures such as watering key sites at night and reducing food sources.

b) Mid Murray Council indicated that they have had no success with scaring the Little Corellas as it merely moves them around and they mention that they have approved shooting some Little Corellas.

c) Alexandrina Council – Use a range of approaches at different times. Bird ‘Frite’ and ‘screecher’ rounds are discharged during the day and starter pistols and lasers are used at dawn and dusk. They also use a lightweight remote control plane with a shell that makes it look like a falcon to unsettle the birds from roosting at key sites.

d) Barossa Council use staff and a contractor to try to scare and unsettle the Little Corellas using Bird Frite shells and lasers.

e) Berri Barmera Council have tried scaring and unsettling the Little Corellas with guns, planes and drones.

f) City of Onkaparinga have tried a number of scaring techniques like Bird Frite shells, electronic devices, balloons and streamers placed in trees. They have also tried removing the water source for the birds.

Although there are different strategies employed across different Councils the consistent message was that the management of Little Corellas is expensive and resource intensive.

14. **Costs associated with Little Corellas.**

   Responding to the increased numbers of Little Corellas and their impacts in 2018 has resulted in costs to Council that were not budgeted for, they are:

   a) Field Services have spent 8 days cleaning footpaths in Mount Barker CBD using correctional service at a cost of $300 a day TOTAL $2,400.

   b) The Keith Stephenson Park Avenue of Honour has 18 trees by the lake netted at a cost of around $250 each which is $4,500 total plus ongoing net sewing repairs as a result of damage caused by the Little Corellas.

   c) The scaring of the Little Corellas was done by a contractor and so far the costs associated with this activity is $2,056.

**Discussion:**

15. **The 2016 report: Little Corellas, Social and Ecological Research for Management in South Australia** mentions the importance of raising the awareness of the community to the complexity of Little Corella management. The report goes on to mention that some people involved in a Little Corella study actually became more accepting of the Little Corellas when they realised the difficulties involved in their management.

16. **Proposed future Little Corella management.**

   Based on previous years the Little Corellas are expected to leave Mount Barker when the weather gets cooler, they will return in October after their breeding season. The proposed management actions are as follows:

   g) Targeting the early arrival Little Corellas which come ahead of the main flock by lethal shooting of a small number of these birds.
h) Commence scaring activities at key sites when the early arrival Little Corellas are observed.
i) Undertake public education in regard to the actions taken in regard to the Little Corellas.
j) Implement long term management of Keith Stephenson Park to make it less attractive to Little Corellas.
k) If the main flock does arrive continue scaring activities at key sites and perform selective shooting of the birds at key sites in an attempt to move them on.
l) Approach the State Government to stress the need for a state-wide management strategy for Little Corellas.

Community Engagement:

| Informs only | Information on Council’s website, media release in local print media, Hills Radio interviews. |

Policy:
N/A

Budget:
The scaring on Little Corellas was not budgeted for in 2017/18. Environmental Health has a budget of $9K which is allocated to vermin control (primarily rats and mice), any costs associated with the control of the Little Corellas has been allocated to this budget line.

Statutory/Legal:
The Little Corella (Cacatua sanguinea) is listed as “unprotected” under schedule 10 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act due to their abundance and their potentially destructive behaviours.

Staff Resource Requirements:
The proposed actions will have minimal impact on existing staff resources.

Environmental:
The Little Corella has impacted a number of trees within Keith Stephenson Park and the Laratinga Wetland in Mount Barker by stripping foliage. There is evidence that they can also displace other native bird species.

Social:
Council has received numerous call from residents that are impacted by the noise that the Little Corellas create. The Little Corellas have also caused damage to the Mount Barker-Hahndorf Golf Course which is privately owned.

Risk Assessment:
The use of a lethal option in the management of the Little Corella will not be popular with some sections of the community, others will however welcome this level of intervention by Council.

Asset Management:
Council’s ‘green’ assets are increasingly coming under threat by the proliferation of this species. Further intervention is deemed to be necessary to protect those assets.
**Conclusion:**
Little Corella numbers have increased significantly in the past 12 months, their presence and impacts have been noticed in Mount Barker. An integrated approach to manage the Little Corella is recommended in the 2016 report: Little Corellas, Social and Ecological Research for Management in South Australia as the most effective way to manager Little Corellas.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 June 2017</td>
<td>To update elected members on the state-wide Little Corella (Corellas) management project, and to flag local actions which have been identified from the project report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Key results and recommendations

Introduction

While many people enjoy seeing little corellas, large flocks in urban and rural areas cause considerable problems in the warmer months. The most common problems are damage to trees (defoliation), taking grain, and disturbing residents with loud vocalisations. These native birds can also damage buildings, particularly when they chew flashing or wiring, tarpaulins, wooden structures, cars and a variety of crops. There is significant public contention regarding the management of little corellas.

Managing little corellas can be difficult. Many local councils have a history of problems with little corellas, and they have invested significant resources into developing strategies for their management. Extensive experience and knowledge of little corellas exists within these individual agencies and in local communities, but little information sharing or coordination of activities occurs among groups.

The purpose of the Discovery Circle’s Little Corellas project was to explore management issues in city and town areas around South Australia in partnership with state government, local government and local communities. For the Little Corellas project, we used a mixed-methods approach, including:

- A social survey (1,270 respondents)
- Nine community workshops
- Field surveys at 144 little corella sites
- Development of models for little corella habitat suitability and land use preferences
- Synthesis of data into a master model for little corella management in South Australia using Mental Modeler (http://www.mentalmodeler.org/)

Our approach recognised that social, environmental and regulatory factors are necessary considerations for effective management of wildlife (Kellert and Clark, 1991); where:

- **Social factors**: interactions between stakeholders and the values held by stakeholders should influence decision-makers
- **Environmental factors**: biological and ecological requirements of the wildlife should guide the entire process
- **Regulatory factors**: the legal (or policy) system in which managers are operating also guides the process. The need for a state-wide little corella management plan was identified before this project commenced; we collaborated with local and state governments to frame the approach to little corella management
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What’s in this report

This report contains the results of our research and provides practical tools and strategies for the management of little corellas in South Australia. We propose an integrated approach (involving multiple strategies and stakeholders) with long-, medium- and short-term foci, including:

- **Creating barriers to roosting and feeding resources** (including practical recommendations)
- **Creating barriers to water resources** (including practical recommendations)
- **Identifying and creating sacrificial sites** (including key considerations for site selection and creation)
- **Using Mental Modeler to understand and educate about the management of little corellas** (including management strategies and trade-offs, with examples)

This report also contains case studies that demonstrate the use of the actions we propose and the use of Mental Modeler in three different scenarios:

1. **Aldinga**
2. **Hawker**
3. **Hewett Primary School**

In this “Key results and recommendations” section we also summarise the results of our research and provide recommendations, based on our research, for a new Little Corella Management Plan for South Australia, to be developed by the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR).
Key results

1. Social factors

Social factors include community knowledge, community acceptance, and how communities work together; we found:

- Some form of little corella management is generally desired, and the development of a state-wide management plan for little corellas was widely supported
- Few participants actually disliked little corellas, but many did dislike their destructive behaviours (particularly to trees) and their noise
- Contention exists about the types of management that are effective and desirable
- Some management strategies were supported by survey respondents who place a high intrinsic value on little corellas, and by survey respondents who are concerned about the impact of little corellas (e.g. encouraging little corellas to alternate sites). Other strategies were opposed by both groups (e.g. removing tree roosts and “doing nothing”). Neutral responses were recorded for both effective (e.g. increasing shrubs, managing water assets) and ineffective (e.g. falconry) control measures. Support for some actions (e.g. lethal deterrents) increased in workshops when they were explained
- While some people have extensive experience and holistic views on the management of little corellas, many members of the community are not aware of the complexities of little corella management, the actions that are taking place, or the costs involved
- The Little Corellas project workshops were useful in both the collection and dissemination of information, enabling a focussed and fair discussion of participants’ knowledge and ideas about the causes and management of little corellas problem sites. Workshops were also useful for increasing tolerance and understanding of the issues
- Participants indicated that the workshops helped them to understand the complexity of little corella management, how costly management could be, and changed their opinions about the desirability of living with little corellas (overall, a convergence of attitudes was most noticeable, some participants became more accepting of little corellas when they realised the complexities of management, while others became more concerned about little corellas when they realised the difficulties involved in their management)
- Considerable confusion and misuse of terms was observed in the workshops, indicating that some responses to the survey might have been different if respondents had more understanding of the terminology and complexities of little corella management
- The practicalities of little corella management are frustrated by the absence of any organised way to share resources or knowledge, or coordinating responses among agencies, and the efforts of some councils maybe undermined by the actions or inaction of others
- A number of people around the state have extensive experience observing and managing little corellas (their input was invaluable throughout the project). Extensive discussions about management options were focussed on:
o **Habitat management and modification** (to reduce the attractiveness of problem sites to little corellas)
  o **Sacrificial sites** (selecting sites and increasing their attractiveness to little corellas)
  o **Lethal deterrents** used to reinforce other controls (and minimising attempts to control the little corella population using lethal methods)

2. Environmental factors

Environmental factors include the biology and behaviour of the wildlife species and the landscape in which the species exists; our results included:

- **Over 2,300 little corella sites identified by the public** were mapped within the Adelaide metropolitan area, Mount Lofty and Fleurieu Peninsula region (including Kangaroo Island), along the River Murray, in the Upper and Lower South-East and Mid and Far North sites
- **Habitat modelling indicated important resources for little corellas:**
  - **At a state-wide level**: river red gums, irrigated green space and major creeks
  - **Around the Adelaide and the Mount Lofty Ranges**: irrigated green spaces and major creeks
- **Conversely, our modelling indicated that little corellas avoid bushland areas**
- **Land use analysis indicated that recreational, agricultural and residential land uses** were consistently the best predictors of little corella distribution – these areas provide abundant food and water resources
- **Field surveys supported the findings of the habitat modelling and land use analysis.** Sites where little corellas are reported typically included extensive irrigated exotic lawn areas, freely available water, open habitat (low tree density, often with pine trees), very few shrubs, and low site “nativesness”. Sports ovals (often surrounded by Aleppo pines) were commonly cited as little corella sites

---
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Recommendations

The environmental factors described above clearly demonstrate that we have developed ideal conditions for increases in the distribution and abundance of little corellas in South Australia. Little corellas thrive in the agricultural and urban landscapes that we have created. Little corellas were not abundant or problematic in most of the state 50 years ago. Now that these birds are abundant and problematic, isolated management actions are ineffective. The approach and culture of pest management practices in urban areas needs revision; proactive and coordinated activities should be ingrained in our approach to these problems, and our reliance on reactionary and isolated (often inefficient) controls needs to be reduced. Further, management that does not account for social factors will be problematic. Therefore, we recommend an integrated management approach, including long-, medium- and short-term actions that consider both environmental and social factors. Importantly, it is necessary to focus on long-term actions first, as these actions are key to reducing issues at little corella problem sites. Medium- and short-term actions may then be used to alleviate issues while long-term plans are actioned.

While this report includes practical actions to alleviate problems with little corellas, our recommendations move the focus away from controlling birds (short-term impact only) and on to landscape management to deter birds, and to reduce their abundance in problem areas over the long-term.

Long-term actions and considerations

Long-term actions include planning on a 10+ year timeframe, with actions to be commenced as soon as possible. Long-term actions and considerations include:

- A long-term guided approach to threat abatement, including proactive management, to minimise future impacts of current and emerging urban-adapting and urban exploiting species (see Glossary for their definitions)
- Reducing the availability of food and water resources to little corellas (or creating barriers to these resources), including:
  - Removal of any unnecessary, open food or water storage at and around problem sites (e.g. grain piles, water troughs, water tanks)
  - Installing or planting barriers to water resources at and around problem sites (e.g. install trough covers, increase bank height, increase vegetation around water resources to reduce direct access; increase vegetation or screening near water resources because little corellas prefer drinking at open locations)
  - Installing or planting barriers to food resources (e.g. cover grain piles, increase vegetation or screening around food resources as little corellas prefer feeding at open locations)
  - Note that the removal of tree roosts (i.e. removal of trees) is not a management action that is acceptable to the community; targeted tree removal may also increase site openness and site attractiveness to little corellas, compounding site problems
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• **Habitat modification** to reduce the attractiveness of problem sites and surrounding areas to little corellas, including large-scale habitat planning (e.g. including parks, street trees and paddock wind breaks) to:
  
  o Increase the **density of trees** (little corellas prefer narrow corridors of trees, which provide vantage points for safety)
  
  o Increase **understory planting** (e.g. shrubs and groundcovers; little corellas prefer trees without understory as open habitats provide vantage points for safety)
  
  o Decrease **irrigated lawn areas** (e.g. some areas of irrigated lawn can be replaced with native plantings that are more water efficient, or interspersed with **islands of native vegetation** while maintaining park amenity)
  
  o Increase **“nativeness”**. This action enhances local biodiversity, increasing **interspecific competition** (i.e. competition for resources from other birds). Further, some exotic plants provide far greater food resources than equivalent native species would provide (e.g. Aleppo pines compared to sheoaks or hakeas). Therefore, exotic species should be replaced by native species where possible and acceptable (considering community expectations and potential impacts on other species such as black cockatoos)
  
  o Modification of problem sites must be done in a strategic way (i.e. considering the broader landscape, all management resources and potential partnerships), which is **sensitive to community needs**

• **Proactive management** should consider sites where little corellas are currently problematic as well as sites where little corellas or other bird species may become problematic in the future. **In some locations the ‘problem site’ is quite obviously the central park in a town (usually along a creek).** However, in some cases the problem is more dispersed, where little corellas have plentiful food, water and roost resources (e.g. along the Murray River). In these cases the initial focus needs to be in the most affected areas (e.g. where the community feel the ‘biggest’ problem exists). Additionally, little corellas may continue to increase in distribution across the state. While the actions described here are designed specifically for little corella problem sites, they will also reduce the chance of other urban adapting/exploiting bird species becoming problematic (e.g. noisy minors, sulphur-crested cockatoos, ibis and rainbow lorikeets). A long-term guided approach to **threat abatement**, including proactive management, will minimise future impacts of current and emerging **urban-adapting** and **urban exploiting** species

• **Development of a management planning template**: local governments across South Australia should use a management-planning template, based on these recommendations. The aim of the template is to streamline the development of little corella management plans among local councils, and provide the architecture for amending existing strategies. The template should include the glossary from this document to facilitate consistent terminology. This approach will create state-wide uniformity in the management plans. The template must include a strategic and integrated approach to little corella management, with long-, medium- and short-term actions for each local government area, and identify sites where little corellas are problematic

• **Further research**: our focus has been on little corellas in urban and peri-urban areas, including regional townships. Further research into resource availability for little corellas in regional (ex-urban) areas, and how best to reduce these resources is needed; agricultural food and water resources are of particular interest
Medium-term actions and considerations

Medium-term actions include planning on a 2-9 year timeframe, with actions to be commenced as soon as possible. Medium-term actions should only commence once long-term actions have been planned and set-in-motion. Medium-term actions and considerations include:

- Information sharing and strategic management requires the establishment of a forum for discussion among groups and individuals involved in the management of little corellas around South Australia, particularly among local government areas, and with community and state government input. We recommend:
  - Annual community meetings in areas with problem sites
  - Annual meetings of staff involved in the management of little corellas and related community education (from local and state government, and NRM Boards). While this report is focussed on little corellas, we recognise that other, similar issues exist around the state, and therefore recommend the meeting be an Abundant Bird Species Forum, to encourage collaboration and the sharing of knowledge in relation to the management of, and education about, abundant bird species in South Australia. These forums should include training in the use of Mental Modeler for running little corella management scenarios for management and educational purposes
  - A review of progress every six years, including data collection from the wider community, local government, state government and NRM Boards. The reviews of progress should repeat a social survey, community workshops, and field surveys as conducted during the Little Corellas project in order to measure change in social and environmental factors. A literature review should also be conducted to incorporate any related new research findings into management and to update ongoing education initiatives. These reviews should be planned and managed in collaboration with any long-term research (described above)

- Increasing information and education to increase public knowledge and tolerance of little corellas, as well as acceptance of management actions. Public expectations need to be realistic and based on an understanding of social and environmental factors, as well as management practices. Education should include:
  - Consistent terminology (see glossary in his document)
  - The relationship between the habitat we create and the species it attracts (i.e. little corellas and other problematic bird species are not in themselves problematic; these species are utilising resources that we provide for them including open habitat, food and water resources)
  - The complexities and costs associated with the management of little corellas. The ‘Mental Modeler’ models created for this project are available online and useful in explaining these issues

- Creation of sacrificial sites as a refuge for little corellas. Land managers and relevant stakeholders should plan, identify and survey potential sacrificial areas and consult widely with those who may be impacted at these sites. If a suitable sacrificial site is available, short-term ‘disruption’ actions should be orchestrated to promote little corella movement to the sacrificial site. Further details about sacrificial sites are available within this document (here)
Short-term actions and considerations

Short-term actions include planning on an annual timeframe, with actions to be commenced as required. Short-term actions should only commence once long- and medium-term actions have been planned and set-in-motion. Short-term actions and considerations include:

- **Disruption of little corellas at problem sites.** It is important to note that disruption is best done when little corellas have somewhere else to go (e.g. a sacrificial area) and in conjunction with long-term plans to reduce the attractiveness of the problem site (so that little corellas are less likely to return and **habitual behaviours are affected**). While disruption can be immediately effective (i.e. the birds fly away), without the medium- and long-term strategies described above, the effectiveness of disruption will likely be short-lived (birds will return unless they have somewhere better to go, a sacrificial site)

- Disruptive activities can include:
  - **Spotlighting** (hand-held or automatic)
  - **Noise generation** (hand-held or automatic, including clapping, starter-pistols, guns, gas guns)
  - **Lasers** (hand-held)
  - **Lethal deterrents** (shooting to deter flocks)

- Some disruptive activities may be **unacceptable** to the local community (e.g. lethal actions in built-up areas and noise generation in residential areas). However, activities may be accepted with engagement and education so that the community understand how the actions fit in with the overall strategy. For example, the acceptance of lethal deterrents may be increased where lethal deterrents are used to increase the effectiveness of non-lethal measures, where the strategic approach is understood by the community, and where lethal deterrents are clearly differentiated from lethal controls see our section about communication barriers, discussed as part of the Community Workshop outcomes)

- Many managers around the state have extensive experience and have had some success at moving little corellas away from problem sites – out of towns and into sacrificial sites (e.g. in The Flinders Ranges Council area). These operators can provide expert knowledge and advice to other managers (i.e. through an Abundant Bird Species Forum), promoting communication and information sharing among groups

Responsibility for management actions

A broad level of collaboration and engagement is required to manage little corellas in South Australia. Local government manages most of the sites where little corellas are problematic. With our proposed **focus away from controlling birds** and on to landscape management, it is reasonable that local government will continue to make an important contribution to the management of little corellas. However, we recommend increased support for local government. Increased support is already evident through the collaboration of state government, the LGA, universities, and local communities on the **Little Corellas** project. State government is also taking responsibility for the development of a state-wide management strategy. Further opportunities exist to collaborate with NRM Boards and other organisations like Birds SA, Conservation Volunteers, Greening Australia, Landcare Australia,
Trees for Life, local plant nurseries, community groups and individuals, agricultural and grain groups. These groups and individuals can assist with community development, revegetation activities and giving advice. It is important to ensure that all groups and individuals are working collaboratively towards the common goals outlined in the local government management plans (described above). See Table 1 below for the types of relevant activities that each group does.

**Actions recommended above should be supported as follows:**

- Natural Resources Management Boards (NRM Boards) should support local councils to plan and implement landscape management, collaborating with other affected landholders (e.g. schools and private landholders)
- Local councils and NRM Boards should facilitate annual community meetings
- LGA and DEWNR should facilitate annual meetings of local and state government staff
- Funding for long-term research should be sought through traditional research grants with leverage funding provided by state government, the LGA and NRM Boards
- Reviews of progress should be conducted by state government, the LGA and NRM Boards
- Whole-of-council approach: in addition to collaborating with other councils and agencies (e.g. NRM, schools) and individuals to manage little corellas, councils should spread the burden of management within their agencies. Pest animal managers should work closely with parks and maintenance staff, environmental and natural resource managers, arborists, town planners and others to develop cohesive plans for problem sites and areas
- DEWNR should provide policy and scientific/environmental management advice to guide available actions to reduce impacts of little corellas at problem sites
- Local community groups and individuals can provide volunteer hands-on assistance with revegetation activities, and identifying water, food and roost resources, in and around urban areas
Table 1 Relevant organisations and groups for potential collaborations, and their activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION/GROUPS</th>
<th>SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird groups: Birds SA, Birdlife Australia (including Birdlife Kangaroo Island and Birdlife South East SA)</td>
<td>Promotes local interest and awareness of birds; conducts bird conservation work; provides a source of scientific expertise and speciality knowledge of birds and bird ecology; manages bird resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Volunteers</td>
<td>Works in partnership with government (all levels) and communities on environmental projects; mobilises and coordinates volunteers for land restoration, revegetation and weed control activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening Australia</td>
<td>Works on landscape-scale projects, including WildEyre in South Australia; focuses on environmental projects that encourage involvement (and engagement) of local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landcare Australia</td>
<td>A community owned and driven initiative, works on integrating management of environmental resources and farmland (e.g. weed control), and promotes sustainable management of private land. Also manages resources for local groups and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees for Life</td>
<td>A community-based organisation that works on land restoration, revegetation and conservation projects (including establishing biodiverse plantings on private land, and regenerating bushland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plant nurseries</td>
<td>Can grow locally native plant species for sale and provide information around their use and importance, may decrease availability or discourage the purchase of declared weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups and individuals</td>
<td>Can be engaged and mobilised to promote biodiverse landscapes at schools and private gardens, for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and grain handling groups</td>
<td>Large grain storage and handling groups, such as Vterra, conduct little corella control activities at some sites; pest managers there may be able to share information and collaborate with councils to enhance the effectiveness of control activities more broadly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary of Terms (relative to little corellas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call birds</td>
<td>Or early birds; small numbers of birds that arrive in an area before the main flock. See also “Scout birds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Science</td>
<td>A scientific endeavour generating new knowledge or understanding that actively involves citizens; the citizens collaborate with scientists and have meaningful roles in projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Management activities that include lethal and non-lethal actions that aim to deter or remove birds (or reduce their numbers) in an area in order to reduce their impacts. See page 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying capacity</td>
<td>The greatest number of little corellas that an area can support, given the available resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cull</td>
<td>To destroy (kill) birds, usually in large numbers, to reduce the overall population size. See also “Lethal population control”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary breadth</td>
<td>A measure of diet variety; highly specialised species have a narrow dietary breadth (specialising on a single food source perhaps), whereas generalist species have great dietary breadth and would feed on many different types of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exotic plants</td>
<td>Non-native plant species, also called weeds, introduced plants; can include Australian native plants that are not indigenous (i.e. from other places in Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterminate</td>
<td>To destroy (kill) every individual bird and remove the species entirely and permanently from all areas (synonymous with extinction); see also “Cull”; “Lethal Population Control”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flock</td>
<td>A large number of birds congregating together in a single area; a few birds does not constitute a flock. See also “Flocking behaviour”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flocking behaviour</td>
<td>A common and natural behaviour in many bird species; cockatoos are highly social and vocal birds, and flocking allows social bonds to develop and provides some safety against predators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>The environment in which an organism exists and derives its needs; little corella habitat includes roosting and nesting, watering and feeding areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat modification</td>
<td>Modifying habitat in some way, such as planting reeds along water banks or increasing shrub cover; as a management strategy, habitat modification may be used to attract or deter particular wildlife from target areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human-wildlife conflict</td>
<td>Experience of negative interactions with wildlife; causes of this conflict can be varied, from real or perceived danger (i.e. dangerous animals), to economic losses (e.g. crop losses), to a reduction in amenity (e.g. damaging trees or fouling of water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-specific competition</td>
<td>The competition for resources among species, including from other birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Landscape of fear”</td>
<td>An ecological term that describes the level of fear of predators felt by a prey species in its environment; creating a “landscape of fear” involves increasing perceived risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal deterrent</td>
<td>Lethal destruction of a small number of birds in order to deter a large flock of birds from the area, typically used in conjunction with non-lethal measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal population control</td>
<td>Lethal destruction of a large number of birds in order to reduce overall population size. See also “Cull”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loafing behaviour</td>
<td>Loafing areas are where little corellas digest food, preen, play and rest (different to feeding or watering behaviour, for example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local enhancement</td>
<td>When the presence (calls and activities) of a few little corellas attracts more little corellas to that area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind map</td>
<td>Information organised in a diagram, which shows relationships between different factors associated with a central idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Models</td>
<td>The output from community workshops using the Mental Modeler software (developed by S. Gray). The models capture experiences and knowledge about little corellas, and can illustrate the outcomes of different management scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting habitat</td>
<td>Hollows in large trees and cliffs comprise nesting habitat for little corellas. Nesting behaviour (forming pair bonds and rearing young) is different to roosting behaviour. Compare “Roosting”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-lethal deterrent</td>
<td>Non-lethal actions that deter birds from an area; making noise and flashing lights are typical non-lethal measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population reduction</td>
<td>To destroy large numbers of birds to reduce the overall population size. See also “Lethal population control” and “Cull”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reinforcement</td>
<td>Positive reinforcement involves the use of an additional measure (e.g. a lethal deterrent) to reinforce non-lethal activities, with the aim of increasing the effectiveness of the non-lethal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem site</td>
<td>The Little Corellas project focused on sites identified by participants, where the presence of little corellas is of concern to them, and where management action is wanted. Problem sites may include those with large numbers of birds creating mess and noise or other factors, such as dispute about management at that site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident flocks</td>
<td>Traditionally, little corellas form large flocks during warm months in the southern areas and form pair-bonds and disperse north during winter to breed; however, some southern areas are now experiencing small resident flocks of little corellas that persist year-round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosting</td>
<td>Birds sleep at their roosts, typically little corellas settle at night in large roost trees. Compare “Nesting”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sacrificial sites or areas

Identified, suitable areas deliberately set aside for little corella habitat as part of integrated management activities; little corellas are not be moved on from these sites. Where possible, management plans should identify sacrificial areas and strategies to encourage birds to these areas and away from problem areas. The term “sacrificial” in this context does not imply that the site is of no value, but that the area is set aside for this purpose.

Scout bird

Or early bird (see also “Call bird”); small numbers of birds that arrive in an area ahead of a main flock. Scout bird is an imprecise term implying that birds report back to other birds in an organised and strategic way about their planned movements, which they don’t. Early bird or call bird are preferred terms. See also “Local enhancement”

Trap and gas/euthanize

A method of “Lethal population control”, where birds are captured and then destroyed by carbon dioxide narcosis.

Urban adapters

Species that live in natural and modified areas, e.g. little corellas. Compare “Urban avoiders”, “Urban exploiters”

Urban avoiders

Sensitive species that disappear or decline with urban development, e.g. wrens. Compare “Urban adapters”, “Urban exploiters”

Urban exploiters

Species that thrive in modified areas and even depend on urban resources; e.g. rock dove, house mouse and red-backed spiders. Compare “Urban adapters”, “Urban avoiders”

Vocalisations

Sounds made by birds that include calls and screeches, which are important for bird communication, e.g. alarm calls, social calls.

Wildlife acceptance capacity

A measure of human tolerance of a wildlife species or of a situation involving wildlife (e.g. little corella acceptance capacity), assessed locally or for the general public depending on the situation. Tolerance varies with attitudes, values, background and experiences or understanding of the problem. Varying levels of wildlife acceptance help explain contention surrounding the management of little corellas in some areas. For example, some people enjoy seeing large flocks of little corellas and oppose any control activities whereas other people may have bad experiences with them, do not enjoy seeing them, and want them controlled.

Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEWR</td>
<td>Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW DPI</td>
<td>New South Wales Department of Primary Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Association of South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPW Act</td>
<td>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UniSA</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

**Scope and purpose of the report**

The purpose of this report is to:

- Inform a new *Little Corella Management Plan for South Australia* being developed by the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR) in collaboration with the Local Government Association (LGA) of South Australia and other interested parties.
- Provide a **relevant and useful resource** that reflects community attitudes towards and experiences with little corellas in South Australia, which is supported by detailed data collection and analysis.
- Report back to **community and stakeholder groups** on the findings of the *Little Corellas* project.
- Help all stakeholders make **informed decisions** about little corellas.
- Develop recommendations to **facilitate communication** among and within agencies working on little corella management in South Australia.
- Provide recommendations and tools for **strategic and coordinated state-wide approach** to the management of little corellas.
- Develop practical and effective recommendations for **landscape-level and site-specific** management of little corellas in South Australia (long-, medium- and short-term actions).

**No “silver-bullet” or “solution” to management issues associated with little corellas or other wildlife exists.** Rather we aim to identify steps, based on extensive research and consultation, to reduce issues with little corellas. These steps include long-, medium- and short-term actions to alleviate problems at targeted sites. The numbers of little corellas and site problems will continue to increase without long-term coordinated management strategies, and short-term actions are also needed. We focus here on “problem sites” in urban and peri-urban areas, including townships, across South Australia.
Legislation, Permits and codes

Most **native species in South Australia are protected** under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972* (NPW Act), although specific levels of protection may vary among species. **Two corella species** occur in South Australia, and they have two different levels of protection afforded under the NPW Act:

**Little corellas** (*Cacatua sanguinea*)
- Listed as an “unprotected” species under Schedule 10 of the NPW Act because they are abundant and can be destructive
- Landowners and shooters acting for landowners **do not** require a *Permit to Destroy Wildlife*, they can shoot an unlimited number of little corellas on their land
- Shooters must comply with the *Code of Practice for the humane destruction of birds by shooting in South Australia* and with all provisions of the *Firearms Act 2015*; including those relevant to the storage, transportation and use of firearms and ammunitions
- Lethal trapping and gassing of little corellas requires a permit

**Long-billed corellas** (*Cacatua tenuirostris*)
- Long-billed corellas are sometimes mistakenly identified as little corellas
- Listed as “protected” species under the NPW Act, they are not considered to be abundant
- Long-billed corellas were highly threatened and in decline until the 1970s when they started exploiting new cropping resources, their numbers and range have now recovered and even expanded into some areas
- Their natural range includes the south east of South Australia, and a *Permit to Destroy Wildlife* is **required** to destroy them

Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR) has developed Codes of Practice for the destruction of birds in South Australia and provides training and accreditation to ensure that managers have sufficient knowledge of bird behaviour, know how to use the traps effectively and give due consideration to the welfare of the animals being caught. DEWNR has also developed a series of guidelines and action plans, undertaken ecological research, convened expert reference groups and committees to help define the problems, develop management plans, implement plans and evaluate results. DEWNR provides scientific and technical advice to local councils regarding the various control methods available to minimise impacts of little corellas on communities and individuals.

Return to Order of Business
Background to little corella problem sites in South Australia

Worldwide, there are hundreds of different species of parrots. They are intelligent birds, often brightly coloured, with curved bills, an upright stance and distinctive feet (two toes forwards and two toes backwards). Cockatoos are a family of parrots found in Australasia, from southern Australia to as far north as the Philippines. Cockatoos nest in tree hollows and are monogamous (they form long-lasting pair-bonds for breeding). Common Australian cockatoos are galahs, sulphur-crested cockatoos, cockatiels, long-billed corellas and little corellas.

While many people enjoy seeing these native birds, large flocks of cockatoos in urban and rural areas can cause considerable problems in the warmer months. The most common problems are damage to trees (defoliation), taking grain and disturbing residents with loud vocalisations. Little corellas can also damage buildings, particularly when they chew flashing or wiring, and to tarpaulins, wooden structures, cars and a variety of crops (Photo panel 1).

**Significant public contention exists regarding the management of little corellas in South Australia.**

*Photo panel 1*  Little corellas can cause damage to infrastructure by chewing wiring and flashing *(A, B)*; they can also cause serious defoliation of trees *(C)*
A mixed-methods approach to investigate a contentious environmental issue

This research project focused on sites, identified by participants, where little corellas are causing significant problems and where management actions may be required. Problem sites were defined as those areas where large numbers of birds were impacting on site amenity and areas where management actions were locally disputed. Sites were considered problematic if some members of the local community declared them as such (agreement was not required among all members of the community as a site can be a problem for some, but not for others). We aimed to collect existing knowledge and ideas from local communities to explore what made those particular sites problematic. We also aimed to understand the intrinsic factors leading to particular sites being popular with flocks of little corellas and what were the problems faced by the local community.

- This project report makes practical recommendations designed to directly influence decision makers and stakeholders so that they can make informed little corella management plans to help reduce the occurrence of problem sites.
- The research project involved the local community as much as possible – a “citizen science” approach. The benefit of this approach was that it ensured that all stakeholders had the best-possible understanding of the complex ecological and social dynamics that determine sites where little corellas are reported as problematic. The participatory approach and sharing of knowledge generation maximised learning, built community resilience and increased ownership of the outcomes of the project for the people involved.

Human-wildlife conflict

Human-wildlife conflict is not unusual; it is formed by negative experiences with wildlife, and is largely a result of human activities and our modification of the landscape. Globally, causes of human-wildlife conflict include:

- **Agricultural areas** expanding into the habitats of animals that can damage or consume crops, livestock and infrastructure. For example, in Africa, elephants eat and trample crops and damage farm infrastructure. Elephants are sometimes shot or poisoned in retaliation. Thus, the human-elephant conflict has poor outcomes for both people and elephants.

- **Residential areas** expanding into the habitats of animals that are (or are perceived to be) dangerous or annoying to people (e.g. wolves, bears, and birds that swoop or are noisy). It should be noted that residential development often displaces wildlife by removing resources such as foraging grounds, roosting trees or shelter. Conversely, residential areas can also attract wildlife by providing these same resources, albeit in a different context. Both displacement and attraction of wildlife can generate human-wildlife conflict.

Two South Australian examples of human-wildlife conflict are:

1. **Common brushtail possums** were once common and widely distributed across South Australia, but changes to the landscape, including the removal of trees for agriculture, has led to largescale declines and the species is now listed as rare under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. In contrast, in highly urban landscapes changes have benefited brushtail possums and their abundance in these areas is relatively high. Urban brushtails can generate conflict when
they inhabit and cause damage inside residential roof spaces (a substitute for a tree-hollow), damage ornamental gardens and make excessive noise at night.

2. Grey-headed flying foxes are listed nationally as vulnerable and rare in South Australia. However, in several large urban centres including Cairns, Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne, Geelong and Adelaide, flying foxes roost in large numbers forming “camps”. Urban areas provide year-round food and water supplies, including from native and non-native urban tree plantings. Human-wildlife conflict can occur when people get upset about the flying foxes damaging trees, producing excessive noise and droppings in urban areas.

Although wildlife are directly involved in human-wildlife conflict, they are not always the crux of the conflict. Human-wildlife conflict may sometimes be more accurately described as human-human conflict over wildlife according to Charles and Linklater (2013). Wildlife managers have to grapple with practical problems associated with urban wildlife, as well as public expectations, which may be divergent. For example, in both of the South Australian examples above, there are people who support attracting these species into urban areas and people who support discouraging the species from urban areas.

While humans may respond in different ways to wildlife, wildlife also responds in different ways to humans. Some species of wildlife do not persist in urban areas. These species may not be able to find enough suitable food or shelter, or they may be susceptible to predation in an urban environment. They are termed “urban avoiders” and examples include small woodland birds, like wrens and thornbills. In contrast, some species persist in urban areas, as well as persisting in their natural habitats. These species find the resources they need amongst the urban matrix of buildings, streets and parks. They are termed “urban adaptors” and both and brushtail possums and grey-headed flying foxes fit in this category, as do little corellas. One further category of wildlife response to urbanisation exists, the “urban exploiters”. These species exist in urban areas, but are not typically found in natural habitats. Urban exploiters include house mice and red-back spiders.

The range of foods that an animal will consume is known as the dietary breadth of the species. While some species will consume only a limited range of foods, others will consume a varied diet. In urban areas, an ability to exploit a variety of foods enables ready access to abundant urban foods. Abundant food can enable population growth and increased densities, which test human tolerance levels and amplify conflict experiences. For little corellas, the abundance and permanency of urban and peri-urban food resources may also reduce the need for seasonal movements and increase the permanency of flocks (i.e. increases in “resident flocks”, see Glossary).

**Human-bird conflict**

Typically⁴, negative experiences with birds leading to conflict in urban areas relates to one or more of these actions:

1. Nesting or roosting behaviours and locations
2. Aggressive behaviours, including attacking humans
3. Fouling of non-roost sites
4. Damaging infrastructure

---

⁴ See Charles and Linklater (2013)
Feral pigeons or rock doves are non-native birds found in large numbers in many Australian towns and cities. Their great dietary breadth (including scavenging for food scraps) and flexible roosting requirements (including a variety of urban structures) enables them to exploit urban areas successfully. SA Health identify the transmission of disease, odour and noise issues and damage to infrastructure as health risks associated with feral pigeons and the Australian Transport Safety Bureau consider rock doves to be “a serious risk to aircraft as they take off”. Many local councils in South Australia have control programs for feral pigeons within their Animal Management Plans (e.g. Town of Gawler).

Native Australian crows and ravens occur in diverse habitats and some are very common in cities and suburbs of southern Australia. As scavengers and predators, their broad omnivorous diet includes meat, insects, fruit, vegetables, bread, crop seeds, eggs, nectar and foliage (see NSW Department of Primary Industry’s, DPI, Crows and ravens Fact Sheet). Australian ravens can create disease risk, mess and excessive noise, they attack other birds, and damage infrastructure. Crows and ravens also damage agricultural and backyard crops of fruits, grains and nuts (e.g. grapes, cherries, olives, plums, berries, pineapples, passionfruit, potatoes, almonds, peanuts).

It is important to recognise that both introduced and native Australian species can generate human-bird conflict in urban areas. Research in many towns and cities around the world has demonstrated some similarities in the way bird species respond to urbanisation. Typically, as urbanisation increases, the number of bird species decreases. Highly urban areas provide resources for only a small number of species, including the introduced species of urban exploiters, like blackbirds and starlings. Urban areas also tend to have quite similar groups of birds present, regardless of where they are in the world, including mostly larger omnivorous and granivorous birds⁵, like little corellas.

While both introduced and native species can generate human-wildlife conflict, there should be a preference for supporting a range of native species in cities. Supporting native biodiversity can be beneficial for both birds and humans. Urban areas can support a range of bird species, rather than being dominated by the urban exploiters. Indeed, well planned residential areas can attract and support a diversity of bird species, including species that typically avoid urban areas, like small woodland birds. Supporting small woodland birds is important as many of these species are in decline.

Urban areas with a diversity of plants and birds are beneficial to people. Australians certainly appreciate the natural environment in and around Australian cities, demonstrated in a 2014 Property Council report⁶ where residents scored various attributes of the cities they lived in. The two most highly-ranked attributes were the range of recreational outdoor environments and the attractiveness of the natural environment. While we may intuitively like to live in attractive natural environment with recreational opportunities, research also shows that living and working in more natural environments improves health and productivity, and may increase house prices⁷.

---

⁶ Property Council of Australia (2014) My City Report
⁷ See Roetman and Daniels (2008)
Biology and ecology of little corellas*  

Description

Little corellas are a small white cockatoo with body length 35-40 cm and body mass 430-580 g. They have a short upright crest, bare blue-grey skin around the eye and salmon-pink lores (the area between the eyes and nostrils). The underwing and undertail feathers are pale yellow. Little corellas are not sexually dimorphic, i.e. male and female birds are indistinguishable with external examination. Little corellas do look similar to long-billed corellas, but unlike long-billed corellas, little corellas have no red breast feathers and they have a relatively short bill; see photo 1.

Little corellas naturally form large, noisy flocks during warm months; their vocalisations include guttural sounds and high-pitch screeches.

Distribution

Pre-European distribution is poorly understood, and is inferred from records of early pastoralists, explorers and naturalists. Until the 1920s little corellas appear to have been largely restricted to the far north east of South Australia. Since then little corellas have extended their range slowly southwards; from the 1960s onwards little corellas were recorded continuously and increasingly in the Flinders Ranges, Mount Lofty Ranges and surrounding areas. This movement was probably facilitated by native vegetation clearance as well as the provisions of new permanent water sources (e.g. stock troughs, dams), food from grain crops, and other factors such as drought. In addition to their range expansion, little corellas appear to have increased in abundance (DEH, 2007).

Little corellas are now widespread throughout inland, western and northern Australia. In South Australia little corellas are common in the eastern parts of the state, including: the Mid North, North East, Flinders Ranges, Riverland, Adelaide Plains, Fleurieu Peninsula, Kangaroo Island and in the South East. Little corellas often congregate along tree-lined watercourses from adjacent plains. They have been observed in a wide variety of other habitats including savannah woodland, mallee, mulga, rangelands, spinifex sandhills, gibber, saltbush, native cypress, crops, stubble, mangroves, offshore islands, dams, tanks and cliffs. Increasingly, little corellas occur in urban areas (i.e. “Urban adaptors”).

Reproduction

Between May and September little corellas spread out across a vast landscape in their breeding pairs or small family groups. Breeding usually occurs from August to October; typical nesting sites are tree hollows lined with decayed woody fragments, however little corellas will also excavate cavities in cliffs and in termite mounds to nest in. Two to four white oval eggs are laid per clutch; the incubation period is 24-26 days, and parents share incubation duties and caring for the young. After seven weeks the fledglings and parents join a large nomadic foraging flock, which increases their individual safety. In contrast to the large raucous summer flocks of little corellas, breeding birds are quiet and somewhat inconspicuous. The species is long-lived with captive individuals reaching in excess of 50 years of age, although wild animals are unlikely to reach this age.

Food, water and roosting resources

Little corellas are strong fliers that can travel great distances in search of food, water, roosting and nesting resources, or the safety of a larger flock. The species has habitual roosting sites that flocks return to in successive years (DEH, 2007). However, flock composition is not fixed and individual birds may move among different flocks and roosts each year (DEH, 2007).

At their roosts little corellas preen and socialise. They use loud vocalisations to communicate regularly with the other members of the flock. They also defoliate their roost trees to create a clear view, increasing visibility of the site and their perceptions of safety from potential predators (e.g. raptors).

Roost sites tend to be established near accessible fresh water and food resources. Little corellas are opportunistic foragers of food. For example, in spring they will feed on grass seeds and bulbs, in summer they may congregate in large numbers to feed on stubble remains in paddocks after harvest, and in late summer-autumn they might exploit grain around stock feed troughs. In the southern Flinders Ranges they feed almost exclusively on fallen grain in stubble paddocks. They also exploit artificial water sources (e.g. stock troughs, dams and lakes).

History of little corella problems

Many local council areas have a history of problems with little corellas, and they have invested significant resources into developing strategies for their management (see Figure 1). Extensive experience and knowledge of little corellas exists within these individual agencies and communities, but little information sharing or coordination of activities occurs among councils, and the efforts of some councils maybe frustrated by the inaction (or uncoordinated actions) of others. A state-wide strategy that umbrellas local plans is needed; streamlining access to management resources for local actions should improve uptake and coordination of management activities across the state.

Figure 1  Many local councils have invested significant resources into developing materials for the community and management strategies for little corellas
Our mixed-methods approach

The *Little Corellas* project was conducted during 2015 and 2016. The project had a number of distinct phases using a variety of methods to help us understand community experiences of little corellas, how little corellas are managed, and to develop recommendations for future management.

**Phase 1: Online survey**

We developed a short online survey to collect information about people’s opinions of and experiences with little corellas. The survey was designed to identify people and places to involve in subsequent phases of the project. The survey was open from November 2015 to March 2016 (5 months), with traditional and social media used to encourage community participation. The survey was also promoted by project collaborators, and paper copies of the survey were available.

**Phase 2: Community workshops – creating interactive “Mental Models”**

We hosted nine community workshops across the state with people affected by, or concerned about, little corellas. At the workshops we explored causes of problem locations using purpose-built software called *Mental Modeler*, which was developed by project collaborator Dr Steven Gray of Michigan State University. The software enabled participants to share their ideas and concerns about little corellas. In each workshop we created interactive maps of this complex problem, which included defining relationships between components and creating scenarios for different management regimes. Workshops were held during December 2015 and January 2016 in Hawker, Milang, Onkaparinga, Quorn and Strathalbyn, and two workshops each were held in Gawler and Mount Barker. The community models were made available to view and download, along with instructions on how to edit and run the models ([http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/projects/little-corellas/community-models/](http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/projects/little-corellas/community-models/)).

**Phase 3: Field data collection at little corella sites**

We visited over 150 sites identified by survey participants as locations where little corellas are causing problems for local people, and we surveyed 144 of these sites across South Australia (see Figure 2). Survey areas included: metropolitan Adelaide, Aldinga, Birdwood, Clayton Bay, Cockatoo Valley, Crystal Brook, Gawler, Goolwa, Hawker, Hewett, Mannum, Melrose, Milang, Mount Barker, Murray Bridge, Nuriootpa, Old Noarlunga, Palmer, Port Augusta, Port Elliot, Quorn, Roseworthy, Sandy Creek, Snowtown, Strathalbyn, Tailem Bend, Tanunda, Two Wells, Victor Harbor, Virginia, Williamstown and Wilmington. At each site we assessed and recorded the habitat type, and estimated the nativeness and cover of ground layer, shrub and tree vegetation (see details in Table 2).
Figure 2  Maps of sites surveyed during the Little Corellas project; sites were identified from a community survey
A) Sites ranging from Hawker to Snowtown; B) Nuriootpa to Victor Harbor

Table 2 Scoring system for estimating nativeness and cover of ground, shrub and tree vegetation at little corella sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVENESS (0-5)</th>
<th>COVER (0-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. Zero, or nearly zero species</td>
<td>0. Zero cover, or almost zero cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclusively, almost exclusively exotic species</td>
<td>1. Sparse cover, &lt; 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mostly exotic species</td>
<td>2. Plentiful, but little cover &lt; 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mixed native and exotic species</td>
<td>3. Cover of 5 to 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mostly native species</td>
<td>4. Cover of 26 to 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exclusively, almost exclusively native species</td>
<td>5. Cover of 51 to 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cover of &gt;76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also noted the presence, abundance and height of tree species of interest at each site. Species of interest were determined from the literature and from survey responses, they were: Aleppo pines, Norfolk Island pines, Monterey pines, native pines, other conifers, sheoaks, river red gums, other gums and native trees, fruit trees and ornamental trees. The overall cover for all trees was recorded, and we recorded whether any visible tree damage or perceived damage/reduced amenity by little corellas (including defoliation, tree pruning and mess from pruning) was present at the site.

In terms of water resources, we recorded whether the site had: 1) irrigated areas, 2) a water resource, 3) whether any water resource was permanent or ephemeral, 4) the accessibility of water to little corellas (e.g. vegetation barriers or other barriers) and 5) any other point of interest.
Phase 4: Little corella habitat suitability models

In order to create little corella habitat models for South Australia we asked: *What landscape features favour little corellas in South Australia?* The purpose of the habitat modelling was to:

- Understand **little corella distribution across South Australia** (including potential future movements)
- Determine **habitat variables** associated with little corella presence
- Identify **land uses** associated with little corella presence
- Identify potential **habitat management tools** for little corellas

Modelling specifications were:

- Presence-only modelling using community (**Little Corellas** project) survey data; BirdLife Australia **BirdAtlas** data
- Maxent modelling software (version 3.3.3k)
- Habitat variables were identified from the community survey and workshop data, and from a review of the existing literature, they included distance (m) to nearest:
  - Major creek
  - Irrigated green space (i.e. council reserves, golf courses, ovals)
  - Exotic pine
  - Grain storage
  - River red gum

Phase 5: Data synthesis - creating the master model

We synthesised results from the survey and community workshops, as well as from field data collection, habitat modelling and previous research, to **develop a master model for little corella management** using **Mental Modeler** software. The master model is available to download and operate from the **Discovery Circle**, it can also be upgraded and refined as new research or technologies emerge. The model enables users to create different management scenarios for little corellas, and identifies trade-offs and outcomes.
Phase 6: Sharing results

We delivered results from the survey and workshops during the project as they became available. For example, we created a map of little corella sites identified from the survey and posted it on the Discovery's Circle’s webpage. The models created during community workshops were also posted there along with an instruction manual for operating the software. Information about the project, getting involved and getting results were posted online (via Facebook, e-mail, Twitter), via postcards and traditional media; see examples in Photo panel 2.

Photo panel 2  Social (top row) and traditional (bottom row) media was used to promote the project, to increase reach and participation and to update participants on project findings
Results

The Little Corella Survey

Broad community engagement

- We received a strong community response with 1,270 people completing the survey¹
- In terms of geographic coverage, we recorded widespread participation with residents from 60 of 68 (88%) local councils being represented
- City of Onkaparinga had the most respondents (16%, or n = 137 respondents), followed by Alexandrina Council (9%, n = 76), Mid Murray Council (7%, n = 63) and Town of Gawler (4%, n = 37). Appendix 1 lists the frequency of respondents per local government area or authority
- Respondents' residential locations were: 51% urban, 30% peri-urban and 19% non-urban

Participant opinions of and experiences with little corellas

- General opinion of little corellas was nominated by participants on a scale from love to hate. We found that few respondents hated little corellas outright (4%, n = 53), many more respondents reported to love them (21%, n = 268; see Figure 3). Overall, 60% of respondents reported a positive opinion⁶, just 29% reported any negative opinion of little corellas⁷

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses](image)

**Figure 3** Survey respondents' general opinion of little corellas

---

¹ A total of 1,571 survey responses were received, we removed incomplete surveys (those with only a few questions answered), surveys where participants were unengaged (little or no variation in response, low standard deviation), and repeated surveys

⁶ Participants that selected “Love”, “Really like”, or “Like”

⁷ Participants that selected “Hate”, “Really dislike”, or “Dislike”
We grouped open-ended responses to the questions: What do you LIKE about little corellas? What do you NOT like about little corellas? into the themes that emerged (Tables 3 and 4).

**Table 3** Themes in participant responses to the survey question: What do you LIKE about little corellas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic value of native wildlife</td>
<td>Comments about little corellas being native birds, Australian wildlife, biodiversity, part of nature, having a role to play and linked to habitat health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value to self</td>
<td>Comments about spiritual or sentimental value of little corellas, feeling connected to nature or landscape and loving all creatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy seeing them</td>
<td>Comments about enjoying their interactions, behaviours, intelligence, socialising, gregariousness, flocks, calls, or beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Miscellaneous comments on infrequent themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments</td>
<td>Comments where nothing was liked about little corellas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4** Themes in participant responses to the survey question: What do you NOT like about little corellas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destructive, cause damage</td>
<td>Categorised divided into sub-themes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Destructive, cause damage – to unspecified objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Damage to infrastructure – property damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Damage to trees, vegetation – defoliation, tree deaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Damage to crops, orchards – damage to crops, seeds, vineyards, fruits, nuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Damage to lawn, grass, greens – damage to grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Comments about excessive noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mess, droppings</td>
<td>Comments about large mess, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced amenity</td>
<td>Comments about feeling anxious or stressed about little corellas, about their behaviours affecting a lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-abundance</td>
<td>Comments about them being a pest or plague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease, health risks</td>
<td>Comments about diseases, mites and rainwater contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce biodiversity</td>
<td>Comments about deterring other birds or biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community divisions</td>
<td>Comments about other people in the community being upset, feeling upset that people complained about little corellas, creating social divisions and harm and perception and intolerance issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Miscellaneous comments on infrequent themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
<td>Comments where nothing was disliked about little corellas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do you LIKE about little corellas?

- Most people enjoyed seeing little corellas, they enjoyed their intelligent behaviours, interactions, gregariousness and beauty (48%, n = 519; Photo 2)
- The quotes below demonstrate Intrinsic value as native wildlife (Quote 1) and Value to self (Quote 2) themes; see Figure 4

**Quote 1**  “I enjoy the variety of parrots that come in waves over our property - Galahs followed by little Corellas followed by Sulphur crested and finally Rosellas. The Corellas are part of that cycle and I’m sure have a role to play in the ecosystem”

**Quote 2**  “Corellas are truly Australian. Their call always reminds me of good times camping in the bush as a child. Now that I live in the bush the sight and sound of corellas always makes me smile”

*Photo 2 Many people enjoy seeing little corellas*

**Figure 4**  Participant responses to the question: What do you LIKE about little corellas? Sample size was 1,072 respondents

Return to Order of Business
What do you NOT like about little corellas?

- Most respondents disliked the damage caused by little corellas or their destructive behaviours, highlighted in Figure 5 with red columns (70%, n = 762; Photo 3). Respondents also disliked the noise made by little corellas (42%, n = 446); damage to trees was most disliked form of damage (28%, n = 301); see Photo panel 3.

- Little corellas were perceived to be over-abundant (see Quotes 3 and 4). Some people felt that little corellas were creating community divisions (Quotes 4, 5 and 6); see Figure 5.

**Quote 3**  they are “noisy, destructive, are in plague proportions and need to be culled”

**Quote 4**  “I don’t like their impacts as an over-abundant species. I don’t like the way people get passionate about these birds while ignoring their impacts”

**Quote 5**  “They do make a racket. I know they have caused management problems for some towns. A town near us implemented their “de-corella” strategy... and now the corellas have moved onto our town. So now the park is quite noisy and filled with birds”

**Quote 6**  “I don’t like people complaining about them”

**Figure 5**  Participant responses to the question: What do you NOT like about little corellas? Items shaded red all refer to damage caused by little corellas (the cumulative total of these damage-related items is 70%)

Overall, 1,067 people responded to the question.
Photo panel 3  Defoliation of trees by little corellas

A) Norfolk Island pine at Old Noarlunga; B) lemon-scented gum at Lockeys Oval; C) gum tree at Aldinga; D) sugar gums at Palmer; E) Aleppo pine at Old Noarlunga; F) gum tree at Wilmington; G) Norfolk Island pine at Aldinga Hotel; H) gum trees at the Hawker Golf Course
Trends in little corella presence

- Respondents were divided when asked about how long little corellas had been an issue in their area. About a third of respondents (33%, n = 367) indicated that little corellas were not a problem. Of the respondents who indicated a problem existed (67%, n = 753), 26% indicated that little corellas had been a problem for 1–5 years, 20% selected 6–10 years, 8% selected 11–15 years and 13% selected 16–20+ years.

- About a third of the respondents (34%, n = 395) reported that the little corella population in their area had stayed the same in the last five years. The same percentage of respondents reported that they would like the population to stay the same for the next five years.

- Almost half (46%, n = 537) the respondents reported that the little corella population had increased somewhat or increased greatly in their area over the last five years. Similarly, 44% (n = 516) of respondents wanted the population to decrease greatly or decrease somewhat in the next five years. This pattern is repeated, but inverted, when a similar number of respondents that had observed little corellas to decrease in the last five years wanted them to increase in the next five years (see Figure 6).

![Graph showing trends in little corella presence](image)

**Figure 6**  
Survey responses to two statements: 1) In the LAST five years, what has happened to little corella populations in your area? 2) In the NEXT five years, what would you like to see happen to little corella populations in your area?

Sample sizes were n = 1,152 for statement one and n = 1,167 for statement two. Arrows indicate the opposite trends in recent experience and future expectation.
- We tested this trend statistically and found a **strong negative association** between what respondents experienced with little corella populations in the last five years and what they would like to see have in the next five years.

- As expected, **strong seasonal trends** in little corella presence were also captured by the survey; these data are presented in Figure 7.

- Most respondents reported very few interactions during the cooler months, whereas most people reported **noticing little corellas on a daily basis** during summer (56%, n = 480).  

---

**Figure 7**  
**Frequency of little corella site visits among month**  
Sample size was 973 respondents and 4,057 monthly observations

---

\[\text{Pearson Chi-Square test of association between two categorical variables (278.121, df = 1, } P < 0.001); \text{ Phi test for affect size } \phi = 0.695, P < 0.001\]

\[\text{Other responses to frequency of sighting during summer were: every few days: 20\% (n = 175); weekly: 7\% (n = 62); every few weeks: 8\% (n = 69); less often: 8\% (n = 68)}\]
Management of little corellas in South Australia

- Most respondents (66%, n = 831) agreed that there is a lot of conflict about the management of little corellas\(^1\). Few respondents disagreed with this sentiment (9%, n = 117)\(^1\).

- Little corella management was perceived as the responsibility of all stakeholders, with 33% (n = 304) of respondents citing everyone involved should take responsibility. Individuals and local communities alone had little perceived responsibility. Local government was an important agency (24%, n = 224). No-one, indicating no management is necessary, was also cited frequently; see Figure 8

![Pie chart showing agencies considered responsible for little corella management by survey respondents.](image_url)

**Figure 8** Agencies considered responsible for little corella management by survey respondents

*Sample size was 921 respondents*

---

\(^1\) They selected “slightly agree”, “agree”, or “strongly agree”

\(^2\) They selected “slightly disagree”, “disagree”, or “strongly disagree”,

Return to Order of Business
We gauged survey participants’ level of support or opposition and perceived effectiveness or ineffectiveness to a series of little corella management actions, presented in Table 5.

*Table 5: Little corella control measures for which level of support or opposition and perceived effectiveness or ineffectiveness was gauged in the survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROL ACTION</th>
<th>CONTROL DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falconry</td>
<td>Using birds of prey to scare little corellas to other sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotting</td>
<td>Using spotlights to scare little corellas to other sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasers</td>
<td>Using lasers to scare little corellas to other sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise-generating devices</td>
<td>Using noise to scare little corellas to other sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping and gassing, lethal control</td>
<td>Destroying little corellas to reduce flock size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting to deter flocks, lethal control</td>
<td>Shooting a small number of little corellas to scare flocks to other sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat modification, increase shrubs</td>
<td>Making sites less attractive to little corellas by increasing shrubs and reducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat modification, tree removal</td>
<td>Removing trees that little corellas roost in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>No management actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education program</td>
<td>Developing education materials to increase acceptance of little corellas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage alternate sites</td>
<td>Identify suitable sites and encourage flocks to those areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary feeding</td>
<td>Luring little corellas to alternate sites by providing food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop netting</td>
<td>Netting crops to reduce impact of little corellas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management, built</td>
<td>Modifying built structures (like antennas) to prevent them from being damaged by little corellas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management, water</td>
<td>Modifying water troughs to prevent access by little corellas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of support for different management actions, 68% of respondents supported\(^{10}\) little corellas being **encouraged to alternate sites** (36% of respondents were **highly supportive** of this particular action). Other actions with more support than opposition were: modifying built structures (60%); education (58%) and supplementary feeding (53%); see Figure 9

Respondents were particularly **opposed to habitat modification involving tree removal**, over 80% of participants were opposed to this action (**highly opposed**: 60%; **opposed**: 14%; **slightly opposed**: 7%). Many participants were equally **opposed to lethal actions**, with 63% of respondents opposed to trapping and gassing and 62% opposed to shooting to deter flocks

Another poorly-supported action was use of noise-generating devices (51% of respondents were opposed\(^{9}\)), and 49% of respondents were **opposed to do nothing**, indicating their support of some action

Fewer people engaged with the associated survey question about **perceived effectiveness** of management actions, see Figure 10. On average, 165 fewer responses\(^{8}\) were recorded for this question than for the previous one about support for control actions. Considerable ambiguity was also recorded within the responses (i.e. a high percentage of **neutral** responses), indicating that the relative **effectiveness of various control actions is poorly known or understood** within the community. Increasing education around management options will likely increase knowledge and acceptance of management activities, and NRM Boards or other groups may be effective in this role

The space between actions that are acceptable to the community and the demonstrated effectiveness of various actions should **provide a focus area for managers**, including in any education actions. For example, falconry was low 49% of survey respondents, but 41% of respondents rated its effectiveness as **neutral**. Using falconry to create a “landscape of fear” for little corellas is very expensive, the effects are temporary, and the action is generally considered to be unfeasible (e.g. Temby 1999). Scare birds and retail kites (Photo 4) are also generally ineffective because little corellas quickly become habituated to them

\(^{9}\) They selected “slightly supportive”, “supportive”, or “highly supportive”

\(^{10}\) They selected “slightly opposed”, “opposed”, or “highly opposed”

\(^{8}\) ≤1.0, n = 15 (matched categories), the range was 157-169 fewer responses to the question about perceived effectiveness than to the associated question about support for little corella control actions

---

*Photo 4 In Aldinga a roof-mounted scare bird sits adjacent to a tree with little corella damage, illustrating their ineffectiveness for long-term management*
Figure 9  
Survey participants' support and opposition of little corella management actions

The sample sizes were: Encourage alternate vies: n = 873; Asset management (modify built structures): n = 873; Education program: n = 870; Supplementary feeding: n = 870; Fumigations: n = 884; Crop netting: n = 873; Spotlighting: n = 877; Asset management (modify water access): n = 873; Laser: n = 871; Habitat modification (increase shrubs): n = 808; Noise generating devices: n = 876; Do nothing: n = 882; Shooting to deter flocks: n = 877; Trapping and gassing: n = 883; Habitat modification (tree removal): n = 870.
Survey participants’ perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness of little corella management actions

The sample sizes were: Encourage alternate sites: n = 707; Trapping and gassing: n = 712; Shooting to deter flocks: n = 712; Supplementary feeding: n = 705; Asset management (modify built structures): n = 705; Crop netting: n = 705; Faltering: n = 713; Education program: n = 704; Asset management (modify water access): n = 705; Habitat modification (increase shrubs): n = 709; Noise-generating devices: n = 712; Habitat modification (tree removal): n = 705; Spotlighting: n = 712; Lures: n = 712; Do nothing: n = 704.
Little corella sites across South Australia

- As part of the public survey, South Australians identified over 2,340 little corella sites across South Australia. See sites in the map below, Figure 11
- **Recreational parks** represented 28% of primary sites identified by survey respondents, and **schools** (10%) and **sporting ovals** (7%) were also commonly identified sites
- Large clusters of sites were recorded within the Adelaide metropolitan area, Mount Lofty and Fleurieu Peninsula region (including Kangaroo Island), along the River Murray from Wellington to Renmark, in the Upper and Lower South-East (Keith to Mount Gambier) and Mid and Far North sites ranged from Gawler to Coober Pedy
- Two survey respondents reported **little corella sites on Eyre Peninsula**, where they have been reported previously (in 2001\(^\dagger\)). These respondents correctly identified different bird species in the survey, and the reported sites were typical of little corella habitat (recreational reserves and a school in Tumby Bay and a caravan park in Port Lincoln). However, local experts have not observed little corellas on the Eyre Peninsula, and know of no recent record of little corellas in the region (G. Kerr, pers. comm. 2016)
- Generally, survey participants demonstrated good bird identification skills for sulphur-crested cockatoos and galahs (84% and 89% correctly identified, respectively). Little corellas were identified correctly by 78% of respondents and long-billed corellas were less successfully identified, with 62% correct (15% were unsure and 22% incorrect)
- Fourteen people mentioned long-billed corellas in their survey responses. Places where small numbers of long-billed corellas were recorded (during all phases of this project) co-occurring within little corella flocks included: metropolitan Adelaide (parklands, Torrens River, Urrbrae), Mount Barker, Mylor, Old Noarlunga, Noarlunga, and Willunga. Large flocks of long-billed corellas mixed with little corellas were reported in the South East. One report was that **90% of corellas in Naracoorte were long-billed corellas**
- Long-billed corellas are native to the Lower South East in South Australia, but little corellas seem newly arrived to some areas there, one project participant mentioned that, "We already had long-bills, but we didn't get little corellas in Millicent until we got the new grain bunker"

![Photo 5 Grain stores and bunkers provide food resources for little corellas, many major facilities like this one in Tailem Bend will have ongoing little corella control programs; image from Google Earth](image)

\(^\dagger\) Species list for NRM Region Eyre Peninsula, South Australia (2011). Australian Government, Department of Sustainability, Water, Population and Communities
Figure 11  A map of little corella sites in South Australia, nominated through our community survey of 1,270 people

Sites were placed as close as possible to the locations described by survey respondents. For privacy reasons, private residences were mapped to the street described rather than on an actual house. An interactive version of this map is available at: http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/projects/little-corellas/
Little corella acceptance capacity

We used participant responses to a series of statements about a flock of little corellas around their house to generate a measure of each individual's acceptance capacity. On a 7-point Likert-type scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree, participants selected their response to 12 statements:

1. I would enjoy seeing the little corellas
2. I would enjoy hearing the little corellas
3. I would think that people should learn to live with little corellas
4. The little corellas would make me feel close to nature
5. I would be concerned about the noise of the little corellas
6. I would be concerned about damage to plants by the little corellas
7. I would be concerned about damage to property by the little corellas
8. I would be concerned about the cost of fixing damage by little corellas
9. I would be concerned about diseases spread by little corellas
10. I would want the little corellas to be removed
11. I would try to scare the little corellas away
12. The only good little corella is a dead one

We conducted a factor analysis to help us understand variations in the way people had responded to these statements. This analysis helped us to identify two underlying factors that can be used to understand how people feel about little corellas:

- **FACTOR 1: CONCERN ABOUT IMPACT OF LITTLE CORELLAS**
  - This factor relates to concerns with impacts and management associated with little corellas, and 47% of the variance in our data was explained by this factor
  - Survey respondents with HIGH SCORES on this factor typically agreed with these statements:
    - I would be concerned about damage to property by the little corellas
    - I would be concerned about the cost of fixing damage by little corellas
  - Survey respondents with LOW SCORES on this factor typically agreed with this statement:
    - I would think that people should learn to live with little corellas

- **FACTOR 2: INTRINSIC-VALUE OF LITTLE CORELLAS**
  - This factor relates to loving little corellas and enjoying them as part of nature, and 23% of variance in our data was explained by this factor
  - Survey respondents with HIGH SCORES on this factor typically agreed with this statement:
    - The little corellas would make me feel close to nature
  - Survey respondents with LOW SCORES on this factor typically agreed with this statement:
    - I would want the little corellas to be removed
Rather than disliking little corellas, decreased acceptance of little corellas typically stemmed from frustrations or concerns relating to their impacts and management (Factor 1). People who scored high on this factor were concerned about damage to property and plants, the cost of damage and the noise, they also wanted little corellas removed or scared away. In contrast many people reported in the survey that they loved little corellas, and they held intrinsic values about little corellas (Factor 2). These respondents enjoyed seeing and hearing little corellas, and little corellas helped them to feel close to nature. We found that:

- As experience of impacts increased, general opinion of little corellas decreased
- Impacts increased with an increase in little corella numbers in the last five years
- People with high concern for impacts want the little corella population to decrease in the next five years
- Males typically scored higher concern for impact scores
- No moderate or strong correlations and no significant differences occurred between the intrinsic-value factor and most other measures, suggesting that this factor is relatively stable; if people hold intrinsic value for little corellas, it may be difficult to change this value (see Appendix 2)

Opinions about management actions by factor groups

We compared the median level of support for different little corella management actions among three groups:
1. All survey respondents together
2. Respondents concerned about impacts of little corellas (Factor 1)
3. Respondents that intrinsically value little corellas (Factor 2)

This analysis enabled us to determine which actions are likely to be widely accepted, tolerated or contentious within diverse local communities (i.e. people within communities experience little corellas differently). We generated an overall community support index for each control measure. The support index is a score out of 100 (presented in Table 6 as a percentage) based on the combined level of support from the three groups. The support index was calculated by adding the median scores of each group and converting the result into a percentage. Control measures with high percentages are likely to be well supported within the community whereas those with low percentages are likely to be opposed. Key findings were:

- Benign actions received broad support (support index greater than 60)
- Encouraging alternate sites (i.e. creating sacrificial areas away from problem sites) was supported by all groups, and “do something” was also strongly supported (i.e. little corella management is wanted)
- Both effective and ineffective benign activities were supported
- Neutral support was universal for increasing shrubs and managing water assets (effective measures)
- Lethal control measures were contentious; overall, survey respondents were highly opposed and, as expected, people concerned about little corella impacts were more supportive of these measures than were people who value the birds intrinsically
- Tree removal is unacceptable to the community
Table 6 Support for different management actions for three groups of people: all survey respondents, survey respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1), and survey respondents who intrinsically value little corellas (Factor 2)

Median response on a scale from highly opposed to highly supportive is given for each group (i.e. from highly supportive to highly opposed for each management action) and the sample size is provided in parentheses below the median response.

Actions are ranked from most supported (towards the top of the table) to least supported (the lower rows in the table) based on a “support index”; the support index was calculated by adding the median scores of each group and converting the result into a percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>ALL SURVEY RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>FACTOR 1 CONCERN ABOUT IMPACT</th>
<th>FACTOR 2 INTRINSIC VALUE</th>
<th>INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>SUPPORT INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage alternate sites</td>
<td>Supportive (863)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (401)</td>
<td>Supportive (390)</td>
<td>All respondents, respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1), and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) typically supported encouraging alternate sites</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do something</td>
<td>Neutral (852)</td>
<td>Highly supportive (399)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (383)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents were neutral, while both respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) typically supported doing something.</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconry</td>
<td>Neutral (869)</td>
<td>Supportive (406)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (391)</td>
<td>While overall the survey respondents were neutral, both respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) typically supported falconry</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary feeding</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (861)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (398)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (389)</td>
<td>All respondents, respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) typically supported supplementary feeding</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management, built</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (862)</td>
<td>Neutral (401)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (389)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically supportive of managing built assets, while respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) were typically neutral</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotting</td>
<td>Neutral (866)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (404)</td>
<td>Neutral - Slightly opposed (390)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents were typically neutral, while respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) were typically supportive of spotting, and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically slightly opposed</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasers</td>
<td>Neutral (860)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (403)</td>
<td>Neutral (384)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically neutral, while respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) were typically supportive of using lasers</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>ALL SURVEY RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>FACTOR 1 CONCERN ABOUT IMPACT</td>
<td>FACTOR 2 INTRINSIC VALUE</td>
<td>INTERPRETATION</td>
<td>SUPPORT INDEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education program</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (861)</td>
<td>Slightly opposed (399)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (389)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically supportive, while respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) were opposed to education</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop netting</td>
<td>Neutral (864)</td>
<td>Neutral (401)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (391)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents and respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) were typically neutral towards crop netting, while respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically supportive</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat modification, increase shrubs</td>
<td>Neutral (858)</td>
<td>Neutral (400)</td>
<td>Neutral (386)</td>
<td>All respondents, respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1), and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically neutral towards managing water assets</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management, water</td>
<td>Neutral (862)</td>
<td>Neutral (401)</td>
<td>Neutral (390)</td>
<td>All respondents, respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1), and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically neutral towards managing water assets</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise-generating devices</td>
<td>Slightly opposed (863)</td>
<td>Neutral (401)</td>
<td>Neutral (389)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents were typically slightly opposed, while both respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically neutral towards using noise-generating devices</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping and gassing, lethal control</td>
<td>Highly opposed (870)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (405)</td>
<td>Opposed (392)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically opposed, while respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) were typically supportive of using lethal population control</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting to deter flocks, lethal control</td>
<td>Highly opposed (866)</td>
<td>Slightly supportive (403)</td>
<td>Opposed (390)</td>
<td>Overall the survey respondents and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically opposed, while respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1) were typically supportive of using lethal deterrents</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat modification, tree removal</td>
<td>Highly opposed (860)</td>
<td>Opposed (400)</td>
<td>Highly opposed (386)</td>
<td>All respondents, respondents concerned about the impacts of little corellas (Factor 1), and respondents with intrinsic value for little corellas (Factor 2) were typically opposed to tree removal</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community workshops

In the workshops the modelling software enabled participants to articulate diverse views and observations (social, ecological, economic) pertaining to little corellas and helped us to facilitate complex discussions around the issues. Comments supporting the value or approach of the workshops, the complexity of the issue, changing opinions and other observations are detailed in Appendix 3.

The model created in each of the nine workshops also reflected the priorities and context or experiences of the participants, so although overlap in some themes occurred among workshops, new themes also emerged. For example, in a workshop in Onkaparinga we discussed the acceptance of little corellas and factors leading to sites becoming problematic (a social focus), whereas in one workshop in The Flinders Ranges Council area, considerable attention was given to the effectiveness of different controls (a management focus). An example of a model built during one workshop is presented in Figure 12. In addition to broad community participation, members of at least seven local councils, including two local mayors, were involved in the workshops. All models and instructions on the modelling are available online at: http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/projects/little-corellas/community-models/

![Image of a diagram representing a little corella community workshop]

**Figure 12** A model created during a little corella community workshop using the Mental Modeler software

Arrows indicate the connection, direction, the type and strength of the relationship between components. Each connection occurs between two components only, the direction is indicated by the arrow (e.g. “water availability” leads to a “little corella problem site”), the type of relationship can be positive or negative and the strength is indicated by line. Detailed instructions on using the software are here.

---

**Return to Order of Business**
Key themes and insights from the workshops

The nature of problem sites
Problem sites comprised isolated locations, a series of neighbouring sites or diffuse problem zones (e.g. corridors of sites along the River Murray). During the warmer months the experience of problems associated with little corellas can be ongoing (i.e. for people living adjacent to a problem site) and/or associated with a particular event – such as a ceremony in a memorial garden or the Mannum Hot Rod Show; communities fear the loss or disturbance of their events by little corella presence. In addition to seasonal inundations and large flock sizes, conspicuousness of little corellas is enhanced by their use of high profile public spaces (such as schools or recreation parks), which increases public encounters (and conflict) and awareness of little corellas generally.

Terminology is a barrier
We found considerable confusion and misuse of terms associated with little corella management. We found terms such as “cull” and “extermination” (inferring large-scale destruction and extinction of little corellas) were interchanged for targeted lethal deterrents (destroying a few birds to move a flock). “Scout birds” was also used widely; we do not support the use of this term because it implies that a few birds investigate sites and report back to the flock to inform their movements. We prefer the terms “early bird” or “call bird”. Whatever the context (discussion, report, correspondence) it is important to define clearly all terms.

Communication is a barrier
Many people didn’t understand wildlife management actions, the complexity of management issues, the justification for various approaches, or the problems experienced by councils. The costs of management options were also poorly understood. One cost relayed to us was for $24,000 to destroy 1,500 birds using trapping and gassing. The little success and limited effect of such an exercise coupled with the high cost would be useful information for a public wanting action. The exorbitant costs of using falconry should also be released in order to increase public understanding of this option and the costs (many people support the idea of this action, but have no understanding of the cost or temporary nature of any effect produced).

We also noted that understanding of lethal deterrents was low. Often people were opposed to lethal deterrents and considered them to be similar to lethal population control measures (like trapping and gassing birds). We found that people changed their minds about the use of lethal deterrents during our workshops. Comments from workshop participants suggested that they changed their minds for two main reasons. First, workshop participants better understood the complexities of little corella management. Second, workshop participants better understood the use of lethal deterrents, particularly how lethal deterrents can be used in conjunction with non-lethal measures (e.g. spotlighting or noise-generation) to increase the effectiveness of the non-lethal measures. For example, if a few birds are shot during an initial spotlighting effort to disrupt a flock of little corellas, subsequent spotlighting efforts with no shooting will likely be more effective at disrupting the flock (as birds associate the spotlighting with the shooting). Further discussion also brought to light that the careful use of lethal deterrents may help reduce the overall numbers of birds being destroyed (i.e. by avoiding lethal control measures). Thus, the use of lethal deterrents is likely to receive more support from the community than our survey results suggest, but only where lethal deterrents are used to increase the effectiveness of non-lethal measures, where the strategic approach is understood by the community, and where lethal deterrents are clearly differentiated from lethal controls.
Local councils want support and co-ordinated action

Many councils feel that they need to be acting on little corellas, and know that the public want action. They want their activities to be meaningful and effective, but they’re not always sure about what to do, what works, and what strategic approaches to take. Many councils have worked in isolation to eventually learn the same lessons; they may react as a problem arises and enact ad-hoc trials of different approaches to manage little corellas. Some councils were curious about what other local councils were doing. They have no organised way of sharing resources or knowledge, or coordinating responses among agencies, and many supported the notion of a state-wide strategy. Many councils invest considerable resources into little corella management and have detailed knowledge of their management (e.g. Figure 12), but little reporting, data collection or monitoring occurs. Managing time (field staff) and public expectations are key challenges for some councils. Councils also want residents to know how complex wildlife management is, and for the public to take ownership of the issue.

Little corella habitat suitability models

For an abundant species, surprisingly little is understood about the mix of landscape characteristics that influence the distribution of little corellas. The aim of this habitat modelling was to identify these landscape features and drivers of little corella distribution, and to understand why little corellas favour certain areas in South Australia. This information should help inform future management strategies.

- We used observations and insights of citizen-scientists collated from the Little Corellas project to inform our analyses and merged these with observations of little corellas from BirdLife Australia Second Atlas. To our knowledge this is the first time that habitat suitability models have been generated for the little corella
- We created two habitat suitability models for little corellas: a state-wide South Australian model and a Mounty Lofty Ranges model. The second model was necessary because the landscape features of this region are generally uncharacteristic of the rest of the state

Results suggest that little corella habitat was generally characterised by the presence of one or more of the following habitat features: 1) river red gums; 2) major creek lines; 3) irrigated green space; and 4) pine trees. However, depending on where you are in South Australia, the relative importance of these landscape features differed. Interestingly, although grain silos may exacerbate existing little corella issues at a local scale, they were found not to be a strong determinant of little corella distribution in our models.
We believe this study is first to consider the influence of native vegetation cover and land use type on little corella distribution. The results of these analyses indicate that:

1. Little corellas avoid bushland areas and favour highly fragmented environments
2. Habitats provided by recreational (i.e. irrigated green spaces), agricultural, and residential land uses are preferred

The analyses presented here show us the landscape characteristics favoured by little corellas and provide potentially useful habitat manipulation strategies. The relative suitability of the Mount Lofty Ranges, and other temperate agricultural regions, compared to the rest of the state poses management challenges; the availability of irrigated green spaces is clearly an attractant in these regions⁴. Below we summarise the modelling methods and results. An in-depth description and discussion of the models, including modelling methodology and model limitations, is provided in Appendix 4.

**South Australian model**

- Little corella input data included 3,069 presence locations (1972–present); Photo panel 4A
- The habitat suitability model is shown in Figure 13; *model performance was good-excellent*
- State-wide, the most important habitat features for little corellas were *river red gums*, irrigated green spaces and *major creek lines*. These three variables combined explained 90% of the little corella distribution
- Model results suggest that as distance (m) from nearest *river red gum*, irrigated green space or *major river* increases, the **probability of little corella presence declines** (Appendix 4)
- *Pines* were less important. Probably because they are planted less frequently in regional South Australia, particularly in the state’s pastoral zones
- Unsurprisingly, as human population density increased so did the occurrence probability of little corellas. This trend is likely to reflect the increased availability of food and water resources within human-dominated environments
- Some uncertainty exists about the current status of little corellas on the Eyre Peninsula. Our habitat models suggest that the habitat conditions are favourable for their establishment there

---

⁴ The predicted habitat suitability values at some of the sites shown in the maps may not be as expected because of two factors: 1) some input datasets are known to be incomplete (e.g. irrigated green spaces, red gums) and, consequently, information on one or more of these habitat variables is not available at all sites; or 2) other site specific factors not captured by the habitat models influence little corellas at these sites. One or both of these factors will influence the final model predictions. These maps should be considered as indicative of potential little corella distribution only

⁷ *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*
Mount Lofty Ranges model

- Little corella input data included 718 presence locations (1972–present); Photo panel 4B
- The habitat suitability model is shown in Figure 14; model performance was good-excellent
- Two-thirds of little corella distribution within the Mount Lofty Ranges was explained by the availability of, and proximity to, irrigated green space. The probability of little corellas increased as the distance to the nearest irrigated green space decreased (Appendix 4). The availability of these spaces within the region is much greater than for the rest of the state
- Distance to nearest major creek line was also a factor in determining little corella distribution within the region. Tall eucalypts are used as roost sites. These trees are often concentrated along watercourses in highly fragmented environments
- The influence of distance to nearest pine (Pinus sp.) tree on little corella distribution was greater within the Mount Lofty ranges than for the rest of the state. Pine trees are largely confined to agricultural regions of South Australia, especially the Mount Lofty Ranges, so are more readily available. That said, little corellas feed primarily on the seeds of grasses and herbaceous plants. Pine seeds may comprise only a minor dietary component (Higgins, 1999)
- Distance to nearest river red gum was not as an important factor within the region. This species of gum is not confined to watercourses and rivers within the Mount Lofty Ranges, as it is across the rest of the state. Further the diversity of tall, emergent tree species within the region is comparatively higher than for the rest of the state. Therefore the dependence of little corellas on river red gums in this region is likely to be less than in other areas of the state

---

*Pinus species*
Photo panel 4  
Little corella presence locations across South Australia (A) and for the Mount Lofty Ranges (B) used to create habitat suitability models
**Figure 13**  Little corella habitat suitability model for South Australia, with the relative importance (%) of each habitat variable to the final model

1. Distance to nearest river red gum tree 49.1
2. Distance to nearest irrigated green space 20.1
3. Distance to nearest major creek 19.2
4. Distance to nearest pine tree 1.1

\[\text{Note that "red gum" and "major creek" are highly correlated. This relationship can confound the relative contribution rankings.}\]
Figure 14  Little corella habitat suitability model for the Mount Lofty Ranges, with the relative importance (%) of each habitat variable to the final model
Analysis of land use and vegetation fragmentation

Landscape composition is likely to have a significant influence on the distribution of little corellas in South Australia. In separate analyses, we examined the influence of land use and native vegetation cover on little corellas. With regard to land use, we were interested not only in the pattern of land uses (i.e. the number, shape and size of patches), but also the relative influence of competing land uses on little corella occurrence. We are not aware of any similar analyses for little corellas. Because of computational complexity, land use was only considered for the Mount Lofty Ranges subregion.

Summary

- Irrespective of analysis type (i.e. pattern or proportion), recreation, agricultural and residential land uses were consistently the best predictors of little corella distribution; see Table 7
- Residential areas and agricultural environments are attractive to little corellas because of their diversity of land uses and habitats, as well as the abundance food and water resources
- Recreation areas (i.e. irrigated green spaces), such as ovals, golf courses, and caravan parks, also provide feeding resources
- Interestingly, both the land use and native vegetation cover analyses suggested that:
  - Little corellas actively avoid bushland areas (i.e. “Reserve” in Table 7)
  - Little corellas favour highly fragmented patches of native vegetation (e.g. vegetation along roads/rivers, surrounding ovals and in council parks and gardens; see Appendix 4)
- Because little corellas avoid large areas of native vegetation increasing nativeness of existing parkland areas represents a constructive action to reduce site attractiveness to little corellas
- In terms of landscape pattern, the probability of little corella presence increased with the number of patches of recreation, agricultural or residential land uses in surrounding areas (Table 7)
- More recreational land uses (i.e. irrigated green spaces), such as ovals, golf courses, and parks, equates to more potential feeding resources
- As the number of agricultural and/or residential properties within a 1 km radius increases, in general, so does the availability and diversity of these resources. Smaller agricultural holdings are commonly associated with lifestyles and hobby farms. These environments, in particular, provide opportunistic food and water resources for little corellas
- Interestingly, both the land use and native vegetation cover analyses suggested that little corellas actively avoid bushland areas and favour highly fragmented patches of native vegetation (i.e. vegetation along roads/rivers, surrounding ovals and in council parks and gardens). Therefore, increasing the nativeness of existing parkland areas represents a constructive action to reduce site attractiveness to little corellas
Table 7 Average explanatory power of land use categories surrounding little corella sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE TYPE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY POWER (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, livestock, vacant</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry, horticulture</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site-specific characters

- Landscape-level habitat characters (distance to creek, river red gum or irrigated green space) and land use (recreational, residential, agricultural and bushland) will predispose different areas to little corella presence across the state, but site-specific characters are also influential. Site characters can exasperate existing problems, or be manipulated to reduce attractiveness of problem sites to little corellas in conjunction with other activities (i.e. integrated management).

- We looked for commonalities among 144 little corella sites surveyed during the project (individual sites listed in Appendix 5). Key site characters associated with little corella presence were: extensive exotic lawn areas, access to water, open habitat (i.e. low tree density, often including pine trees) and very few shrubs; see Table 8, Figure 6, Photo panel 5.

✓ Exotic lawn
✓ Water access
✓ Open habitat
✓ Few shrubs

Return to Order of Business
### Table 8 Characteristics of 144 little corella sites surveyed during the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Description and Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated lawn</td>
<td>• <strong>HIGH OCCURRENCE</strong>: irrigated lawn occurred at 100% of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>HIGH COVER</strong>: median score for lawn cover was the maximum of 5 (&gt; 75% cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>LOW NATIVENESS</strong>: median score for grass nativeness was 1 (exclusively/almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exclusively exotic species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>• <strong>LOW COVER</strong>: median score for shrub cover: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>LOW NATIVENESS</strong>: median score for shrub nativeness: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>• <strong>LOW COVER</strong>: median score for (short) trees &lt; 10 m was 2 (&lt; 5% cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>MEDIUM COVER</strong>: median score for (tall) trees &gt; 10 m was 3 (5-25% cover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>MEDIUM NATIVENESS</strong>: median score for nativeness in short and tall trees was 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(mixed exotics and natives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>HIGH OCCURRENCE (PINES)</strong>: pine trees (<em>Pinus</em> spp.) were present at 63% of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>MEDIUM COVER (PINES)</strong>: median score for <em>Pinus</em> spp. was 3: 5-25% cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>HIGH DAMAGE</strong>: damage to roosting trees such as Norfolk Island pines(^a) and native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tree species was common, they prune these trees to increase visibility and perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of safety, and to maintain good beak condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>• <strong>MEDIUM WATER ACCESS</strong>: an obvious(^b) water resource occurred at 50% of sites;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a permanent water resource occurred at 39% of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>LOW BARRIERS</strong>: fewer than 5% of sites with water had a barrier to the resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vegetative barrier or another barrier such as dam lining)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Photo 6** Little corellas (indicated by red arrow) roosting in tall trees at the Tailem Bend Ferry Terminal

This site has a permanent water resource, irrigated green lawn, tall sparse trees and few shrubs – perfect habitat for little corellas

\(^a\) *Araucaria heterophylla*; Norfolk Island pines have a single trunk, and simple symmetrical branching such that damage to these trees has great visual impact (loss of symmetry)

\(^b\) Water resources were only assessed at the immediate site, obscure adjacent resources may have been missed
Ovals with irrigated grass and Aleppo pines are typical little corella sites

Photo panel 5  Town ovals with irrigated grass and Aleppo pines were typical sites for little corella activity

A) Two Wells; B) Strathalbyn; C) Cockatoo Valley/Sandy Creek; D) Goolwa; E) Milang; F) Tanunda; G) Wilmington oval
Access to food resources at problem sites

Photo panel 6  Food resources accessed by little corellas

A) seeds and bulbs in grass and lawn areas; B) pine nuts, especially from Aleppo pines; C) flower nectar; D) fruits and seeds of olive groves, and other nuts such as almonds; E) spilt grain in farm paddocks and paddock stubble; F) ideal little corella habitat is created by an Aleppo pine windbreak with adjacent paddocks and permanent water accessed via the stock trough (photo F: D. Wingrove)
Access to water resources at problem sites

**Photo panel 7  Water resources readily accessed by little corellas**

A) a school dam in Gawler; B) wetlands at an Adelaide golf course; C) a dam at a golf course in Mount Barker; D) a large water body in the Roseworthy industrial area; E) a lake at Bonython Park in Adelaide; F) a lake at Keith Stephenson Park in Mount Barker. Clear open banks allow ready access to the resource (red arrows), whereas vegetated areas create a partial barrier with minimal effect on site amenity (blue arrows) – these barriers need to be complete (whole) in order to reduce little corella access to site resources.
Access to water resources at problem sites, continued

Photo panel 8  Water resources readily accessed by little corellas

A) on the banks of the Onkaparinga River; B) the Murray River; C) stock troughs; D) birds drank from this swimming pool in Strathalbyn; E) small puddles on roadsides were used (little and long-billed corellas together); F) small sticks and snags were used to access water at a Strathalbyn park, but it was not the preferred access point
Recommendations for management actions

Integrated management

- Integrated management is vital for managing little corella problem sites. Integrated management should occur at different levels and time frames; while immediate and site-specific actions are needed now, land managers also need to consider future trends and emerging problems (e.g. new problem sites or new problem species).

- With unlimited access to resources and a reduction in predators near towns, the population growth of little corellas will continue to increase. Control actions then become a permanent fixture of management regimes, and new problems will continue to emerge. An integrated approach seeks to reduce problem sites and, in the long-term, reduce the need for management of little corellas (managing the sites, rather than the birds).

- It is important that no action should occur in isolation, but as part of a cohesive plan; if little corellas are excluded from some areas, then alternate suitable refuge areas will assist in keeping little corellas away from problem sites. These “sacrificial areas” need to be incorporated into the strategy and good communication among the community is also necessary so that control activities are not undermined or confused.

- Managers must coordinate and target actions at identified problem sites to make those sites less attractive to little corellas. By targeting interventions at problem sites managers avoid spreading resources thinly across a large area with little impact.

- Creating barriers to resources is vital and an effective means for reducing problems at targeted sites. Habitat modification (increasing shrubs) and modifying water troughs received better public support compared to some other measures (e.g. lethal population controls or noise deterrents).

- Increasing “nativeness” of sites affected by little corellas is key to alleviating little corella pressure, enhancing local biodiversity, and diminishing future threats of over-abundant urban-adapting species thriving in these areas (e.g. Australian white ibis, rainbow lorikeets, noisy minors).

- Irrigated green areas are important for recreation, and modifications need to be meaningful and planned, as well as sensitive to community needs.

- Enacting integrated management will require coordination and collaboration within councils and among other agencies and organisations. For example, within a council it is necessary to have planners and park/landscape managers involved in little corella management, as well as executive support. Council staff will need to liaise with other agencies and organisations to assist and support the integrated management. For example, local Natural Resources Management Boards, schools, golf courses, caravan parks, and other members of the community.

Return to Order of Business
1. Creating barriers to roosting and feeding resources

Site managers need to differentiate between problem and non-problem sites and tailor any management strategies appropriately:

**Non-problem sites:**

- Identify suitable areas where little corellas are not problematic “non-problem sites”, and designate these areas as “sacrificial” areas where little corellas will not be disturbed

**Problem sites:**

- Identify and engage with all stakeholder groups associated with the problem site, including the local Natural Resources Management Board and local community groups who use the park
- Identify feeding and roosting resources associated with a problem site, and list priority trees for protection at that site (e.g. special heritage trees, memorial trees and trees at risk from pruning/defoliation by little corellas)
- Develop an integrated action plan to disrupt how little corella flocks use the problem site; the plan should include:
  - Revegetation activities to add screening vegetation, such as an understorey shrub layer, to reduce site attractiveness to little corellas (visual screens decrease the openness of habitat and reduce little corella perceptions of safety – remove a clear view of the surrounding area)
    - Photo panel 9 depicts a park where little corellas are not problematic; it includes spaces for recreation set amongst islands of vegetation with well-developed understorey, shrub-layers and trees
    - Photo 7 depicts a non-problem site (no management problems exist); little corellas feed on grass areas, but they do not roost there. A native woodland patch that reduces little corella perceptions of safety and limited water access decreases the overall site attractiveness to little corellas for roosting
  - Revegetation activities in an area, including street tree selection, should focus on locally native species. A council-wide approach to native plant selection should be adopted
    - Local native plants are optimal because native flora and fauna are adapted for local conditions, whereas introduced plant species provide new resources and greater risk of creating new problems (adaptive species learn to exploit new resources and have little competition, leading to increased abundance)
    - Note that if local native plants are not feasible/suitable they can be substituted for non-native alternatives that mimic the structure and character (e.g. ornamental hedges, shrubs and/or garden beds) of native vegetation to deter little corellas
  - Increased nativeness includes establishment of a complex understorey (grasses, shrubs)
    - Native shrubs reduce the openness of problem sites (vantage decreases) and their attractiveness to little corellas will also decrease
    - Complex understories also enhance biodiversity; the loss of bird biodiversity was of particular concern to the community. Noisy minors are also associated...
with open urban parks (sparse trees over irrigated lawn). Once established they dominate and exclude small birds, and they are listed as a national threatening process. Grasses, shrubs and complex tree layers will deter noisy minors and little corellas, and will prevent their attraction to the site initially (i.e. low risk, preventative management)

- Tree cover in the Adelaide metropolitan area is considered to be artificially high because the urban forest has replaced large areas of low woodlands and shrublands (Smith, 2010). Low-statured trees and shrubs help create complex layers for wildlife and should be incorporated into revegetation activities

  - Although falconry as a control technique is prohibitively expensive and any effects produced are temporary, predatory birds do cause unease within little corella flocks and these raptors may be encouraged to problem sites through the provision of low-cost specialised roosting/nesting platforms and hunting perches

  - International resources and tools are available for supplementing raptor habitat (e.g. building nest boxes for falcons), but activities in South Australia will need to target the requirements of local raptor species and should be developed with advice from local bird experts (research, trials and monitoring maybe required)

- Irrigated grass areas (including invasive environmental weeds such as kikuyu) should be reduced where possible

  - Schools and councils pay large sums to irrigate turf areas, native lawn alternatives should be used in suitable areas to replace lawn and decrease water use

  - Substituting turf for appropriate native perennial ground covers will remove food resources for little corellas, and can alleviate public fears about increased risks of snakes in tall vegetation adjacent to paths

- Protect important trees at risk using an electric track system (such as BirdJolt) to stop the use and defoliation of significant trees by little corellas:

  - These systems give a non-lethal electric fright to birds that land on it

  - The system can be moved among affected trees and in response to observations and monitoring activities

  - Displaced birds should be monitored to ensure that new roosting areas are suitable (and that the problem is not transferred elsewhere)

  - Temporary netting is also effective for excluding little corellas from trees at risk, including for medium-sized trees (e.g. Morton Bay figs; Hodgens, 2015)

- For non-tree roosts at problem sites, such as fences and buildings at the Hewett Primary School and the Strathalbyn Swimming Pool, the electric track system could also be used to deter little corellas from roosting (Photo panel 10)

  - Screening vegetation or other visual barriers (e.g. canvas screens) should also be used to deter birds from these roosts, note that little corellas will exploit areas if small gaps occur in the screens

Return to Order of Business
- **Remove declared weeds, particularly Aleppo pines**, and replace with locally native trees. Aleppo pines were common at little corella problem sites (see Photo panel 11) where they provide rich food and roosting resources
  - The weed potential of *Pinus* species, especially Aleppo pines (*P. halepensis*) in the Mount Lofty Ranges, provides sufficient justification to consider their removal from public and private lands in South Australia. Their role in exacerbating impact of little corellas at problem sites provides even a greater impetus
  - The negative affect of pine removal on yellow-tailed black cockatoos* needs to be considered carefully and incorporated into a planned replacement
  - Locally native cone-bearing plants should be included when replacing Aleppo pines
  - Contact the [Natural Resources Management Board](#) and other identified stakeholders (e.g. Bird groups) to coordinate their removal and to plan revegetation programs

- **Use dense planting of short statured trees adjacent to agricultural crops** and other open areas to reduce site attractiveness and to protect crops from little corella foraging activities (Jarman, 1986)
  - Visibility at these sites may also be reduced by synthetic screens (hessian, canvas, plastic). The low cost of these materials mean that they can be used to experiment with screen configuration
  - Manage the removal and replacement of Aleppo pines as paddock windbreaks (if not before, then particularly as these trees reach senescence)

- **Use traditional management and control activities** to deter and disrupt little corella flocks in trees at problem sites
  - Non-lethal techniques (such as noise and spotlighting) should be favoured as they are most accepted by the community (bearing in mind that some noise-producing devices can be problematic, particularly when their use is ongoing)
  - Non-lethal techniques can be more effective if reinforced by lethal deterrents. Lethal deterrents should only be used with appropriate permissions and safety considerations, and with careful consideration of community attitudes (see our section about communication barriers, discussed as part of the Community Workshop outcomes) where we discuss how acceptance of lethal deterrents may be increased where lethal deterrents are used to increase the effectiveness of non-lethal measures, where the strategic approach is understood by the community, and where lethal deterrents are clearly differentiated from lethal controls
  - Avoid trapping and gassing or falconry, which are ineffective (e.g. Temby 1999; also supported by workshop data and other data collected during this study – e.g. on the River Murray some people feed carp to encourage kites that then

---

*Calyptorhynchus funereus* (listed as Vulnerable in SA)
scare away the little corellas, but noticed little corellas returned when the kites leave)

- Coordinate with landholders to **reduce problems on private land**, and encourage communities to promote **urban biodiversity in private gardens** (collaborate with NRM groups on these activities), seek and/or promote beneficial collaborations with other groups and programs (e.g. **Paddock Tree Project** by Trees For Life)

- **Communicate with the public** about actions at problem sites; erect signs about management activities at problem sites

- Identify any **other factors that contribute** to the site being problematic. Specifically, adjacent watering areas

- Monitor and review
Photo panel 9  Beaumont Common: increasing site nativeness in urban areas also decreases site attractiveness to little corellas

Revegetation activities that include understory planting can create beautiful urban parks without compromising on a sense of openness and safety. While little corellas may still use the grassed areas, Beaumont Common was not a problem site.
**Photo 7** Enfield Memorial Park and Folland Park: a non-problem site

Managers of the Enfield Memorial Park reported that little corellas visit the site and feed on grass areas, but that no management problem exists at the site. Limited water access and decreased perceptions of safety for roosting there from a native woodland patch (3.2 hectares) likely reduces the attractiveness of this site to little corellas.

**Photo panel 10** Non-tree roosts at problem sites

Problem sites: little corellas roosting on a fence at Hewett Primary School (A) and on steel beams at Strathalbyn Swimming Pool (B)
Aleppo pines should be removed from problem sites, where possible

Photo panel 11: Aleppo pines (Pinus halepensis) were commonly found at little corella sites
A) the corner of Honeypot and South Road; B) Strathalbyn oval; C) Strathalbyn cemetery; D) Grange golf course; E) North Adelaide golf course; F) new Aleppo saplings at Royal golf course; G) Murray Bridge township; H) Aldinga township; I) Roseworthy university campus; J) windbreak at Old Noarlunga; K) windbreak at Melrose; L) Aleppo corridor at Aldinga; M) Two Wells oval
2. Creating barriers to water resources (lakes, dams, pools, ponds and rivers)

Site managers need to:

**Non-problem sites:**

- Do not disturb little corella access to water resources at non-problem sites

**Problem sites:**

- **Identify all stakeholder groups** associated with the problem site
- **Identify drinking/watering resources** associated with a problem site
- Develop an integrated action plan to **restrict access to water resources** at problem site; the plan should include:
  - For problem sites with built banks around the water bodies being used by little corellas, to **increase bank height** (or decrease water level) so the distance from bank to water level is greater than the body length of little corellas (i.e. at least 45 cm; see Photo panel 11, 12)
  - In the workshops some people were concerned that changes to bank levels would affect other birds negatively, but we observed common parkland bird species readily accessing water resources from raised banks; however, galahs are also likely to be negatively affected at problem sites. Generally, high public approval was received for this action once it was explained
  - Note that we do not propose the replacement of natural banks with built structures, but recommend the slight modification of existing structures at problem sites as an effective approach
  - When communicating this strategy, it is important to stress that water resources will not be removed, rather that little corella access to the resource is being constrained
  - If little corellas are observed using **tree snags in lakes or rivers** to land on and drink from at problem sites, then these structures should be pruned to below the water surface
  - Note that tree snags should not be removed (only trimmed below the water surface) because they are important aquatic habitat
  - For lakes and ponds with bare earth banks, a physical barrier to water resources should be created by planting **thick reed vegetation** around the edge
    - Note that vegetative barriers should be complete, small gaps may be exploited
  - If large open earth bank areas are required at problem sites, then other actions should be taken to reduce visibility (openness and clear view) and perceptions of safety near those areas. Adjacent dense tree plantings and screening shrub vegetation or material/synthetic screens to remove a clear line of sight when little corellas are drinking will decrease their perception of safety at the site, and make it a less attractive watering site
Polyethylene dam liners may also provide an effective barrier at dam sites because they are reportedly difficult for little corellas to walk on.

Swimming pool covers should be used in problem areas such as at Strathalbyn when the pool is closed (see Photo panel 8D), and used in conjunction with other deterrents.

Stock trough modifications can be very effective when targeted correctly; PVC pipe on wire around the rim of a trough creates a spinning edge as little corellas try to land and drink. Water levels could also be adjusted so that distance from edge to water level exceeds little corella body length, i.e. > 45 cm (see Photo 8)

- Stock troughs near problem sites should be targeted first
- Trough modifications will be more effective in some areas than in others, in dry areas compared to river sites for example

Landscape-level considerations: little corella problem sites may have an obvious watering point or the resource may be at an adjacent site, or not known

- See examples of problem sites relative to water resources for Bonython Park (Photo panel 13), University of Adelaide Roseworthy Campus (Photo panel 14A) and Snowtown (Photo panel 14 B-C)
- For problem sites associated with large rivers (e.g. Mannum, Taillem Bend, Murray Bridge, Loxton, Berri etc.), management activities should focus on problem sites and constraining access to water at those sites via reed plantings and screening vegetation in conjunction with other management activities

Access to river water at problem sites should also be reduced. Problematic sites along rivers have typical little corella habitat (i.e. open areas of exotic irrigated grass, and ready access to water and roosts). Water access should be reduced by reedy vegetation barriers and increased site nativeness (including native shrubs) to decrease perceived safety at the site for drinking (and for feeding on grass areas); see Photo panel 15

Monitor and review
Increase bank height

**Photo panel 12**  Limit little corella access to water resources by increasing bank height

A) we watched little corellas repeatedly try to drink water from this high bank, but they were unsuccessful; B) ducks and water fowl used the area and accessed the water from this bank; C) increasing bank height along this levee would reduce water access to little corellas, although snags in the water were also used, they were not preferred and could also be removed as part of an integrated plan; D) a favoured little corella watering resource is within reach at Bonython Park, Adelaide; raising the bank or lowering the water level will exclude little corellas

---

**Return to Order of Business**
Target water resources at landscape level

Photo panel 13 Bonython Park: an emerging resident population of little corellas

A) West Terrace ovals near Adelaide High School, and the water pond at Bonython Park (red arrow); B) little corella sites identified by the survey; C) defoliation of a roost tree adjacent to the water resource; D) little corellas drinking water at Bonython Park

Little corella sites were reported throughout the West Parklands around the Adelaide High School ovals and Bonython Park, Adelaide City. Little corellas feed on the grassed areas of these sites, and move to Bonython Park to drink (B, D). Increasing bank height at Bonython would remove this resource and would influence overall site attractiveness. An integrated plan would also include revegetation activities to increase understory areas, removal of Aleppo pines, and communication and community education components.
**Photo panel 14** Target little corella water resources associated with problem sites

A) At University of Adelaide Roseworthy Campus a water treatment pond with black plastic lining excludes little corellas, but other dams with bare banks provide ready access, and stock troughs and Aleppo pines are also abundant at the site; B-C) At Snowtown water resources of town dams are readily available to little corellas (C) and Aleppo pines are abundant (B)
(no)Barriers to river water at problem sites

Clear banks provide ready access

Photo panel 15 Little corella access to water at river sites

Open habitat with good vantage (high perceptions of safety for little corellas) and exotic grass banks with no shrubs and adjacent roosting resources at: A) Riverside Drive, adjacent to Berri Riverside Caravan Park; B) Old Noarlunga; C) Mannum Ferry Terminal; D) Many Ann Reserve, Mannum; E) Sturt Reserve, Murray Bridge; F) Long Island Boat Marina, Murray Bridge
3. Identifying and creating sacrificial areas

Sacrificial sites are:

- Identified, suitable areas deliberately set aside for little corella habitat
- Sites where no deterrence or control activities occur
- Sites that little corellas are encouraged to move into and away from problem sites
- Sites that provide suitable feeding, watering, and roosting resources
- Sites that little corellas should eventually become accustomed to and return to habitually

Note that the term “sacrificial” in this context does not imply that the site is of no value, but that the area is set aside for this purpose, to offset damage to and concern about specific sites elsewhere.

A recipe for a sacrificial site

- Is the site near or adjacent to a major creek or other suitable reliable water source?
- Does it have tall scattered gum trees (trees must not be too dense)?
- Is the habitat open with good visibility? (Can little corellas see threats coming from all directions?)
- Is the grass irrigated? If so, does little corella presence conflict with use/users?
- Is the grass slashed regularly? (Little corellas feel unsafe in long grass because visibility is reduced)
- Do the surrounding landholders want (or tolerate) the little corellas there?
- Are supplementary feeding and watering provisions required during roost establishment?
  - Water provision (e.g. a trough) may be sufficient in the long-term
- Are the birds free of harassment at this site and on surrounding properties (e.g. from shooting)?
  - Birds should not be harassed when commuting to and from this site

Broader considerations for sacrificial sites

- Previously when little corellas have been displaced from their usual roosting (problematic) site, where did they go?
  - Do they always go to the same location?
  - Is this location suitable as a sacrificial site, or is it a “no go” location for the community?
- Is it better that they stay where they are?
- Local councils may need to experiment with the flock by deliberately displacing them to determine their behaviour and site preferences
- Little corellas may in part seek out townships for reasons of safety, including:
  - A general absence of predators (e.g. eagles); and/or to
  - Escape hostility in the surrounding landscape (e.g. shooting)
- Councils must cooperate to ensure that they don’t play “aerial ping-pong” with little corella flocks
- Councils must monitor and review their sacrificial site strategies

An important consideration for all sacrificial areas is what actions are co-occurring at problem sites to make the sacrificial area effective as a management tool. Isolated management tools won’t work. Little corellas need to be discouraged from problematic sites and, simultaneously, encouraged to sacrificial sites.
Little corella management tool – Master model and management scenarios

The little corella management modelling tool has been developed to increase understanding of the complex relationships among factors influencing little corella problem sites. The model is necessarily simplified in order to make it comprehensible. The model (depicted in Figure 15) was developed in Mental Modeler and is available for download at: http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/projects/little-corellas/community-models/

The model is general and may need to be adapted to local conditions. Table 9 includes descriptions of each of the components in the model. Table 10 provides some working examples of different management scenarios:

- Increasing sacrificial areas ONLY
- Increasing lethal population control ONLY
- Noise deterrents ONLY
- Noise deterrents and lethal deterrents
- Increase understory plantings (shrub layer) ONLY
- Public education ONLY
- Do nothing (i.e. little corella problem sites increase)
- Integrated management

Three integrated management case studies are also provided:

1. Aldinga
2. Hawker township
3. Hewett Primary School

Instructions in the use of Mental Modeler are available online and are also included as Appendix 6 of this report.
Figure 15  The master model created during the Little Corellas project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Model component</strong></th>
<th><strong>Component description and influence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Little corella problem site</em></td>
<td>Identified, specific locations where little corella presence is problematic to some members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resources</td>
<td>Typically, problem sites and resident flocks have water access: rivers, creeks, wetlands (natural and reconstructed), effluent ponds, dams, and stock troughs. Water resources decrease as nativeness of vegetation, tree density and understorey plantings increase (visual barriers decrease little corella perceptions of safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to water</td>
<td>Physical barriers can reduce access to water, including stock trough modifications, dam lining, reeds at water edge, increased bank height, and other screens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food resources</td>
<td>Typically, problem sites have food access including: irrigated grass, agricultural spillage, crops, exotic pines and open ground. Food resources decrease as nativeness of vegetation, tree density and understorey plantings increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roost resources</td>
<td>Typically problem sites are roosting areas, resources include low density tall trees in open habitat. Roost resources decrease as nativeness of vegetation, tree density and understorey plantings increase and bird fright systems increase. Roost resources also increase roost dwell time and public experience of noise, mess and damage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Management actions</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management costs</td>
<td>All control activities (indicated by asterisk * in the model) incur a cost; cost vary among activities, e.g., <em>lethal population control</em> is more expensive than <em>spotlighting</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting early arrivals</td>
<td>Control activities that target early arriving little corellas (ahead of the main flock) will be more effective than actions delayed until the flock resides at the problem site. By targeting early arrivals, managers aim to reduce the chance of resident flock and alter habitual behaviour of flocks from returning to that roost in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual behaviour</td>
<td>Little corellas flock to sites habitually; targeting early arrivals may deter main flocks from problem site. Resident flocks increase with habitual use of problem sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance of resident flock</td>
<td>Resident flocks are small groups of little corellas that reside year-round at problem sites instead of dispersing for several months in the cool periods. These flocks are increasing in some areas, and resident birds increase incidences of problem sites when the main flock returns to join them there. Reliable and freely-available water, food and roost resources increases the chance of resident flock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise deterrents</td>
<td>These control measures are all linked to management costs and to reducing little corella sites; the weighting of their cost and influence varies among techniques. For example, <em>falconry</em> has high management costs and little negative influence on problem sites, <em>lethal deterrents</em> have a lower relative cost and greater affect in conjunction with other actions (strategic effort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal deterrents</td>
<td>From our survey and workshops we found that <em>noise deterrents</em>, <em>lethal deterrents</em> and <em>spotlighting</em> also had various levels of negative influence on site amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal population control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotlighting/lasers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric fright system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrificial areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncoordinated control actions</strong></td>
<td>These activities, including non-strategic shooting nearby, undermine coordinated actions and may increase problem sites. <em>Uncoordinated actions</em> also decrease the effectiveness of <em>sacrificial sites</em> as a management tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information sharing and research, process formalised</strong></td>
<td>A cohesive approach enhances effectiveness of strategic tools, such as <em>sacrificial sites</em>, and decreases problem sites. It also increases <em>public education</em>, <em>public awareness of issues</em>, <em>public opinion of management actions</em>, and <em>public acceptance of little corellas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public education</strong></td>
<td>Education includes <em>information sharing</em>; it enhances <em>public awareness of problems</em>, <em>public acceptance of little corellas</em> and <em>public opinion of management actions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Component</td>
<td>Component Description and Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increasing site nativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativeness of vegetation</td>
<td>Revegetation programs, restoring sites with native plants, decreases problem sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree density</td>
<td>Increasing tree density tends to reduce roosting resources for little corellas, because they like tall sparse trees in open landscapes for good visibility (perception of safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understorey plantings</td>
<td>Revegetation programs, restoring and amending sites to enhance understory vegetation (especially shrubs) with local native plants, reduces problem sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird biodiversity</td>
<td>The range of bird species present at the problem site; we found no evidence that little corellas decrease bird biodiversity at problem sites (often sites are in townships with already reduced bird biodiversity). However, increasing site nativeness and improving understory vegetation will benefit bird biodiversity at managed sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black cockatoos</td>
<td>These birds enhance overall bird biodiversity, and share some food resources with little corellas (e.g. pine nuts); therefore, if food resources for little corellas are reduced then black cockatoos may also be affected (the model will flag this impact and it needs to be considered carefully as some black cockatoos are endangered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little corellas’ concern for safety</td>
<td>A clear field of view provided by open habitat increases little corella perceptions of safety and their association with a particular site. Increasing the nativeness of vegetation, tree density and understory plantings will decrease site vantage and problem sites. Raptors also decrease perceptions of safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat corridors</td>
<td>These areas include creek lines, which provide favourable habitat (food, water roost resources) for little corellas and increase problem sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other site factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site amenity</td>
<td>Amenity at the problem site; site amenity will decrease at problem sites; noise controls may also decrease amenity, but reducing the problem will enhance amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visitors</td>
<td>Visitors are linked to site amenity, including tourists; site visitation will decrease as little corella site problems increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little corella roost dwell time</td>
<td>The time spent by little corellas in tree roosts at problem sites; roost resources will increase dwell time and the more time that little corellas spend there the more opportunity for the public to experience noise, mess and damage to trees by the birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public experience and opinion of little corellas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public experience of noise, mess and damage</td>
<td>Includes experience of damage to trees and infrastructure, and droppings and tree debris (mess). This component increases with increases in problem sites, and decreases with their reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of cleaning up after little corellas</td>
<td>These costs increase with problem sites, as public experience of mess, noise and damage increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public acceptance of little corellas</td>
<td>As problem sites decrease, public acceptance of little corellas increases. Public acceptance also decreases as experience of impacts and associated costs increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion of management actions</td>
<td>Public opinion decreases with increases in problem sites, and opinion of actions increase as problem sites decline (i.e. the public want effective actions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness of problems</td>
<td>Problem sites and their impacts will increase public awareness of management issues, so does information sharing and public education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10  Outcomes of simple and integrated little corella management scenarios

The Mental Model enables managers to see where trade-offs and benefits occur for different scenarios; Table 8 shows components that increased and decreased, and the level of effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT SCENARIO</th>
<th>INCREASES</th>
<th>DECREASES</th>
<th>OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Management costs (-0.02)</td>
<td>Little corella problem site (-0.03)</td>
<td>Poor: very little effect on decreasing little corella problem sites, and management costs accruing sacrificial areas only work with measures taken at problem sites to discourage little corellas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrificial areas ONLY</td>
<td>Noise, mess and damage (-0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing outcomes of simple and integrated little corella management scenarios]
### MANAGEMENT SCENARIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASES</th>
<th>DECREASES</th>
<th>OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increasing lethal population control ONLY</strong></td>
<td>Management costs (0.03)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing the increase in management costs (0.03) for the increasing lethal population control ONLY scenario.]
**Noise deterrents ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT SCENARIO</th>
<th>INCREASES</th>
<th>DECREASES</th>
<th>OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Little corella problem site (-0.02)</td>
<td>POOR: very little effect on deceasing little corella problem sites, site amenity is negatively affected, and management costs accrued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site amenity (-0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public opinion of management actions (-0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site visitors (-0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, noise deterrents may be effective as part of an integrated strategy.
### Management Scenario

**Noise deterrents AND lethal deterrents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Costs (0.03)</th>
<th>Increases</th>
<th>Decreases</th>
<th>Overall Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management costs (0.03)</td>
<td>Little corella problem site (-0.04)</td>
<td>Site amenity (-0.10)</td>
<td>Public opinion of management (-0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visitors (-0.01)</td>
<td>Noise, mess and damage (-0.01)</td>
<td><strong>POOR-MODERATE</strong>: using noise and lethal deterrents together enhances the effect of the control measures and decreases problem sites. Some perceived loss of amenity also occurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Management Scenario

**Increase understory plantings (shrub layer) ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increases</th>
<th>Decreases</th>
<th>Overall Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Site management costs (0.06)</td>
<td>• Little corella problem site (-0.08)</td>
<td>MODERATE: small effect on decreasing little corella problem sites, broad positive influence otherwise, for comparable management costs to other isolated actions (sacrificial site, lethal population control or noise deterrents ONLY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bird biodiversity (0.05)</td>
<td>• Food resources (-0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Little corellas' concern for safety (0.05)</td>
<td>• Roost resources (-0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site visitors (0.01)</td>
<td>• Water resources (-0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site amenity (0.01)</td>
<td>• Chance of resident flock (-0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public experience of noise, mess and damage (-0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public awareness of problems (-0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Little corella roost dwell time (-0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT SCENARIO</th>
<th>INCREASES</th>
<th>DECREASES</th>
<th>OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public education ONLY</td>
<td>Public acceptance of little corellas (0.10)</td>
<td>Little corella problem site (-0.01)</td>
<td>POOR-MODERATE: little effect on decreasing little corella problem sites; however for comparable costs to other single-action strategies, considerable public engagement (acceptance, awareness, opinion of actions) is achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public opinion of management (0.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public awareness of problem (0.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management costs (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MANAGEMENT SCENARIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASES</th>
<th>DECREASES</th>
<th>OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>Noise, mess and damage (0.13)</td>
<td>Site amenity (-0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e. little corella problem sites increase)</td>
<td>Public awareness of problems (0.06)</td>
<td>Public acceptance of little corellas (-0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs of cleaning up (0.02)</td>
<td>Public opinion of management (-0.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Graph

[Graph showing various factors and their impact ratings]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT SCENARIO</th>
<th>INCREASES</th>
<th>DECREASES</th>
<th>OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated management</strong></td>
<td>Site costs (0.25)</td>
<td>Chance of resident flock (-0.46)</td>
<td>VERY HIGH: very strong effect on reducing little corella problem sites, broad positive influence, very strong influence on reducing chance of resident flock (and creation of more problem sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting early arrivals</td>
<td>Little corellas’ concern for safety (0.15)</td>
<td>Public experience of noise, mess and damage (-0.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrificial areas</td>
<td>Public acceptance of little corellas (0.13)</td>
<td>Little corella roost dwell time (-0.30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to water, food and roost resources</td>
<td>Public opinion of management (0.12)</td>
<td>Little corella problem site (-0.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase tree density, nativeness of vegetation and understorey plantings</td>
<td>Native bird biodiversity (0.08)</td>
<td>Water resources (-0.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric fright system</td>
<td>Site amenity (0.05)</td>
<td>Black cockatoos (-0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>Management costs (0.04)</td>
<td>Habitual behaviour (flocks returning to problem sites) (-0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site visitors (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public awareness of problem site (0.01)</td>
<td>Costs of cleaning up after little corellas (-0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study 1: Aldinga

Recommended actions:

- Revegetate open roadside areas to increase shrub cover (and visual screening) and reduce foraging opportunities and perceptions of safety for little corellas
  a. Dense plantings of low-statured trees is also effective and low maintenance
  b. Use temporary material/synthetic screens to deter birds from revegetated areas
- Remove declared weeds, especially Aleppo pines, replace with local plant varieties
- Create a visual and/or physical barrier to water through planting reeds around dam edges, installing a dam liner, and increasing density and cover of native plants in adjacent areas
- Install barriers to stock troughs in the area
- Consider the social impact of removing significant trees, even declared weeds. Old trees need to be replaced eventually and local native species should replace them. More shrub and screening vegetation should occur around the oval to make it less attractive to little corellas overall
- Install a non-lethal electric bird fright system to deter little corellas from roosting in severely defoliated trees; move the system to affected (problematic roosting) areas as required
- Provide information materials for the public, consult and engage all stakeholders
- Monitor and review
Model actions were:

- Increase barriers to water
- Increase tree density
- Increase public education
- Increase understorey and nativeness of vegetation
- Increase electric fright systems

Management outcomes

- Large decreases occur for: little corella problem sites; access to water, food and roost resources; chance of resident flock
- Noise, mess and damage (and costs of cleaning up) and roost dwell time also decreased
- Large increases occurred for site costs, little corellas’ concern for safety, public opinion of management and native bird biodiversity
- Public awareness of problem increased (with public education); management costs and site amenity and site visitors increased slightly
- Black cockatoos decreased slightly because of reduced access to Aleppo pine resources, this management action should be considered closely and planned with advice from NRM and bird groups
Case study 2: Hawker Township

Recommended actions:

- Town dam (circled in red):
  - a) Install temporary hessian/canvas/shade cloth screens to fill in the gaps in existing vegetation and create a visual barrier to the water
  - b) Revegetate the gaps (over time) to create a long-term closed visual barrier to water
  - c) Install a dam liner to help conserve water
  - d) Consider removal of the tree at the dam site, (risk: high public opposition exists for tree removal generally), or
  - e) Install a non-lethal electric fright system (e.g. BirdJolt) within the tree to deter the birds from using it as safe retreat
    - Move the system around to other problematic areas in Hawker
- Modify stock troughs near the town to exclude little corellas; review and amend access to all water resources near other problem sites (hospital, golf course, and racecourse), including secondary dams (circled in orange)
- Increase understory vegetation and tree density at other problem sites (e.g. golf course)
- Install temporary signage to let local people know what is being done, and why
- Monitor and review
Management actions were:

- Target early arrivers
- Establish sacrificial areas
- Noise and lethal deterrents
- Establish barriers to water resources
- Increase tree density, vegetation understorey and nativeness
- Coordinate response, share information
- Electric fright system

Management outcomes

- Large decreases occur for: little corella problem sites; water, food and roost resources; site amenity; noise, mess and damage
- Uncoordinated control actions, habitual behaviour, roost dwell time and costs of cleaning up also decreased
- Large increases occurred for: site costs; little corellas’ concern for safety; public acceptance of little corellas; native bird biodiversity; management costs; public opinion of management
- Black cockatoos decrease slightly; whenever this outcome is flagged management should consider closely the activities and plan them with advice from NRM and bird groups. However, black cockatoos do not occur in this area so this flag is not locally relevant and action can proceed
Case study 3: Hewett Primary School

Recommended actions:

- Revegetate around water resources to create a visual and physical barrier
- Revegetate understorey and increase tree density throughout the area (excluding oval)
- Revegetate bare ground areas around the school to remove foraging opportunities
- Use sturdy tree guards and/or temporary material screens at revegetation sites to deter birds from the area while the plants establish
- Install a non-lethal electric fright system on affected buildings, fences or trees to remove roosting resources; move system around to different areas as required
- Install temporary signage at the site to let local people know what is being done, and why
- Monitor and review
Management actions were:

- Establish barriers to water, reduce food and roost resources
- Increase tree density, vegetation understorey and nativeness (remove bare ground)
- Public education
- Electric fright system

Management outcomes

- Large decreases occur for: little corella problem site; chance of resident flock; noise, mess and damage; roost dwell time; water resources; costs of cleaning up
- Large increases occur for: site costs; little corellas’ concern for safety; public acceptance of little corellas; public opinion of management; native bird biodiversity; site amenity
- Management costs, public awareness of problem and site visitors also increased
- Black cockatoos decreased slightly; this management action should be considered closely and planned with advice from NRM and bird groups
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**Appendix 1: Local council areas or authorities represented by participants in the Little Corella Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council Area or Authority</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Local Council Area or Authority</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide City Council</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>District Council of Mount Barker</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Hills Council</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>District Council of Mt Remarkable</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrina Council</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>District Council of Orroroo Carrieton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berri Barmera Council</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>District Council of Renmark Paringa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbeltown City Council</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>District Council of Steaky Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Charles Sturt</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>District Council of Tumby Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Holdfast Bay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>District Council of Yankalilla</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Marion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kangaroo Island Council</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mitcham</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kingston District Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mt Gambier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Light Regional Council</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Onkaparinga</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Mid Murray Council</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Playford</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Municipal Council of Roxby Downs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Adelaide Enfield</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Naracoorte Lucindale Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Lincoln</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northern Areas Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Prospect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Outback Communities Authority</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Salisbury</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Port Augusta City Council</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tea Tree Gully</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Port Pirie Regional Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Unley</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regional Council of Goyder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Victor Harbor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tatiara District Council</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Torrens</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>The Barossa Council</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The City of Burnside</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation of the Town of Walkerville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The City of Norwood, Payneham &amp; St Peters</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council Ceduna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Coorong District Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Barunga West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Corporation of the City of Whyalla</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Cleve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Flinders Ranges Council</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Coober Pedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Rural City of Murray Bridge</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Grant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Town of Gawler</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Karoonda East Murray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wakefield Regional Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Kimba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wattle Range Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Loxton Walkerie</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yorke Peninsula Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Mallala</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Relationships between measures and demographic variables and two underlying factors (Concern for impact and Intrinsic-value).

Relationships were tested with non-parametric correlations (Spearman’s rho, ρ). Statistically significant, meaningful results are highlight with coloured cells, with green cells indicating a positive relationship and red cells indicating a negative relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Concern for impact factor (ρ)</th>
<th>Intrinsic-value factor (ρ)</th>
<th>Explanation/Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General opinion of little corellas</td>
<td>-0.722*</td>
<td>0.104*</td>
<td>Strong negative relationship between general opinion of little corellas and concern for impact factor scores (typically, opinion of little corellas decreased as impacts increased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion of little corellas at primary site</td>
<td>-0.715*</td>
<td>-0.114*</td>
<td>Strong negative relationship between general opinion of little corellas at primary site and concern for impact factor score (typically, opinion decreased as impacts increased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of little corellas site to home</td>
<td>-0.135*</td>
<td>0.067*</td>
<td>Weak relationship, but directions of relationships are relative: as distance from little corellas sites increases, concern for impacts decrease (slightly) and the intrinsic factor increases (slightly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest no. of little corellas seen at a site</td>
<td>0.254*</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>Weak correlation between numbers of little corellas and concern for impact factor, in intuitive direction: impacts increase as little corellas numbers increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often you notice little corellas in summer (frequency)</td>
<td>-0.138*</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>Weak and no relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the LAST 5 YEARS, what has happened to little corellas in your area?</td>
<td>0.529*</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>Typically, people who feel populations have increased score higher on the concern for impact factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the NEXT 5 YEARS, what would you like to see happen to little corellas in your area?</td>
<td>-0.695*</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>No significant relationship between numbers of little corellas and intrinsic-value factor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Concern for impact factor (ρ)</th>
<th>Intrinsic-value factor (ρ)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.093*</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>Weak positive correlation. No significant relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with natural environment</td>
<td>0.194*</td>
<td>0.115*</td>
<td>Weak positive relationship: the directions and strengths of these relationships are interesting... It's not just people concerned for the natural environment that love corellas and are not concerned about the impacts of little corellas... while these people might typically be a slightly higher on the intrinsic-value factor, they are also slightly higher on the concern for impact factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Mann-Whitney U)</td>
<td>Male: 372</td>
<td>Female: 412</td>
<td>Makes typically scored significantly greater concern for impact factor scores than did females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a significant difference between males and females on the intrinsic-value factor.
Appendix 3: Participant comments and responses made during the community workshops supporting the value or approach of the workshops, the complexity of the issue, changing opinions and other observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Participant comments and responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| About the workshop              | • that was "a really valuable workshop"  
• One participant said that the modelling program was excellent, and that they could see lots of applications for the program in community engagement activities  
• At the end of one workshop we asked whether there was anything else that participants would like to cover regarding little corellas, one participant said: "you've covered it pretty well" |
| Participation in the workshop   | • In several workshops some people indicated initially that they would not be participating. Yet many of these people couldn't help participating and contributing when the discussion turned to their areas of interest or experience  
• One participant said that he wasn't going to come to the workshop because he felt frustrated with the history of little corella management. He felt that management too often consisted of releasing documents and he wanted to see actions being implemented. However, he was glad that he had attended the workshop, he could understand the process and why it was important, and he hoped to see some action soon. He was happy to see that something was happening |
| About little corella management | • “you can see how complex it is”  
• “people think too simplistically about the issue; they’re looking for silver bullets”  
• We found some appetite for long-term approaches to little corella management: ... a “long-term project is needed”; “Public education on the impacts of corellas and other over-abundant species, including kangaroos and koalas is important. I am in favour of addressing the causes of overabundance and management actions to reduce numbers”  
• People felt that the numbers were increasing  
• People said that they didn't know what the council was doing; they wanted to know what other councils were doing; others felt that council actions were focused on council assets only  
• Some participants felt that "poor farm hygiene" (i.e. spilled grain) contributed to problems with little corellas; few farmers participated in the workshops and it was suggested that little corellas were preferred to rabbits or mice for cleaning up the grain |
| Attitudes and changing opinions | • “there were things I hadn't considered”  
• Some people were surprised to find that they didn't know or understand what other people in their community were thinking about the issue; some people were surprised to see how frustrated others were about little corella management  
• One participant said that they liked little corellas, but could now understand how they would not want them in their tree  
• Another participant said that they could now see both sides of the issue |
Appendix 4: Supporting information for state-wide and Mount Lofty Ranges suitable habitat models

Figure 4.1 State-wide model: the response of little corellas to distance (m) to nearest: A) river red gum; B) major creek; C) irrigated green space; and D) pine tree. The blue shading indicates variability.
Figure 4.2  The response of little corellas to distance (m) to nearest: A) irrigated green space; B) major creek; C) pine tree; and D) red gum. The blue shading indicates variability.
Figure 4.3  Average predicted habitat suitability for little corellas relative to number of: A) agricultural properties; B) irrigated green spaces; and C) residential properties within a 1 km radius of any given location.
Pattern versus proportion (%) of land uses

- The pattern of surrounding land uses was a better predictor of little corella presence than the relative proportion (%) of each land use
- Pattern analysis: The best land use predictors of little corella presence were the number of: 1) recreation spaces (i.e. irrigated green spaces); 2) agricultural properties; and 3) the number of residential blocks within 1 km radius (Appendix 4)
- Proportion (%) analysis: although poorer predictors of presence, the results of this analysis were in agreement with the above pattern analysis

Native vegetation cover

South Australia

- An analysis of native vegetation cover suggested that it was the number of woodland patches within a 12 km radius that was the biggest determinant of little corella presence
- Habitat suitability increased as the number of woodland patches increased indicating a preference for highly fragment environments

Mount Lofty Ranges

- The results of our analysis suggested that little corellas generally avoided bushland areas and preferred highly fragmented patches of native vegetation (i.e. vegetation along roads/rivers, surrounding ovals and in council parks and gardens). The best predictor for little corellas was the number of patches of woodland within a 3 km radius at any given point
Appendix 5: List of little corella sites surveyed during the project

Adelaide Aquatic Centre
Adelaide High School ovals
Aldinga Arts Eco Village
Aldinga Football Club
Barossa Tourist Park and ovals
Beautiful Valley Caravan Park
Birdwood High School oval
Birdwood Park, football oval
Bonython Park / Tulya Wardli
Bowman Park and caravan park, Crystal Brook
Bute Rd, Snowtown
Carpark opposite Aldinga Hotel
Christies Beach High School
Christies Beach Primary School
Clayton Bay Boat Club
Clayton Bay Wetlands Caravan Park
Clonlea Park
Collins Reserve, Kidman Park
Corner of Willyaroo Rd and Nine Mile Rd
Coulthard Reserve
Cnr Honeypot and Main South Rd
Cruising Yacht Club of South Australia
Crystal Brook grain silos
Curdndatta Park, cricket club on Davies Rd
Eastern Fleurieu School
Eastern Fleurieu School Strathalbyn R-G Campus
Entrance to Melrose
Evanston Gardens Primary School
Flinders Park Football Club oval
Forsyth Reserve
Gawler & Barossa Jockey Club
Gawler and District College B-12
Gawler Aquatic Centre
Gawler Caravan Park
Gawler Oval Complex
Gawler Primary School
Gawler Railway Station
Goolwa Oval
Goolwa Regatta Yacht Club
Goolwa wharf area
Grange Recreation Oval Reserve
Hackham Football Club
Hawker Golf Course
Hawker Memorial Hospital
Hawker race course
Hewett Primary School
Huntfield Heights Primary School
Imperial Football Club Inc.
Investigator College
Karbeethan Reserve
Keith Stephenson Park
Lakala Reserve
Laratina Wetlands
Le Messurier Oval
Lockleys oval
Lockleys Reserve
Long Island Reserve, boat marina
Luard St, Milang
Mannum Caravan Park
Mannum Community College oval
Mannum Ferry Terminal
Marcellin Technical College
Market Square Reserve
Mary Ann Reserve
Melrose Caravan and Tourist Park
Melrose Primary School
Middleton Cemetery, Lines Rd
Milang Bowling Club and park area
Milang Football Club
Milang Lakeside Caravan Park
Mount Barker High School
Mount Barker Showgrounds
Mount Barker South Primary School
Mt Barker-Hahndorf Golf Club
Mt Barker-Hahndorf Golf Club
Murray Bridge Golf Club
Murray Bridge High School ovals
Narungga (Park 25) oval area
Noarlunga Football Club
Noarlunga Private Hospital
North Adelaide Golf Club
North Haven Golf Course
North Haven Primary School OSHC
Nuriootpa Bowling Club
Nuriootpa High School
Nuriootpa Linear Park
Nuriootpa Primary School
Nuriootpa War Memorial Swimming Pool
Oaklands Wetland and Reserve
Ocean View College
Old Noarlunga Primary School
Opposite Leitchs Roseworthy Hotel car park
Palmer western end of town in sugar gums
Pinkerton Creek Rd, Pinkerton Creek
Port Augusta foreshore area
Port Augusta Golf Club
Port Elliot Oval
Port Noarlunga Primary School
Public park on Haines Rd
Public park on Hindmarsh Blvd
Quorn and District Memorial Hospital
Quorn Caravan Park
Quorn Oval
Railway Station Park
Roseworthy grain silos
RLS Recreation Reserve
Sandy Creek Golf Club - Barossa Valley (formerly Gawler Golf Club)
Sandy Creek Primary School
Seaford wetlands
Seaton High School
Small reserve btw Martin St and Mindarie St
Snowtown Primary School
Soldiers Memorial Gardens
Soldiers Memorial Gardens, Middleton
Soldiers Memorial Park (Chase View Tce), Hawker
South Lakes Golf Club Inc.
South Tce opposite Pulteney School
State Sports Park
Stoney Creek, Quorn
Storm water retention basin
Strathalbyn Caravan Park
Strathalbyn cemetery, Park Av
Strathalbyn Childrens Centre and reserve
Strathalbyn Football Club
Sturt Reserve
Symonds Reserve
Tailem Bend Ferry Terminal
Tailem Bend Golf Course
The Grange Golf Club
The Royal Adelaide Golf Club Inc.
Trinity College Gawler
Two Wells Football & Netball Sporting Club
Two Wells Primary School and Hart Reserve
University of Adelaide Roseworthy Campus
Victor Harbor oval
Victoria Park Racecourse
Virginia Primary School
Virginia Recreation Park, football oval
West Terrace Cemetery
Whispering Wall park area
Wilfred Taylor Reserve
Willaston Cemetery
Williamstown Primary School
Wilmington sports ground
Appendix 6: Using Mental Modeler for the Little Corella project

The Little Corella project is being run by the Discovery Circle, a citizen science initiative at the University of South Australia: [http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/](http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/)

Part of the Little Corella project will use Mental Modeler which is an easy-to-use conceptual modelling computer program. It is designed to help individuals and communities identify the components of complex problems. It can also assist users to explore how identified components relate to each other. For the Little Corella project, we are using this program to:

1. Define components that contribute to problem sites (related to little corellas)
2. Define the strength of the relationships between these components
3. Run scenarios to test how the model might react to a range of possible actions

Tools required

You will need:

- A computer with internet access.
- A compatible internet browser such as Google Chrome or Mozilla Firefox.
- **Note:** the program does not work in some other internet browsers, like Internet Explorer
  - If you want to install Google Chrome, it is free to download [click here](http://www.google.com/chrome)
  - If you want to install Mozilla Firefox, it is free to download [click here](http://www.mozilla.com)
  - **Note:** if you are using a work computer, you might need administrator privileges to install new programs.

Instructions

These step-by-step instructions will enable you to open the little corella model that has been sent to you. You will be able to:

(a) add or remove components
(b) define relationships between components
(c) define strengths of these relationships
(d) run your own scenarios
Opening a model in Mental Modeler

1. If you are opening a model that was emailed to you, you must first save the file on your computer. The file name will end with the extension type for mental modeller files: .mmp

2. Open the online version of Mental Modeler, at: http://dev.mentalmodeler.com/

Note: If you have attended a workshop, you will notice that the online version of the program looks a little different. The online version has a few useful extra features, but the processes to use the program are the same.

3. Click “Load” to open your model, find your saved model, and then click “Open”.

4. The model will appear on the screen and the file name will appear in the “Files” column on the left.

Viewing a model in “full screen” mode

This mode allows a little more space to work.

1. Click on the icon near the top-right of the screen.

2. A box will appear, asking “Allow full screen with keyboard controls?”

3. Click “Allow”.

4. To exit full screen mode, click “Esc” on your keyboard or click on the screen.
Adding or removing components

You can add any component that you think is important to the little corrella issue. A component needs to be measurable (i.e. something that can increase or decrease). For example, “trees” could be a measurable component, with the measurement being the number of trees. Importantly, the number of trees can increase or decrease. Components can include things like:

- Biological or ecological considerations, such as food, habitat or shelter
- Management considerations, such as deterrents or costs
- Social considerations (for people), such as the amenity of parks, the value of biodiversity, acceptance or annoyance

1. **To add a component:** Click on the button at the top of the screen. Enter a name for the component, use something intuitive that describes the component well (e.g. trees), and move the component around the screen by dragging it with the mouse.

2. **To remove a component:** activate the component by hovering your cursor over it – the component will light up and the icons of a bin (above) and an arrow (below) will appear. Click on the bin to remove the component.

- **Note:** please keep track of the components that you add, or ones that you remove from the original model, because we would like to see your models after you have worked on them.

Adding relationships between components

1. Activate the component by hovering your cursor over it.

2. **Direction of relationship**

   Left click on the arrow icon and hold the mouse button down while you drag the arrow to a second component that you want to link with.

   - **Note:** the arrow defines the direction of the relationship between the components. In the example below, “Rain” has an influence on “Crop production”, but “Crop production” does not influence “Rain”. Therefore the arrow points from rain to crop production. A good rule of thumb when defining relationships is to ask yourself: When One Component increases, does the other component, increase or decrease? In the example below, when rain increases, crops tend to increase.
3. **Strength of relationships**

The strength of the influence can also be defined. In the online version of *Mental Modeler*, the strength of the relationship is defined using a slide bar (see examples below). A good rule of thumb is to ask whether it increases a lot, a little or decreases a lot or a little.

**Note:** This process is different in the desktop version of Mental Modeler that was used in the Little Corella workshops. The online version allows a more fine-scale adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE A</th>
<th>EXAMPLE B</th>
<th>EXAMPLE C</th>
<th>EXAMPLE D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Bar in middle of slide**
  - (Strength = 0)
  - In this example, rain has an affect on crop production, but the strength is not defined

- **Bar at top of slide**
  - (Strength = 1)
  - In this example, rain has a highly positive influence on crop production, where heavy rain would be expected to generate high crop production

- **Bar between middle and top of slide**
  - (Strength = 0.5)
  - In this example, rain has an moderately positive influence on crop production, where heavy rain would be expected to generate moderately high crop production

- **Bar at bottom of slide**
  - (Strength = -1)
  - In this example, rain has an highly negative influence on crop production, where heavy rain would be expected to generate very low crop production

---
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Running scenarios with *Mental Modeler*

Running scenarios with *Mental Modeler* will give insights into effective management actions (What will work? What are the trade-offs?) For example, in models about little corella problem sites, we would expect that a scenario involving the removal of all trees would also have a negative influence on the little corellas at problem sites. However, such an action would also have consequences elsewhere in the model, like the loss of park amenity and biodiversity. The types of connections between your components will determine how your model behaves under different scenarios.

1. To begin a scenario, click on the “Scenario” tab near the top-right of the screen. In this view, all the components of your model will be listed down the left-hand side of the screen.

![Scenario Tab Image](image1)

2. In the “Files” column on the left of the screen, click “ADD” to create a new scenario (you can add as many as you like). Above the list of components a space will appear where you can name the scenario – see “barriers to water” in the image below.

3. You can then create a scenario by adjusting the strength and direction of one or more components:
   - In the +/− column, click on the arrow corresponding to the component that you want to adjust and a slide bar will appear.
   - Move the slide bar to indicate the change of relationship that you want. A graph will appear (and update automatically) as you manipulate the components.

4. Once you have created scenarios, you can use the “File” column on the left of the screen to look at each scenario or move back to the model.

![Scenario Adjustment Image](image2)
Interpreting the scenarios

The example below was generated using a model from a trial workshop. A scenario was created where “water availability” was reduced as much as possible. The columns in the graph indicate where the trade-offs occurred under this scenario. You can see that the Corella problem locations were decreased. Other components that decreased under this scenario were habitat, bad experiences of little corellas, and frequency of encounters. Conversely, two components increased, namely Little corella acceptance and park amenity.

Note: When evaluating the scenarios, it is helpful to consider what the future might look like under the conditions you have set. If your scenario results are counter to your intuitive understanding, it could mean your model needs to be refined. You can go back and check:

- If a relationship between components has been overlooked (e.g. perhaps a connection needs to be added).
- If the relationships between the variables are correct (e.g. perhaps there is a positive relationship when a negative relationship is more appropriate).
- If the strengths of the relationships are correct. Adjustments in the strengths of relationships can have a surprising influence on outcomes of scenarios.

107
Saving your model

1. Click the “Save” tab at the top screen.

![MentalModeler](image)

2. You will be asked to name the file and choose a location to save it in. Change the File name to include your surname and the date, for example:

   **Scanlon 12 Dec 2015.mmp**

3. **Note:** the default file name will have “.mmp.mmp” at the end. You only need one .mmp at the end of your file name (you can delete the other one).

4. Please send the file to us (e-mail: discoverycircle@unisa.edu.au); we would appreciate a short summary of the changes that you have made (e.g. new components, plus interesting scenarios or observations about the model). Thank you!!

Additional resources for Mental Modeler

- **Mental Modeler:** [http://www.mentalmodeled.org/#resources](http://www.mentalmodeled.org/#resources)
- **Discovery Circle:** [http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/](http://www.discoverycircle.org.au/)
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12.10 REPORT TITLE: DRY AREA APPLICATION 2018
DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018
FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/28199
ATTACHMENTS: ATTACHMENT 1, DOC/18/17501 – Hahndorf Dry Area map
ATTACHMENT 2, DOC/18/17499 – Nairne Dry Area map
ATTACHMENT 3, DOC/18/17497 – Keith Stephenson Park Dry Area map

Key Contact
Yelaina Eaton, Senior Community Development Officer, Community Connections.

Manager/Sponsor
Greg Parker, General Manager, Council Services

Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:
Goal Area 1: Community Wellbeing
CW 2.1: Build a community that works in partnership with government and non-government organisations to achieve real and long-lasting improvements in safety and wellbeing.

Annual Business Plan 2017/18:
N/A

Purpose:
To seek Council endorsement for the application to the Minister for a continuous Dry Area licence for identified areas within Hahndorf, Keith Stephenson Park and Nairne (attachments 1, 2 and 3) per Section 131 of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997.

Summary – Key Issues:
1. The Dry Area licence covering identified areas within Hahndorf, Keith Stephenson Park and Nairne expired in July 2017.
2. A review of current and potential areas that could benefit from being Dry Areas was undertaken by staff in consultation with key stakeholders including SAPOL, business and community. The unanimous response was in favour of retaining the existing dry areas.
3. A continuous Dry Area Licence is sought for the areas identified in attachments 1, 2 and 3.

Recommendation:
That Council endorse the application for a continuous Dry Area Licence per Section 131 of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 for:
- Hahndorf,
- Nairne, and
- Keith Stephenson Park

(Refer attachments 1, 2 and 3.)

---

**Background:**

1. A ‘dry area’ is a declared area where the consumption, and/or possession of alcohol is prohibited per Section 131 of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. The purpose of dry area legislation is to curb alcohol-related problems in public areas. A person who consumes or has possession of alcohol in a dry area is guilty of an offence, which carries a maximum penalty of $1,250.

2. Since 2005 identified areas within the townships of Nairne, Mount Barker and Hahndorf were declared dry areas where the possession and consumption of alcohol were banned in response to community problems caused by the misuse of alcohol.

**Discussion:**

3. During February and March this year the suppliers of liquor, residents associations, SAPOL, our Federal Member for Parliament and the broader community were consulted about the proposal for the three areas in the Mount Barker district to become continuous dry areas.

4. Feedback, written and verbal, has been received from SAPOL, Nairne and Districts Residents Association, Wallis Cinemas and Hahndorf Community Association and a number of community members who attended the public consultation meeting on 13 March 2018.

   a. Unanimously the community supported the continuation of the current dry areas previously endorsed by Council citing that the dry areas have had a positive impact on the reduction of anti-social behaviours.

   b. The Community identified a need for Dry Area re-education for licence holders and patrons.

   c. There was some discussion about extending Dry Area licensing to cover River Road in Hahndorf and Gawler Street in Mount Barker.

      i. In response to these comments SAPOL and Council’s Planning, Policy and Strategy and Public Health & Safety teams were engaged to assess the need for the inclusion of additional Dry Areas.

      ii. Feedback suggested no evidence of alcohol related problems existing in these areas that would justify the application for a dry area licence and that monitoring and review should continue.

      iii. Based on this consultation it is not recommended that additional areas be included in the 2018 Dry Area application.
**Community Engagement:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informing only</th>
<th>Community was notified and engaged in the following ways:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Council’s website,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advertisement in the Courier,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Email to residents associations, business associations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoteliers, SAPOL and affected businesses, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community engagement session at the Hahndorf Institute Hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision to be made</th>
<th>To endorse the application for a continuous Dry Area Licence for Nairne, Mount Barker and Hahndorf per attachments 1, 2 and 3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key factors to be considered in decision (dot points)</td>
<td>The implementation of Dry Areas in 2005 has had a positive impact and improved amenity of the selected locations by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Curbing anti-social behaviour, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving community safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of community influence</td>
<td>The community want to retain the existing Dry Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Their local and historical knowledge of the existing areas suggest that prior to the Dry Area licencing in 2005 there was significant anti-social behaviour and unsafe environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of consultation, informing community &amp; cost</td>
<td>Community was notified and engaged in the following ways:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Council’s website,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advertisement in the Courier,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Email to residents associations, business associations, hoteliers, SAPOL and affected businesses, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community engagement session at the Hahndorf Institute Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to stakeholders/Council</td>
<td>Feedback on the process will be communicated through:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Council’s website, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Email to residents associations, business associations, hoteliers, SAPOL and affected businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe for consultation</td>
<td>Consultation occurred between 21 February and 16 March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community input</td>
<td>Feedback, written and verbal, has been received from SAPOL, Nairne and Districts Residents Association, Wallis Cinemas and Hahndorf Community Association and a number of community members who attended the public consultation meeting on 13 March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Unanimously community supported the continuation of the current dry areas previously endorsed by Council citing that the dry areas have had a positive impact on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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reduction of anti-social behaviours.

b. There was some discussion about extending Dry Area licensing to cover River Road in Hahndorf and Gawler Street in Mount Barker.

i. In response to these comments SAPOL and Council’s Planning, Policy and Strategy and Public Health & Safety teams were engaged to assess the need for the inclusion of additional Dry Areas.

ii. Feedback suggested no evidence of alcohol related problems existing in these areas that would justify the application for a dry area licence and that monitoring and review should continue.

iii. Based on this consultation it is not recommended that additional areas be included in the 2018 Dry Area application.

| Recommendations | To endorse the application for a continuous Dry Area Licence for Nairne, Mount Barker and Hahndorf per attachments 1, 2 and 3. |

**Policy:**
There is no existing policy.

Dry Areas are supported by the Strategic Plan 2035: Goal Area 1, Community Safety, Public Health and Wellbeing.

**Budget:**
N/A

**Statutory/Legal:**
Section 131 of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997.

**Staff Resource Requirements:**
N/A

**Environmental:**
N/A

**Social:**
The community want to retain the existing Dry Areas.

Their local and historical knowledge of the existing areas suggest that prior to the Dry Area licensing in 2005 there was significant anti-social behaviour and unsafe environments.
**Risk Assessment:**
The risks identified with not continuing the dry areas include:
- Reduction in police power for expiating those consuming alcohol in public places,
- Reputational damage to Council for not supporting community safety,
- Increased incidence of drunk and disorderly behaviours in Nairne, Hahndorf and Keith Stephenson Park.

There are no identified risks of continuing the dry areas.

**Asset Management:**
Current Dry Area signs will need to be updated to meet the requirements of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997.

**Conclusion:**

That Council endorse the application for a continuous Dry Area Licence for the identified areas within Nairne, Mount Barker and Hahndorf per attachments 1, 2 and 3.

---

**Previous Decisions By Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>HPRM Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 April 2012</td>
<td>12/21288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Dry Zone Application 2012

Purpose: To recommend that Council endorses the continuation of Dry Zones licences for a period of 5 years.
Mount Barker Dry Areas

Annotations
- Mount Barker Area 2
- Mount Barker Area 1

Assets - Roads
- Roads DPTI
- Roads

Property - Cadastral Boundaries
- Property Boundary

Attachment 3 to Item 12.10
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Mount Barker 2035 – District Strategic Plan:
Governance and Leadership

Purpose

To allocate ward donation funds to individuals or organisations.

Summary – Key Issues

1. Council has allocated an amount for 2017/18 of $15,268 which equates to $1,388 for each Council Member to allocate to individuals and/or groups at the Council Members’ discretion. This is known as a Ward Allowance.

2. At each Council Meeting, Council Members may nominate individuals or groups to which a donation from their Ward Allowance will be made.

Recommendation

That Council will make the following donations, given that each Member nominating the donation has given careful consideration to whether there is a conflict of interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Member</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Group/Individual</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

1. Council receives many requests for assistance from individuals, community members and community groups. Requests may be received by Council Members via telephone, letter or via email, or direct to Council.
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2. Council has allocated an amount for 2017/18 of $15,268 which equates to $1,388 for each Council Member to allocate to individuals and groups at the Council Members’ discretion. This is known as a Ward Allowance.

3. This Ward Donation practice has been in place for over 16 years.

4. The Representation Review process (completed in September 2013) ensures equal representation (Council Member per elector) in each Ward. No change was made to the number of Councillors in each Ward. This process ensures the amount of Ward Allowance available to the community is equal between each of the Wards.

5. At the end of each financial year, a report of the expenditure of Ward Allowances will be reported to Council.

**Ward Donation Procedures**

6. Members receive a print-out indicating how much is still to be spent.

7. Individual members of the community or community groups may require small financial assistance for projects/initiatives of community interest and benefit from Council.

8. These requests should be made directly to the Mayor and/or Council Members for their consideration/assessment.

9. Any requests received directly by Council will be acknowledged by the Executive Assistant to the Chief Executive Officer and Mayor, and advised that any such requests received will be provided to all Council Members who may choose to contribute some funds from their annual Ward Allowance.

10. When determining donations, Council Members should consider the community interest/benefit to be received and enjoyed by the community at large as a result of that donation.

11. As per section S73-75A of the Local Government Act 1999 Council Members should also consider and assess any material, actual or perceived conflict of interest as a result of making a particular donation or voting on the donations.
12. At each Council Meeting, Council Members may nominate members of the community or community groups to receive a donation from their Ward Allowance. These donations are reflected in the Council meeting minutes, available on Council’s website www.mountbarker.sa.gov.au

13. Council Members are encouraged to advise the Executive Assistant to the Chief Executive Officer and Mayor as soon as possible of any requests for ward donations received in advance of Council meetings in order for such requests to be included in the Council meeting agenda. The form can be found on the extranet under Forms.

14. When making a donation in the Council Meeting, the Elected Member should:
   
a. Declare who the donation is to be made to, the amount and the purpose of the donation; and
   b. Complete and submit a Ward Donation Form to the Minute Secretary (Sue Miller).

**Community Engagement**

| Informing only | Notification by way of Council minutes. Recipients will be notified of any donation. |

**Policy**

There are currently no Council Policies in relation to Ward Donations.

**Budget**

The budget allocation for Ward Donations is $15,268 which equates to $1,388 recommended expenditure by each Council Member. Any unallocated ward allowance balance is not carried over to the next financial year.

**Statutory/Legal**

There are no statutory/legal implications or requirements in relation to Ward Donations.

**Section 73-75A of the Local Government Act 1999:**

However, Elected Members should be mindful of material, actual or perceived conflict of interest that may arise as a result of making a ward donation.

**Staff Resource Requirements**

This is incorporated into the existing responsibilities of the finance staff.

**Environmental**

There are no environmental implications arising from this report or its recommendations.
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Social
Ward donations enable individual members of the community and community
groups to request small donations to assist with their endeavours.

Risk Assessment:
It is the responsibility of each Council Member to assess the risks association with
the ward donations.

Asset Management:
There are no asset management implications arising from this report or its
recommendations.

Conclusion
Council Members have the opportunity to make ward donations.

Key Contact
Sue Miller, Executive Assistant to Chief Executive Officer & Mayor

Manager or Sponsor of Project
Andrew Stuart, Chief Executive Officer
13. INFORMATION REPORTS
NIL
14. QUARTERLY REPORTS

Recommendation
That the following report be noted.

14.1 REPORT TITLE: ADELAIDE HILLS REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY QUARTERLY REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: 3 APRIL 2018

FILE NUMBER: DOC/18/25850

ATTACHMENTS: 1 – DOC/18/27451 - KEYOUTCOMES SUMMARY

Key Contact
Ros McDougall, Risk & Governance Officer, Infrastructure and Projects

Manager/Sponsor
David Peters, General Manager Corporate Services

Purpose:
To provide a quarterly report on the outcomes of Adelaide Hills Region Waste Management Authority Board.

Summary – Key Issues:
- Ongoing review of the Charter.
- The Supreme court case hearings have been completed and it is anticipated that a decision will be handed down in the second half of this calendar year.

Background:
1. Adelaide Hills Region Waste Management Authority “AHRWMA” is a regional subsidiary comprising Adelaide Hills Council, Alexandrina Council, Rural City of Murray Bridge and Mount Barker District Council and its role is to coordinate waste management and recycling on behalf of its member Councils.

Discussion:
2. Attached is the Key Outcomes Summary from the Board Meeting on 22 February 2018. As advised at the January meeting, Council receives a summary on a quarterly basis to ensure effective communication to each of the constituent Councils (shareholders) of the Authority. This is one of the recommendations that has been made from the Auditor General’s governance audit.
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3. Three important matters for Council to be aware of are:

- The Board endorsed a response to the fire at Thomas Foods, whereby an ‘at cost’ rate was determined for disposal of material
- Following a review of the Hooklift operation, a Tender Process has been completed for the purchase of a new Hooklift Vehicle
- Review of the Authority Charter has commenced with a workshop being held on 15 March 2018.

4. Minutes and agendas of the Board’s meetings are available on the Authority’s website.

**Conclusion**
Quarterly reports will keep Council updated on matters involving the AHRWMA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Decisions By Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adelaide Hills Region Waste Management Authority

Key Outcomes Summary from Board Meeting 22nd February 2018

GOVERNANCE and STRATEGIC

- The AHRWMA Audit Committee met on 14th February where the following reports were received and reviewed;
  - SECOND QUARTER 17/18 FINANCES AND STATISTICS
  - SIGNIFICANT TRANSACTIONS REPORT
    The Audit Committee received, reviewed and noted the Significant Transactions Report for the period.
  - THOMAS FOODS FIRE RESPONSE
  - HOOKLIFT TRUCK TENDER UPDATE
  - BUSINESS BANKING ONLINE DOCUMENTATION
  - BANK LOAN RENEWAL
  - CHARTER REVIEW STATUS UPDATE
  - GOVERNANCE REVIEW ACTION PLAN

- The Acting EO has progressed with the Charter Review, utilising the services of Carolyn Vigar from Tanom Legal to review the latest version of the Charter and prepare an updated Charter with annotations for discussion. The Board received the annotated Charter and resolved to undertake a workshop to consider the discussion points, before the Acting EO progresses to undertake a workshop with Member Council CEOs and relevant staff, in order to finalise the revised Charter.

- The Brinkley Lease has been finalised and common seal affixed, which has now been returned to the Murray Bridge Council for signing. The lease is backdated to commence on 14th of February 2016, expiring on the 13th of February 2021, with 1 right of extension of 5 years. This brings the lease expiry to 2026 and in this time the AHRWMA will progress with determining a longer term tenure option with RCMB.

- The Acting EO submitted feedback regarding the EPA’s Energy from Waste discussion paper.

- Comments have been provided via the Adelaide Hills Council regarding the State Government’s disaster waste management plan.

- The AHRWMA is maintaining informed of the current issues facing the recycling industry surrounding the China Ban and is communicating with stakeholders, including WMAA and other Regional Subsidiaries on this topic.

FINANCIAL

- All areas of operations are currently tracking to budget, with the exception of legal costs, which is projecting an unfavourable variation of $254,000.

- While legal costs are unfavourable, we have also seen an increase in customer income, with a favourable variation of $248,000.

- It is not anticipated that there will be any further legal costs this financial year and therefore the Board considered and adopted an additional expense of $254,000 for legal costs within budget review 2 (BR2).

- The landfill has been receiving additional customer income on a consistent basis, which is up by 819 tonnes in comparison to the same time last year. The Board considered and adopted that an additional $248,000 be included within BR2 for customer income. Due to the additional income, the EPA levy expenses were also increased by $43,000.

- All other areas of the finances are currently tracking in line with the budget.

- The overall position is projecting a net operating deficit of $608,000, compared to an original budget of $559,000 deficit as per BR1.

- Taking into consideration current abnormal costs to the end of December (legal fees of
$724,000) the underlying business performance would be $112,000 favourable.

Managerial

- The construction of Brinkley Cell 8 is now complete and EPA approval gained to use this cell for waste disposal.
- The Board endorsed a response to the fire at Thomas Foods, whereby an at cost rate has been determined for disposal of this material.
- Following a review of the hooklift operation a Tender Process has been completed for the purchase of a new Hooklift Vehicle.
- A licence amendment process has been completed with EPA approving receiveal of non-friable asbestos at the Brinkley Transfer Station site for transport to a licenced disposal facility and utilisation of cell 7 (the fire cell) for hard waste from the Transfer Stations.
15. **MAYOR’S REPORT**

16. **MEMBERS’ REPORTS**

17. **QUESTIONS ARISING FROM COUNCIL MEETING**

18. **CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS**
   
   NIL