

**Estimates and Financial Operations Committee
2017-18 Council Budget Estimates Hearings
Supplementary Info**



Department of Fire and Emergency Services:

Supplementary Info D1:

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: My next question is a fairly long one. I refer to budget paper No 2, volume 1, page 320, "Significant Issues Impacting the Agency". The third dot point refers to the ESL. Could the minister please provide a breakdown of the total ESL collected per local government authority for the year 2016–17 and the forecast for 2017–18?

The CHAIR: That is the emergency services levy, and you want information provided about how much is being collected by local government area?

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Yes. That is the first part of my question.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: I will ask Mr Pasquale to answer the question, certainly with the information he has available.

Mr PASQUALE: We do not have that level of detail available this evening, but we do publish on the DFES website an array of information in regard to the emergency services levy in terms of collections and grant allocations. I am happy to provide that level of detail.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: I am happy with Mr Pasquale's suggestion. I just make the point that in this place, we never refer members to websites. We are always very happy to ensure that they get the information available. Honourable member, we will certainly provide what we can by way of supplementary information.

The CHAIR: So, ESL by LGA is D1.

[Supplementary Information No D1.]

Answer:

The Emergency Services Levy (ESL) assessed by each Local Government Authority for the year 2016-17 and the forecasts for 2017-18 are presented in the attached table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	2016-17 ESL ASSESSMENT	2017-18 PROJECTED ESL
ALBANY CITY	2,657,942.86	3,057,870.16
ARMADALE CITY	8,077,185.59	8,964,626.69
ASHBURTON SHIRE	445,697.14	473,861.74
AUGUSTA-MARGARET RIVER SHIRE	790,523.07	844,410.11
BASSENDAN TOWN	2,382,207.00	2,353,199.00
BAYSWATER CITY	9,897,602.04	9,487,054.00
BELMONT CITY	8,648,684.81	8,355,537.93
BEVERLEY SHIRE	100,821.24	107,232.92
BODDINGTON SHIRE	85,626.00	90,375.00
BOYUP BROOK SHIRE	93,635.74	100,757.83
BRIDGETOWN-GREENBUSHES SHIRE	241,837.05	255,266.53
BROOKTON SHIRE	52,205.01	55,595.01
BROOME SHIRE	927,285.28	982,596.45
BROOMEHILL-TAMBELLUP SHIRE	56,587.00	60,075.00
BRUCE ROCK SHIRE	50,652.83	53,870.71
BUNBURY CITY	3,877,522.63	4,086,050.62
BUSSELTON SHIRE	2,000,890.77	2,134,549.78
CAMBRIDGE TOWN	4,629,409.21	4,951,917.00
CANNING CITY	16,168,300.62	17,312,553.48
CAPEL SHIRE	524,690.00	990,344.73
CARNAMAH SHIRE	35,997.00	38,250.00
CARNARVON SHIRE	235,383.37	248,113.82
CHAPMAN VALLEY SHIRE	62,504.00	66,675.00
CHITTERING SHIRE	198,516.00	210,600.00
CLAREMONT TOWN	2,434,731.31	2,508,051.31
COCKBURN CITY	14,769,238.71	15,974,236.53
COLLIE SHIRE	357,905.22	378,247.93
COOLGARDIE SHIRE	222,756.07	221,040.82
COOROW SHIRE	82,786.00	87,825.00
CORRIGIN SHIRE	59,690.90	63,027.97
COTTESLOE TOWN	1,503,698.71	1,565,827.92
CRANBROOK SHIRE	60,563.00	64,200.00
CUBALLING SHIRE	47,996.00	50,550.00
CUE SHIRE	30,034.12	31,507.51
CUNDERDIN SHIRE	64,901.58	72,651.90
DALWALLINU SHIRE	69,466.76	72,961.63
DANDARAGAN SHIRE	269,772.03	274,050.00
DARDANUP SHIRE	524,942.93	591,793.31
DENMARK SHIRE	300,747.76	321,062.58
DERBY-WEST KIMBERLEY SHIRE	193,299.09	202,696.20
DONNYBROOK-BALINGUP SHIRE	246,759.37	260,737.97
DOWERIN SHIRE	40,541.00	43,950.00
DUMBLEYUNG SHIRE	38,115.54	40,559.21
DUNDAS SHIRE	65,672.94	70,193.06
EAST FREMANTLE TOWN	1,184,501.88	1,243,925.57
EAST PILBARA SHIRE	475,139.57	502,332.08
ESPERANCE SHIRE	651,274.35	685,697.93
EXMOUTH SHIRE	189,456.00	198,743.81
FREMANTLE CITY	7,022,812.55	7,414,786.85
GINGIN SHIRE	393,236.66	414,548.26
GNOWANGERUP SHIRE	66,314.00	76,575.00
GOOMALLING SHIRE	53,179.00	57,842.52
GOSNELLS SHIRE	12,865,922.02	13,348,892.00
GREATER GERALDTON CITY	3,197,943.67	3,337,426.47
HALLS CREEK SHIRE	62,393.64	66,149.85
HARVEY SHIRE	968,185.57	1,064,753.36
IRWIN SHIRE	203,500.11	214,985.89
JERRAMUNGUP SHIRE	85,626.00	90,450.00
JOONDALUP CITY	20,094,979.19	21,507,895.00
KALAMUNDA SHIRE	5,973,084.03	6,260,991.46
KALGOORLIE/BOULDER CITY	2,720,348.82	2,852,552.70
KATANNING SHIRE	168,739.83	178,184.03
KELLERBERRIN SHIRE	60,727.40	67,456.86
KENT SHIRE	33,298.90	35,025.00
KOJONUP SHIRE	85,948.20	91,031.16
KONDININ SHIRE	51,049.00	53,775.00
KOORDA SHIRE	27,903.00	29,850.00
KULIN SHIRE	41,035.80	45,000.00
KWINANA TOWN	4,985,165.89	5,032,466.53

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	2016-17 ESL ASSESSMENT	2017-18 PROJECTED ESL
LAKE GRACE SHIRE	76,639.23	84,687.39
LAVERTON SHIRE	43,091.50	45,406.02
LEONORA SHIRE	125,089.75	134,311.65
MANDURAH CITY	7,174,611.03	7,633,484.82
MANJIMUP SHIRE	434,025.54	458,719.48
MEEKATHARRA SHIRE	64,575.83	67,354.98
MELVILLE CITY	14,529,503.25	15,358,394.20
MENZIES SHIRE	44,105.71	43,800.00
MERREDIN SHIRE	155,621.69	166,586.63
MINGENEW SHIRE	26,057.00	27,450.00
MOORA SHIRE	110,114.17	116,540.72
MORAWA SHIRE	40,269.63	43,011.00
MOSMAN PARK TOWN	1,371,880.77	1,388,382.28
MOUNT MAGNET SHIRE	34,429.26	39,937.73
MOUNT MARSHALL SHIRE	34,648.00	37,500.00
MUKINBUDIN SHIRE	30,175.00	31,725.00
MUNDARING SHIRE	3,007,404.26	3,136,116.57
MURCHISON SHIRE	2,485.00	2,625.00
MURRAY SHIRE	678,014.46	735,952.30
NANNUP SHIRE	83,036.40	87,865.34
NAREMBEEN SHIRE	43,878.00	46,200.00
NARROGIN SHIRE	224,635.74	239,526.67
NEDLANDS CITY	3,771,071.25	3,873,656.58
NGAANYATJARRAKU SHIRE	284.00	300.00
NORTHAM SHIRE	489,839.78	523,325.48
NORTHAMPTON SHIRE	237,176.43	247,819.85
NUNGARIN SHIRE	14,715.00	15,750.00
PEPPERMINT GROVE SHIRE	329,725.53	351,487.00
PERENJORI SHIRE	31,240.00	35,475.00
PERTH CITY	26,460,204.18	22,318,771.60
PINGELLY SHIRE	60,320.01	63,619.03
PLANTAGENET SHIRE	251,973.90	268,799.54
PORT HEDLAND SHIRE	1,414,127.67	1,486,762.48
QUARADING SHIRE	58,631.83	61,906.58
RAVENSTHORPE SHIRE	127,293.41	134,297.26
ROCKINGHAM CITY	10,709,842.70	12,096,430.54
KARRATHA CITY	1,752,221.28	1,847,034.39
SANDSTONE SHIRE	9,798.00	10,200.00
SERPENTINE-JARRAHDALE SHIRE	1,210,297.77	1,398,640.90
SHARK BAY SHIRE	52,395.72	55,300.16
SOUTH PERTH CITY	6,482,980.67	7,085,325.61
STIRLING CITY	33,385,016.22	34,230,134.00
SUBIACO CITY	4,638,168.69	4,476,314.38
SWAN CITY	17,669,338.67	18,061,970.43
TAMMIN SHIRE	24,018.51	26,150.57
THREE SPRINGS SHIRE	31,524.00	33,450.00
TOODYAY SHIRE	222,885.00	237,226.10
TRAYNING SHIRE	26,270.00	28,050.00
UPPER GASCOYNE SHIRE	6,461.00	7,125.00
VICTORIA PARK TOWN	6,173,055.40	6,507,961.54
VICTORIA PLAINS SHIRE	40,044.00	42,375.00
VINCENT TOWN	6,183,036.93	6,673,663.45
WAGIN SHIRE	96,267.04	101,543.40
WANDERING SHIRE	27,903.00	30,000.00
WANNEROO CITY	20,815,829.35	22,070,716.62
WAROONA SHIRE	200,443.56	217,607.78
WEST ARTHUR SHIRE	43,262.00	46,950.00
WESTONIA SHIRE	17,253.00	17,025.00
WICKEPIN SHIRE	38,269.00	40,425.00
WILLIAMS SHIRE	48,498.34	51,157.60
WILUNA SHIRE	25,063.00	26,775.00
WONGAN-BALLIDU SHIRE	72,250.73	77,249.64
WOODANILLING SHIRE	26,199.00	27,675.00
WYALKATCHEM SHIRE	35,465.99	37,444.07
WYNDHAM-EAST KIMBERLEY SHIRE	367,298.32	387,686.29
YALGOO SHIRE	17,395.00	14,775.00
YILGARN SHIRE	92,474.02	95,743.38
YORK SHIRE	200,704.68	211,951.82

**Estimates and Financial Operations Committee
2017-18 Council Budget Estimates Hearings
Supplementary Info**

Department of Fire and Emergency Services:

Supplementary Info D2:

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: I imagine some of this will need to go on notice as well. Would the minister please provide a complete account of how the ESL was allocated in the last financial year, broken down by service—that is, CSRS, FFRS, VSS, VBFB, VMRS, DFES, admin, SES, and others?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: I will ask Mr Pasquale to respond to that question.

Mr PASQUALE: You will note that the service outcomes that are defined in the *Budget Statements* are not on that basis. By “services” you are referring to, I guess, stakeholder groups and the services that are part of DFES. DFES operations are structured on a kind of multi-hazard approach. That is not articulated in the *Budget Statements* to that level of detail. That is not something we would have on hand or available with that level of detail.

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Can we possibly get that level of detail later?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: Member, because we do not measure or collect the data in the way that you have asked for us to provide it, it would take a significant bit of work to do it. I will ask Mr Pasquale to advise what possibly could be provided by way of supplementary that might be helpful to you. It will not go all the way. I think it will be quite significant work. I ask Mr Pasquale to suggest what information may be available.

Mr PASQUALE: What we could do is look at all the direct costs associated with those particular services that you referenced and allocate those directly. But not all programs are broken down by service. Corporate overheads, for example, and other programs that support all those different services are not articulated and broken down to each of those services. So if we could limit it to the direct costs, that would be something that we are able to produce.

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Thank you.

The CHAIR: They will, as clearly as they possibly can, allocate that to direct costs rather than the list of services and programs that you read out. They will do the best that they can.

[Supplementary Information No D2.]

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: On the same issue that we have just addressed, I think the commissioner wants to make a point. If you are okay with that, Madam Chair, it is supplementary information to the answer that has been provided.

Mr KLEMM: I want to elaborate a little, if I may. Although Mr Pasquale and DFES will provide the information that you requested, I want to explain that it may not end up being a fair representation of where all of the ESL is spent. The example I give is that a new truck for the State Emergency



Service might be far cheaper to purchase than a new truck for the Volunteer Fire and Rescue Service. We might buy and fabricate five trucks for the SES and five trucks for the VFRS, as an example, and one will add up to \$500 000 more than the other one, even though if you are not looking at the dollars, both services are getting five trucks. I guess further to that when we talk about corporate costs—what Frank is referring to—there is a broad range of things and that could be training. We have costs associated with developing training packages and those training packages may be used just for career firefighters or they might be used for career firefighters and State Emergency Service volunteers, and so the cost are not broken down across all the different services. I wanted to get that matter on the record.

<041> P/2

[6.50 pm]

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: The other one I would not mind information to would be to provide a complete account on how the ESL was allocated in the last financial year. Once again, it states here that broken down by expense type salaries, new appliances, PPE, cleaning vehicles—the list goes on. I will submit that online and maybe we can get some more detail later.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: Okay.

Answer:

DFES records expenditure by cost centres which are defined by its internal structure rather than allocating to a specific “service type”. To accurately record costs by “service type”, activity based costing would be required.

As DFES does not currently perform detailed activity based costing, it has provided a summary of 2016-17 direct operating expenditure primarily funded by the ESL for each “service type”. Please refer Attachment 1 for details.

Note: Attachment 1 provides a list of operating expenditure allocated to “service types” as defined by DFES to meet the intent of this question and does not include the ESL allocated toward capital works for that year. In addition, some of the expenditure allocation provided has been funded by other minor revenue sources. This revenue was used in conjunction with the ESL to fund the delivery of DFES services and is not able to be separately allocated to specific “service types”.

Summary of ESL funded 2016-17 Operating Expenditure by "service type"

"SERVICE TYPE"	ESL Funded 2016-17
	Operating expenditure \$'000s
Community Engagement	2,071
Aboriginal Advancement Unit	747
Built Environment Branch	3,481
Hazard Planning	3,428
Capability Command Advisory Service Branch	1,038
Office Of Bushfire Risk Management	3,708
Bushfire Mitigation Branch	1,012
Academy	12,735
Operations Readiness And Standards	2,987
Asset Planning And Delivery	19,779
Operations	2,339
Country Operations	24,105
Metro Operations	8,485
Career Fire and Rescue Services (CFRS)	120,762
Volunteer Fire and Rescue Services (VFRS)	8,210
Volunteer Fire and Emergency Services (VFES)	261
Private Fire and Rescue Services (PFRS)	224
Volunteer Bushfire Brigades (VBFB)	30,012
State Emergency Service (SES)	5,858
Community Emergency Services Managers (CESM)	2,887
Special Operations	3,081
State Operations	10,353
Spatial Services	1,086
Aviation Services	14,118
State Wide Operational Response Division (Sword)	724
Marine Services	7,331
Comprehensive Fire Crew Protection	4,028
Critical Messaging System	1,848
Volunteer And Youth Services	833
Chaplain And Wellness Services	1,662
Radio Communications	5,067
Digital And Social Media Communications	1,105
ESL Fees And Charges To Local Govt And Landgate	5,502
Corporate Services	44,750

**Estimates and Financial Operations Committee
2017-18 Council Budget Estimates Hearings
Supplementary Info**

Department of Fire and Emergency Services:

Supplementary Info D4:

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: Thank you for the question. It is a political issue; a political decision has been made, so I cannot ask my advisers to comment on the issue.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: That is fine.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: If you are okay, I ask that we take that question on notice and we will provide a supplementary answer from the minister himself in relation to that. It is not appropriate for the advisers to respond to it. I think the minister needs to respond to it.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: That is quite reasonable, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR: Honourable member, can I get a summary of what you want.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Once the cap is reached in both the metropolitan and regional budget, at that point will no more funds be expended to volunteers?

[Supplementary Information No D4.]

Under the Volunteer Fuel Card Scheme, each BGU has a limit of \$1,000 on their fuel card. Once the \$1,000 limit is reached, the card is no longer able to be utilised by the BGU, as per the terms and conditions of the Scheme.

The total approved expenditure for the Volunteer Fuel Card Scheme is \$1.139 million for 2017-18 (\$1 million Royalties for Region funding and \$0.139 Consolidated Account funding). Given that there are less than 1,000 BGUs that are eligible to apply for the Volunteer Fuel Card Scheme across WA State, it is unlikely that the expenditure limit will be fully spent.



**Estimates and Financial Operations Committee
2017-18 Council Budget Estimates Hearings
Supplementary Info**

Department of Fire and Emergency Services:

Supplementary Info D5:

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: At what point was that budgetary decision made? It was in the budget papers; questions were asked. Again, I apologise via you rather than your department, so it is a little unfair to put you on the spot —

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: I am in the hot seat, member —

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Unfortunately; that is why you get the big dollars, as the minister.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: — so do not feel sorry for me.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Can you tell us at what point the decision was made to limit both accounts to \$1 million and at what point the \$1 000 limit on an individual unit and brigade or group was established in terms of time frame?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: I understand it has been a very recent decision. In terms of what day and when, I will have to take that on notice. I know that the Premier spoke about it yesterday on the radio and the minister put out a press release yesterday about it. In relation to when the decision was made, I will take that question on notice.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Either on notice or supplementary information; whichever is easier for you.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: I will provide it as supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No D5.]

The decision to fund the extension of the program and amend the regional component of the Fuel Card Scheme to \$1,000 was made as part of the budget review process.

The decision to align the metropolitan component with the regional component was made on the 16 October 2017.



**Estimates and Financial Operations Committee
2017-18 Council Budget Estimates Hearings
Supplementary Info**

Department of Fire and Emergency Services:

Supplementary Info D6:

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: I am happy with that. I refer to page 323 of budget paper No 2, volume 1, and "Training and Organisational Resourcing Services", and the line item "Average Cost per Participant to Deliver Pathways Training". How many individuals participated in the pathways training for each year listed? Some of this could be quite onerous, so I am happy to take this on notice. I have some follow-up questions to that.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: If the member is okay with that, we will take that question on notice. There is probably a bit of work that needs to be done to put that list together. We will provide that by way of supplementary.

[Supplementary Information No D6.]

Answers:

Supplementary Information No D6. – Clarification from S. Paterson

The 2016/17 figures are:

1,880 individuals (operational DFES volunteers - does not include Bush Fire Services) participated in pathways training

Volunteer Fire and Rescue Services	816
Volunteer Fire and Emergency Services	192
Volunteer Marine Rescue Services	172
State Emergency Services	<u>886</u>
	2,066

Of the 2,066 course participants, 186 were dual registered volunteers and so are only counted once.

Also, please note this is the first year we counted Volunteer Marine Rescue Services participants.



1

**Estimates and Financial Operations Committee
2017-18 Council Budget Estimates Hearings
Supplementary Info**

**Department of Fire and Emergency Services:
Supplementary Info D7:**

The CHAIR: When you say “each year listed”, which years do you mean? Do you mean 2015–16 and 2016–17?

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Yes; through the budget period.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: Just clarifying, was that for 2015–16 and 2016–17? Ms Paterson has indicated that she might have some information at hand, so we might be able to provide it to you now.

Ms PATERSON: I can provide you with some information for 17 August 2017. It is broken down by service. The number of pathways registered volunteers from the VFRS is 1 851; from the VFES, there are 473; from the SES, there are 1 519; and from the VMRS, there are 460 volunteers registered.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: Does that suffice?

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Yes, very much so. I will put the second part of the question on notice. I will read it out. I think it is too long. Could you please provide a breakdown of the number of participants in each of the listed years by service type—that is CFRS, VFRS and SES?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: I think Ms Paterson has answered that question for the current financial year. I think that is the same question. We can certainly provide that answer for 2015–16 and then obviously this year is already on the record from what the member just asked a few minutes ago. Am I correct, honourable member?

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Yes, you are right.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: By way of supplementary, we are able to provide that breakdown, I understand, for the year 2015–16, and we will provide that by way of supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No D7.]

In 2015/16 the breakdown by service was:

1,808 individuals (operational DFES volunteers - does not include BFS) participated in Pathways training

Volunteer Fire and Rescue Services	854
Volunteer Fire and Emergency Services	194
State Emergency Services	<u>799</u>
	1,847

Of the 1,847 course participants, 39 were dual registered volunteers and so are only counted once.



**Estimates and Financial Operations Committee
2017-18 Council Budget Estimates Hearings
Supplementary Info**

Department of Fire and Emergency Services:

Supplementary Info D8:

Hon KEN BASTON: On page 321 under "Explanation of Significant Movements", note 1 at the bottom of the page states —

Following a 2016–17 audit finding, the methodology for determining the number of community Bushfire Ready Groups established has been revised ...

What was the methodology change?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: Member, thank you for the question. I will ask Ms Paterson to provide a response to that question.

Ms PATERSON: I cannot provide that exact detail here. I would need to take that on notice or take it as a supplementary question and provide you with that answer if you are comfortable with that. There is a fairly detailed definition around volunteers, how the group is formed and the number of people in the group, from memory. To give you the correct answer, I would need to go back to the audit finding.

Hon KEN BASTON: I thought it might have been simpler than that.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: If the member wants that, I am happy to provide that information by way of supplementary.

[Supplementary Information No D8.]

The methodology change related to the definition of what constituted a Bushfire Ready Group from *"A group with a Bushfire Ready Facilitator and/ or at least one Street Coordinator, working together to deliver the program to residents in a street or defined area supported by a local bushfire brigade"* to *"A Bushfire Ready Facilitator or Street Coordinator, working with community to deliver bushfire preparedness to residents in a defined area."*

This change allowed DFES to capture not only Bushfire Ready Facilitators but also Street Coordinators as groups.

