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CATHAO RLEACH Members, take your seats please. We'11 start the meeting. Two votes of sympathy that we'11 do today. That will be the only business, other than the local property tax that we'11 deal with today. MS. GALLAGER: Cathaoirleach, for Mary Mullaney, mother of Ian our colleague and for Tony Murphy brother of our colleague Christine Flood. CATHAO RLEACH we'11 stand please.

## [ ONE M NUTE' S SI LENCE MAS OBSERVED]

CATHAOI RLEACH Members, Chief Executive.
MR. CURRAN Members, we're in the process, as you know, of preparing the budget for 2019. There's some very significant challenges this year. They were there last year but there's some extra ones this year. The local property tax, as you know, $20 \%$ of that goes into the equalisation fund. There's nothing we can do about that. Even the $80 \%$ we keep, 1.7 million of that goes to self-fund housing. Again, we've made representations to the Department in relation to that and we'11 continue to do so.

Commercial rates, we can't really because we are in the middle of a harmonisation process so there's no flexibility there.
we have, coming at us next year, national pay agreement, pay restoration. we got $80 \%$ funding for that last year. We won't get anymore this year.

We have additional pension costs, 200 council staff will be eligible to retire over. The next five years. In addition to that, new recruits don't contribute to our pension scheme, they pay into a single public services pension scheme which hits us pretty hard. There's a loss of income of 60,000 there. Again, we've 14:02 made our case to the Department.

The 700,000 that was allocated for the LPT capital, that now goes down to 500. We have previously been able to use the excess income in RES, the housing partner, again that is ring-fenced this year which hits us as well.

We have made a lot of applications, or we are at the moment, under the Urban Regeneration and Development Fund. We (inaudible) this morning for Enterprise Ireland under their regional competitive fund. All of those, if we are successful, will match money of $25 \%$. So there's an increase there.

Virtually every section has looked for an increased budget. Some we just have to do, such as the social housing conditional survey, increase provision for remedial works, central heating, boiler maintenance,
energy upgrade, additional graveyard maintenance, extra library staff, library book fund, playgrounds, public lights, LEDs, etcetera.

So it's going to be extremely difficult. I think what we'11 do at this stage maybe is ask Brian to run through that in more detail. You have seen the recommendation that was made in the document that was sent out.

CATHAOI RLEACH Just before we do that sorry,
Cllr. Timmins, I missed you there. You were looking to come in there.

CLLR. TIMMN: Sorry, I don't mean to cut across you. I had my light lit up before the CEO came in. Just very briefly with your indulgence, Chairman, a matter has come to my attention which is very serious and that's the Regional Planning Guidelines which were presented to us in the spring and I believe there's an important vote coming up in October at the Regional Assembly. I would ask, given the urgency of this matter and given the fact that it could have huge implications for building in County Wicklow, it may lead to massive rezoning, I would ask, with your indulgence, if we could put it on the agenda for next Monday's meeting.
CATHAOI RLEACH Just on that, I've already talked to Lorraine about that and there will be an item and a presentation by the planning document, Sorcha walsh will be back next Monday, before there's due to be a
vote from the Midlands East Regional Assembly on this plan on the Friday, on 5th October. So I will certainly facilitate that. I don't want to go round the table now. Briefly cllr. Cullen now.
CLLR TOMM CULLEN Chairman, yourself and myself and other Members of Wicklow have been doing our best trying to amend or change this and it's a very concerning situation and I'd like to second Cllr. Timmons and I appreciate that you are allowing it on the agenda. Can I ask you, it's the most important thing, probably that $I$ have seen on the Council since I've been a member, this issue, the effects on County Wicklow, could we invite the five Dáil deputies from wicklow to attend this meeting, Chairman?
CATHAO RLEACH Absolutely.
CLLR. TOMM CULLEN Is that agreed?
CATHAO RLEACH Absolutely. There is no problem at a11. I've already been talking to a number of them in regard to this but certainly you can do that. okay, Brian.

MR. GLEESON Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Good
afternoon, Members. First of all, I will summarise the main areas $I$ plan to cover during the presentation this afternoon. I will outline the budgetary process for local authorities, explain the local property tax calculation in respect of 2019 , look at the budget challenges that we're facing next year and then review the estimated income and expenditure and service requirements. I will then address the financial effect
on both an individual and a Local Authority of any variation in the rate and then finally I'11 conclude with the LPT recommendation for 2019.

The budget process involves four stages. The first stage is the decision on the local property tax rate variation under Section 120 of the Finance Act. This is followed by the general municipal allocations, which involve the allocation of discretionary funding to Municipal Districts each year. In 2018 over 200,000 was allocated between the five MDs. The third most important stage is the adoption of the annual budget at the end of November, at which we must also determine the commercial rates base year adjustment and the level of rates relief on vacant premises. The last stage is the schedule of the Municipal District works which outline the proposed level of works that would be budgeted and delivered in each District for the coming year.

With regard to the local property tax. The Local Authority, may, as a reserve function, resolve to vary the base rate of LPT, within its function layering, by a maximum of plus or minus $15 \%$. As per the Department regulations, any decision to vary the basic rate of LPT 14:07 must be taken by September 30th. This decision must also be notified on or before that same date to both the Revenue Commissioners and the Department.

Next one to explain is how the 2019 LPT allocation is calculated. If you look at the screen there in front of you, just take the first figure there of 17.18 million that represents one hundred percent of the LPT income allocation for wicklow. This is calculated by the Revenue Commissioners based on declared liabilities for County wicklow. 20\% is then deducted for equalisation and this is retained centrally and redistributed to a number of other local authorities to ensure that they are no worse off than the previous funding position. That leaves 13.7 million, but when compared to our baseline amount of 8.5 million it leaves a surplus figure of 5.2 million . Part of the surplus 3.4 million is retained by wicklow County Council for its own use while the remainder, 1.7 , is allocated to self-fund housing services and thereby replacing Central Government funding in this area.

So after the self-funding element is deducted it leaves 14:09 approximately 12 million for inclusion in the Revenue budget. Just another point to note is that the variation is based on the gross figure of 17.2 million . So for every $1 \%$ variation it equates to 171,809 .

Before deciding on whether or not to vary the local property tax rate the Local Authority must have regard to the following matters: The estimation of income and expenditure for 2019; the financial position of the

Local Authority as in its ability to service its browsing and manage its cashflow; feedback from any public consultations; and the financial effect of the varied rate of both the individual and the revenue putting of the Council.

As part of the review of income and expenditure for 2019 I wish to highlight some of the challenges that we face in the coming year. First of all, there's the restricted sources of funding. The provisional local property tax is 11.98 million which is only a slight increase on last year's figure of 11.97. In addition, commercial rates are in the middle of a rates harmonisation process and the ARV cannot be altered during this particular period.

With regard to the national pay agreement, like 1ast we're expecting an $80 \%$ compensation the from the Department on the pay increases assigned under this agreement. These increases are projected at approximately 900,000 . So $20 \%$ equates to 177,000 and this must be met from our own resources.

Increasing pension costs is another concern. Year-on-year these costs are increasing with more retirements. In addition, we don't receive pension contributions from new staff who commenced work from 1st January 2013 and are part of the single public services pension scheme. The combination of both
factors results in nearly 900,000 of additional costless for 2019.

The next item is reduced income. As you are aware under the IPB capital distribution we received 700,000 in 2018 and that was put towards footpath repairs across the five MDs. Next year this amount will be reduced to 500,000. Also, due to market volatility this year, we are also expecting that the IPB dividend would be reduced by up to $50 \%$, which will have an impact of approximately 120,000 on the 2019 budget.

The final point $I$ wish to touch on is the match funding requirements for Urban and Rural Regeneration Schemes. Under these schemes each application must have a minimum value of two million and half a million respectively, and the Council must provide $25 \%$ matched funding. As such, we have included a provisional estimate of half a million for these.

In relation to the estimation of income and expenditure, the table on the screen just outlines the high level categories. I will go through each one. Commercial rates 27.9 million, a small increase on 2018. Local property tax, as we've said 11.98 , similar 14:12 to last year. Grants and subsidies, 29.1 million. Other income is 31.3 mil1ion. That will cover housing rents, parking income, Irish water contribution and our pension deductions. On the expenditure side, payroll
expenses is 45.8 million . That relates to nearly half of the total expenditure. Loans 1.7 million. Social benefits which relate to the provision of social housing 7.8 million. Capital grants 6 million, which covers community and LEADER grants. And other expenditure 47.6 million which would include our roads programmes.

To summarise the income and expenditure position, our current expenditure is estimated at 109 million. The current income estimate is 100.4 million. This leaves a shortfall of 8.6 million. That shortfall would be increased to 11.2 million if the local property tax was reduced by $15 \%$, which would obviously have a serious detrimental impact on our ability to provide services. However, there is also a requirement to achieve a balanced budget each year by the Department so this funding gap must be closed in order to adopt the budget in November of this year.

I just want to go through the additional cost of 8.6 million in a bit more detail. It's broken down, as we said, the national pay agreement, the net costs, after compensation, 177,000; additional pension costs 860,000; reduced income on the IPB and the HAP 525,000; 14:14 increased income 300,000 - this relates to commercial rates income following the valuation of some new businesses. This year matched funding, as we've said, 500,000 and then a figure of 6.8 million in respect of
service directorate and Municipal District funding requests. This would also include additional staffing requests.

Just in relation to the 6.8 million. That is broken down as follows. Additional staffing requirements 850. CLLR FOX: Sorry, Brian, that's the wrong slide. MR. GLEESON of the 6.8 million , additional staffing requirements 581,000; housing and corporate estate 3.2 million; roads, water and environment services 600,000; planning development and environment approximately 1 million; community cultural and social development 760,000; and nearly 400,000 between enterprise, corporate services and finance. Some of the proposed new and additional expenditure programmes included in these submissions are the social housing conditional survey works, increased provision for new letting, additional money for central heating and boiler maintenance, additional funding for graveyard maintenance, energy upgrade scheme provision, extra library staff in line with the workforce plan, an increase to the Library Book Fund and additional funding for playgrounds and public lighting.

Other matters that we must have regard to include the financial position of the Local Authority, the ability to service its borrowings and manage its cash flows. The revenue deficit at the end of 2017 was 2.69 million. This was actually reduced by nearly

300,000 in 2017 and we are expected by NOAC to continue to try and reduce this deficit year-on-year. The ratio current assets to current liabilities is $3: 1$ which is quite positive and shows we can comfortably meet our short-term liabilities. The ratio of loans payable to revenue income is 83\%. This is also adequate and shows the level of income available to cover our loans.

In relation to feedback from public consultations held, an advert was placed in the local paper and on social media and by text alert. We received 32 missions; 23 were in favour of a reduction of the rate; 3 requested an increase; 3 requested no change to the rate; and 3 made a general comment on local property tax without any reference to a variation.

We must also look at the financial effect of the varied rate on the liable person, on the revenue of the Local Authority and on the service plans of the Local Authority. 52,700 properties are registered in Wicklow. The LPT base rate is $0.18 \%$ of the property valuation property. The bands are based on the values as at 1st May 2013. These valuations will not change until November 2019, which will therefore impact on budget 2020. Also, $57 \%$ of properties are currently valued at 200,000 or under in County Wicklow.

The next table I just want to go through is the potential impact on a liable person. This table is
also available to look at on page 9 of the report that was circulated last week. If we start off on the left-hand side, the first couple of columns there outlines the valuation bands and the standard rates that apply to each band. The next set of reports are columns there, outline the financial impacts of the local property tax variation of $1 \%, 5 \%, 7.5 \%, 10 \%$ and $15 \%$ across all valuation plans. To give an example of each, a $1 \%$ change would from range from 90 cent to $€ 5.58$, whereas a $15 \%$ change ranges from $€ 13.50$ at the lower range to $€ 87.75$ at the upper range.

The next set of columns there show the impact of a $10 \%$ change and that ranges from 17 cent per week at the lowest band up to $€ 1.13$ per week at the highest.

The final two columns show the houses and the number of each value bands throughout County wicklow.

We next want to look at the impact on the 2019 revenue
budget. As I mentioned earlier, the variations is based on $100 \%$ gross allocation of 17.2 million. As such a $1 \%$ variation in the base rate equates to 171,809 . A $10 \%$ variation on the rate equates to 1.72 million and a maximum adjustment is 2.6 million based on the $15 \%$ variation. So for the average householder a $15 \%$ reduction would result in a saving of only 90 cent per week, but would reduce the Council budget by 2.6 million, which would have a huge
detrimental impact on the level of services that we can provide.

Finally, we need to look at the potential impact on existing service delivery. while maintaining the local property tax level in 2018 this allowed Wicklow County Council to maintain some and increase other existing budgets. For example, housing of the homeless was increased by 160,000 . Social housing conditional survey provision for 43,000 . Central heating was increased by 25,000 . Provision was made for Creative Ireland initiatives 35,000. Additional 1ibrary staff 178,000. New energy saving measures 80,000 . DPG grants were maintained at 750,000 in the budget and it also allowed us to retain the Community Grant Scheme at 14:21 $€ 200,000$ and discretionary funding for Municipa1 Districts at $€ 900,000$. There was also increased funding for Arklow, Wicklow and Bray harbours for 154,000 and additional funding was provided for burial ground extensions in the amount of 80,000 .

Any reduction to the local property tax rate in 2019 would put at risk the continued funding of these particular initiatives.

To conclude: The 2019 funding shortfal1 currently stands at 8.6 million, therefore the recommendation to the Members is to increase the basic rate of LPT by $10 \%$ for 2019. This will generate an extra 1.7 million for
the budget and it addresses non-discretionary cost increases relating to pay, pensions, reduced income and matched funding requirements. It would also prevent cuts to essential services and allows for the continued targeting of investments in local programmes. That concludes the presentation. Thank you for your time. CATHAO RLEACH Thank you, Brian. I'11 just let it out to the floor for questions and answers and I'd ask Councillors to be as brief as possible in regard to this. Cllr. Behan, you're first up.
CLLR BEHAN Cathaoirleach, I don't have a question. I just want to thank the Chief Executive and Brian and the staff for preparing the report. I have the same opinion that I've had on this from day one which people won't be surprised at. Basically - and I think the Chief Executive in fairness alludes to it in his report - this fax is effectively a con job on the people of this country because people thought when they were being asked to pay a property tax their money would go into additional services in the County. As the Chief Executive rightly points out -in fairness to him he does point it out - all that happened was the property tax money was just substituted in for the rates support grant. So we got nothing from the point of view of the people of the County as a result of this tax. Absolutely nothing. In fact it could be argued that with the abolition of Urban and Town Councils and reductions in staff at local level, we're actually worse off as a County Council trying to provide
services for the people. That's the first point I'd make and I would honestly ask people to really reflect on that. This is something that the people of this County are absolutely raging about. The fact that they're paying a property tax and they're not seeing resultant improvement in services. I could go around a whole lot of list things that I have been looking to get done in the Bray Municipal District, some of which money was actually allocated for three years ago that hasn't actually been spent yet because of lack of staffing, too many jobs being required to be done of too few people, particularly at engineering and outdoor staff level. So to expect people to pay an additional $10 \%$ next year for a property tax, given what I think is the abysmal level of services $I$ think is just not acceptable.

I would also say that as a body wicklow County Council has a lot to answer for in terms of how it has stewarded the public's money up to now and we all know about specific examples, I won't go into them except to mention one or two. One is the astronomical bill that's facing somebody - whether it's the national taxpayer or the local taxpayer - for the clean-up of the illegal dumping in west wicklow, which some estimates put at $€ 100$ million by the time it's finished.

We can also look at a decision that was made here to
allow an American vulture fund off with half a million euro for land on the Southern Cross because we basically caved in and didn't want to negotiate it. That would amount to one-third, I think, of the additional increase that Mr. Gleeson has recommended here today.

So even looking at how we're doing our business I think many people would be very skeptical, we're even spending the money that we're getting properly?

I know I'11 be told by the officials: Well, if you're not going to not agree to this expenditure increase we're going to have a reduction in services. I just don't accept that. Those of us who have been around this area for a long time know that estimates, processes are estimates. They're moveable feasts. Figures changed. It's even accepted in the report. Figures can change between now and November or December.

So I think we have an opportunity, the last decision we will make before we go to the people again to see what verdict they have on the work of this Council over the last five years. We have an opportunity to make some bit of a difference for people in terms of the income that they are allowed to keep for themselves.

I want to propose, Cathaoirleach, not an increase of

10\% but a reduction, the maximum reduction possible in next year's property tax of $15 \%$. Thank you.

CATHAO RLEACH okay. C11r. walsh.
CLLR. WALSH Thanks, Cathaoirleach, and thanks Brian for the comprehensive presentation there. Firstly, this is the fifth year we find ourselves in this position looking at the LPT rate and really I think it's just farcical. I think as Councillors we shouldn't be expected to make this decision here year in and year out. We're damned if we do, we're damn the 14:27 if we don't. Well find ourselves in the unenviable position here. We reduce the LPT and then we'11 have an impact on service; we increase it and then we have an impact on our householders. We have the equalisation fund which is bad enough and then we have the effect of, the additional amount gone to our housing services. So we're left with a net situation with regard to the general purpose grant. So really I think to propose a $10 \%$ increase on an already hard-hit taxpayer, I think we have inflation figures on the rise, we have insurance figures, transport figures, everything on the rise. We have to consider the consequences of a hard Brexit that will happen on the taxpayer. So really I don't think how we can contemplate increasing the LPT rate at this particular point in time.

I would just like to ask the Director, there was a comprehensive submission submitted by himself to the

Department in July I think last in relation to the equalisation fund and general purpose grant and I'm just wondering whether there was any response from the Department in relation to that? But generally I think this whole situation, we find ourselves year in year out here making this decision. We shouldn't have to be -- in the presentation there you spoke about the national pay agreement, you spoke about the additional pension costs which really should be addressed by Central Government. You make that point yourself and it should be -- that equates to 0.8 I think, that we have to consider here as a Council. So again that's just not satisfactory. Thank you.
CATHAO RLEACH Okay. I'11 just ask Brian to take a those and then we can get back after.
C11r. Nicola Lawless, then C11r. Gráinne McLough1in after that. Cllr. Lawless.

CLLR. LAVLESS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I actually agree with C11r. Walsh we are all damned if we do and damned if we don't here in the Council with the local property tax. It is a large onus on us to make that decision but I would quite happily second Cllr. Behan's proposal. That will come as no surprise to anyone in the Chambers here because we've always supported a decrease in the local property tax.

Speaking to any member of the public and you say we have local property tax coming up again, most people will just role their eyes to Heaven and say: This is
an unfair tax. Why to $I$ have to keep paying tax on my house and property that I own.

I know, Brian, your presentation, thank you very much for that, it's very comprehensive as we11, and I was just, you know, doing my figures, as you do, and just taking in the bracket of $200,000,250,000$, you know to say that, you know, an extra 77 cent per week it doesn't an awful lot but it's $€ 40.50$ a year. But if you look at somebody who is on a pension, invalidity pension, disability, that may possibly own their home valued at that, most people will go to the post office and they pay, $I$ think it works out at $€ 7$ a week they might pay off it, or they might pay monthly. The post office charges $€ 1$ for every time you make that transaction. So if you pay weekly and we increase it by $10 \%$, that's an examine extra $€ 52$ or that household or an extra $€ 12$ on that household if they pay through the post office. I think we have to take that into consideration as well.

I work in the community sector and you would say sure you'd have to have a euro in your pocket; who wouldn't have a euro in their pocket? Believe me and you I've met many families that wouldn't have a euro in their
pocket. I just think the cost of living is just increasingly rising year-on-year on for people and it's just another burden on people. I completely understand that we need funding here in Wicklow but I don't think
it should be done through the local property tax. This was supposed to be a temporary stop-gap. This came in when the recession hit because of funding and we should be getting proper funding from Central Government. And, also, we should be getting funding for the pensions and retirements coming from the Government. We shouldn't need the local property tax to be subsidising this as such.

So, as I say, no big surprise. I would definitely, definitely not support an increase of $10 \%$ in the local property tax. Thank you.
CATHAO RLEACH okay. C11r. McLoughlin.
CLLR MELOGGLIN Thank you, Cathaoirleach, thanks for your presentation, Brian. There was one image up on the screen there where you give figures up to 100,000 , valuation 2 and 300 and all the way down. What I fee1 about it, I would like to know in our different areas how is that affecting us because I know that in Greystones, Newcastle, Wicklow, North Wicklow, we are the ones that are going to have to pay the bulk of that increase and once again we are the ones that have roads that are so bad, they need so much attention that none of this money will come back to us. We know it's going to be spent everyone else in the County. Now I disagree with Cllr. Lawless, I completely agree with the local property tax, as $I$ also believe in a water tax - and I'11 say that out loud as wel1. But the situation is it's an unfair balance. If you do want us
to go and put up $10 \%$, which would affect most of our constituents, I think the least you need to do before you come to us, we need to have a longer discussion, not something that was spent to us last week. what do you propose to do with that extra money in the areas so ${ }_{14: 33}$ when we go back to the people and say to them: we did agree to the $10 \%$ extra and this is what you got for it, rather than constantly: You will pay extra but actually somebody else is going to get something out of it. I find it very difficult to increase and I wouldn't decrease it. I do support it but we've got to be able to say to people what exactly they're going to get for their increase, not some list that is a bit random, Brian, to be honest to you and not relevant to the people in our why itself.
CATHAO RLEACH C11r. Mary Kavanagh.
CLLR. KAVANAGH Thank you, Cathaoirleach, and thanks to Brian for the presentation. Yeah, I certainly wouldn't be supporting a $10 \%$ increase in property tax for a number of reasons. Looking at the figures here and if you go to schedule 1, page 4, there's an item there called "other expenditure". The 2018 figure was 37 million; the 2019 estimate is 47 million, so there's a difference there of 10 million for something that we don't even know what it is. Now, if we don't know what 14:34 it is, we're not being told, we have no idea whether that figure is just an estimate, a best guess or whatever and I'm quite sure that if there is a deficit in income and expenditure, instead of adding on a $10 \%$
increase to the very, very hard pressed house owners, then we could look for some explanation of what that is, whether it is made up of a number of items or one item or whatever.

The other thing I have a huge problem with is the fact that there are people in this County potentially going to be levied an extra $10 \%$ to cover pay restoration and pensions, which really have nothing at all to do with local property tax. To be honest it's an absolute sham and it's a scandal that these increases in pay and pensions are not being met out of central funding. I think they've a cheek actually to come looking for $20 \%$ from Councils and then expect hard pressed, you know, parents of school goers who have to pay voluntary contributions of up to $€ 1,000$ per child to go to school to pay for ipads for them, the elderly homeowner who has to face increases in fuel charges, even a bag of coal now costs over $€ 20$ a bag for a 40 kg bag. We just can't keep hitting people. This was supposed to be a temporary tax back in the day when we were in the middle of the Celtic Tiger collapse. Those days are gone. The country is booming compared to then. We should be looking for reductions in property tax not increases. Thank you.

CATHAO RLEACH Okay. Cl1r. Oliver o'brien. CLLR OLIVER O BRIEN I'm proposing that when the vote is taken that the percentage local property tax variation be calculated on the basis of each

Councillor's vote in giving a percentage value. what this in effect means that if 16 Councillors voted for keeping it as it is and 16 Councillors voted for a reduction, the maximum reduction of $15 \%$, that that would mean that it would reduced by $7.5 \%$. That would actually mean that we wouldn't be disenfranchised here. That's what happens year after year. It's just a charade. It's a tax system that governs this and basically my vote means nothing if I'm in the minority, even if I'm only in a minority of one. It means that the people that we are representing are having no input whatsoever into the property tax. So I am proposing that that's the way it be done.

CATHAO RLEACH C11r. Fox.
CLLR. FOX: Thank you, Chairman. Well certainly we have rehashed around this Chamber every September how unfair a tax this is and it is an unfair tax. It discriminates against people who live in counties where house values are high, like County wicklow. I could be paying twice as much as somebody down the country in the very same house as what I live in. So it is a discriminatory tax. And look, none of us like paying tax. It is what the national legislators have handed us down so we have to get on with it, okay?

As Cllr. Walsh has said, the equalisation fund of 3.64 million, again it's very unjust. The 3.46 million of Wicklow taxpayers' money that is going to another Local Authority area.

Can I just ask you, Brian: The self-fund housing of 1.76 million, where exactly does that go to? And also a question on the revenue deficit of 2.69 , you know, obviously we can't continue to have a deficit every year. So as a figure, you know, if we annually have a deficit, what does that figure now stand at, the overall figure? Because it doesn't seem to make any sense that Central Government would take 3.46 million off us and allow us to grow a deficit -- a total figure and an annual deficit.

I personally would favour leaving tax, property tax at the standard rate, not increase it $10 \%$ and not decrease it. And the reason for that is Cllr. Behan rightly said we are short of staff. You go to the Bray Municipal District, the staff are under pressure. There is not enough outdoor staff. There is not enough engineering staff. But the way to resolve that is not by reducing our revenue. It's not by taking 2.5 million out of the budget. That just doesn't make sense. It just doesn't add up. The way to address that is by maintaining the property tax at the standard rate. That additional 2.5 million $I$ think is critical, absolutely critical because if you see that the discretionary funding that is given to the Municipal
Districts, if we reduce the property tax that becomes a laughable figure, that $2.5 \mathrm{mil1ion}$ spread across Municipal Districts and I think something we done in the last budget, which was we addressed the
discretionary funding to Municipal Districts was a success. Now it will take a year or two for those projects to be on the ground for people to actually see those on the ground in each of the Municipal Districts. But certainly I would favour retaining property tax at the standard rate.

Chairman, I know it's probably an unpopular thing to propose but I'm happy to propose it to stay at the standard rate and keep the additional funding, when we get around to the budget, particularly for the Municipal Districts and discretionary funding.

One other point I would like to make before I finish. I would be very concerned in November 2019 about the revaluation of houses and how many people will have to go up to a higher band and the increase that will befall people next year. Certainly I think that is something that we should correspond with Government on and the Department on because house prices since 2013 have increased dramatically. It will see a huge increase in some people's property tax if we revalue the full figure in 2019. Thank you, Chairman. CATHAO RLEACH Thank you. C11r. Mitchel1. CLLR. MTCHELL: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, yeah, and thank you for the presentation there earlier. Just to say about the property tax, I mean I think every other country in Europe has a property tax and the concept of a property tax to tax people who have something to fund
services for the whole community is a
worldwide-accepted thing and so when it was reintroduced here, ten years ago, it was -- part of it -- the point definitely was stated to reduce the Central Government deficit which was enormous because of the financial crash and the crash of the other revenue which the Government was getting. So that's what it is doing.

Having got a property tax it does give people better services because they are now paying more directly for them. But I think if we didn't have property tax as some are suggesting here we would be almost unique in the world in expecting local services not to be paid for locally. So that is the concept of a property tax, 14:43 it is a reasonable way to fund local services.

So I'm also concerned that if we did do what some people here are proposing, which is to cut it by $15 \%$, we would severely impact the services, the homeless, housing, the ones which were illustrated by the Finance Director and I don't want to do that.

In looking at this I'm also conscious that in Greystones and Bray property values are significantly 14:43 higher than the average for the rest of the County, and therefore the majority of property tax paid in County Wicklow is paid in Bray and Greystones, because of this. Unfortunately the figures are not available
by Municipal District. But I'm also conscious that every other district except Greystones gets far more spend per person. Bray spends about $50 \%$ per person extra. I don't know what Greystones gets. Arklow spends around $80 \%$ more. So in the case of Greystones if the property tax was to go up, there would be a lot more property tax to be paid in the town and in Kilcoole as well and we're not getting that money spent on the local services.

A significant part of the reason for that is that property tax is not levied on new houses. There have been well over a new thousand houses in Greystones and Kilcoole since this was introduced. But it is essential that there is a proper -- money comes to the area for extra maintenance to deal with a huge increase in population because otherwise, I'm certainly now of the view we shouldn't be expanding the area further because we don't seem to be able to maintain it under the present budget. That is a significant problem.

What C11r. Fox said about where the money goes, first of all, the one that really annoys me is that this self-funding housing subject, which we lose 1.7 million on, and then there's the $20 \%$ which is at least a more open process but the 1.7 million disappears from wicklow is disgraceful. Essentially what they're trying to do on this is they're keeping the funding to the various Councils at what it was maybe in 2009, but,
yet certain counties, Wicklow particularly but also Meath and I think Kildare, have grown enormously and we need a larger budget to cope with the people.
Strangely enough, Dublin City where there is a most talked about housing crisis for Dublin City, but actually I think the population of Dublin City hasn't been expanded, or the lowest in the whole region. So they have failed abysmally to try and do something for the property shortage.

So, in short, I just want to say that I would be in favour of maintaining the property tax at the same as last year. I'm not in favour of the $10 \%$ expansion and I believe that's the best way of providing services. I think that those people who are looking for a decrease should state which services they want to cut.
CATHAO RLEACH Okay. C11r. Dermot o'brien. CLLR DERMOT O BRI EN Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I appreciate the report that was sent out during the week and the presentation today. I can see that this is a hard sell because what $I$ see is a mismatch between what the constituents on the ground are telling us as their public reps and how the proposals are sitting within the Chamber here. So I would support cllr. Behan, his proposal to reduce by $15 \%$ because that's what my constituents are telling me that they want, and they're also telling me that this trap whereby there is a comfort zone for saying only "it's onl y". So we have this "it's only". It's only this amount. And what
they said to me is: It's only extra money in my free education; it's only an extra bob on my premium for my insurance; it's only an extra cost on transport; it's only an extra cost for the school tour. It becomes the it's only generation and I don't have a comfort zone for adding -- the money that we get is a gift from the people who own houses across the County and how we thank them is by asking for more. I certainly don't have a comfort zone for that and at the same time explain to them how money leaves the County that they give as a gift. So I support the proposal to reduce. CATHAO RLEACH Okay. C11r. whitmore. CLLR. WH TMORE: Thanks, very much, chair. What I started to realise is that every year there's certain meetings where the same stuff is repeated as had been said the previous year and this is one of them. I think the reason the same issues come up again and again and again with the local property tax is that there is major flaws in the system that has been designed and unfortunately wicklow has been disadvantaged significantly by those flaws.

I'm just going to compare wicklow with Mayo. The two counties have roughly the same population and yet whilst we have to give over 3.2 million of our local equalisation fund, Mayo is a recipient of funding and in 2017 received nearly $€ 7$ million in local property tax. Mayo has a much greater staffing level than

Wicklow County Council so in 2016 we had 611 staff, Mayo had 923 staff. They get much more -- the gross expenditure is more for Mayo. It was 964 per capita compared to wicklow which was 640 per capita. And they also get a lot more in Government grants and subsidies, 308 per capita as opposed to 148. Even when you compare what Wicklow receives, say, under the transport infrastructure fund compared to Mayo, for a three-year period Mayo got 80 million and Wicklow got 8 million. So wicklow is, when it comes to grants funding, you know, from Central Government we are significantly disadvantaged and I think that this local property tax emphasises that considerably. I think we cannot ask people of wicklow to pay an additional $10 \%$ when we have that inherent flaw in this system. I think it's really 14:50 unfair. We have seen cost of living increases that were published a couple of weeks ago. Every single element of people's living and the cost of leaving lives has increased and I don't think that we can add an additional $10 \%$ on to them. We need to stop calling this a local property tax because at the moment our money, $20 \%$ of our money goes outside this County so I think that's something that we do need to raise. I noticed that the Chief Executive said that the equalisation tax is something that we can't change but 14:50 at this particular point in time, yes, he is correct but we need to recognise that this is an national issue and nationally this is something that does need to be addressed. I would suggest that if we have our five

TDs at the meeting next week that we raise this with them as well because they're the ones who should be fighting for us when it comes to the unfairness of the local property tax.

Just interestingly, Mayo have actually voted against increasing their local property tax this year. Their Executive asked them for it increase by $15 \%$ and they're leaving it at the baseline. So I think for us to increase it by $10 \%$ to subsidise a county that is refusing to put that increase on their people I think is unacceptable.

However, I do recognise the need to fund our services. I have seen, since I started in the Council, a slight improvement in things getting done around the County and I do believe that part of that is, you know, the funding that comes and that we have allocated through local property tax. I would be in favour keeping it as it is. I would not, absolutely not agree to increasing 14:51 it by 10\%. But I think if we keep the status quo and at that point we need to start fighting for wicklow whilst the reforms and discussions about the reforms are happening. Thank you.
CATHAO RLEACH Okay. I'm going to let Brian in now to $14: 51$ answer a few of the questions. Then C11r. Fortune, C11r. Walsh can afterwards just that -- Brian if you'11 address the question, if possible. And then we'11 move on then, okay.

MR. GLEESON Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I'11 just take Cllr. Whitmore's points there while it's fresh in the memory. In relation to what you said about equalisation and Mayo, there's a local property tax review that's currently taking place and we did propose ${ }_{14: 52}$ the elimination of the equalisation and that the other local authorities such as Mayo would be funded by central coffers in order to bring them up to the level that they previously had, rather than penalising a County such as ourselves. That review is ongoing.

Also, our expenditure per capita, we have highlighted the fact that in comparison to the other local authorities we are at the lower level, we're third or fourth bottom and that was highlighted in the separate funding baseline review that took place a couple of months ago.

I'11 just stay on the baseline review, I know, Cl1r. Walsh, you raised that query to see where we were ${ }^{14: 53}$ in relation to that. A new model, there was a number of indicators that were highlighted and suggested in that baseline review. They've been included in a new modelled and that's being finalised currently and it's being sent to the Minister for approval, however, I suppose a point to note is the model would only be applicable to any additional funding that would be required by (inaudible) in the coming years.

If I could take the point in relation to
C11r. McLough1in. Regarding the proposal to increase the $10 \%$ and what it was for, we did have on the table, like it is specifically for, we had the pay shortfall that we have in relation to the compensation from the Department, our pension increases, the reduced income from IPB and also our matched funding requirements in relation to the Urban and Rural Regeneration Schemes.

In relation to the point you raised, Councillor, regarding breakdown by Municipal District I think C11r. Mitche11 referred to it, that we have actually looked for that already from Revenue and unfortunately they're not in a position to provide that.

C11r. Kavanagh, you made a point about page 4 on the report and the figure 47 million. Actually on page 7 of the report it outlines a breakdown of what would make up the bulk of that. If you go to the report you'11 see the breakdown by Service Director at Municipal District of the additional requests for funding and it has a few examples of the type of expenditure that would make that up. It would also take account of any additional grants that are being received in relation to roads that would be paid out under that area but obviously would be covered on the income side as well.

CLLR. KAVANAGt what page is that on?
MR. GLEESON It's on page 7. That covers about seven
million of the amount and the remainder would be, I suppose, contra, you'd see the income is actually increased in the table you were looking at on page 4 compared to last year, the grants and subsidies. So that goes up and the expenditure obviously will go up as well to offset that. So it's a combination between those two factors. As I say, the bulk of the items are outlined on page 7 of the report.

Cllr. O'Brien's suggestion regarding the vote, I don't believe that can be done by splitting a vote. There either has to be a full vote one way or the other to increase or decrease or stay the same.

C11r. Fox, relating to the self-funding of housing, where does that go? It actually goes to our capital account and it replaces, I suppose it saves the Government from paying 1.7 million of capital funding to us and that's hence the reason it's called self-funding, we're pushing that funding into capital to pay for the housing element.

In relation to the deficit, $I$ suppose we would be one of a number of local authorities that currently carry a deficit year-on-year, but in the 2018 budget that was adopted here last year, we did make provision for a minimum of 150,000 to further reduce that deficit. As I say, there's provision in each budget to reduce it year-on-year.

Finally, C11r. Mitche11 made the point about expenditure in Greystones per person. while that may be the case that it is lower per person I would point out that the expenditure per size of Municipal

District, Greystones would be a lot higher than other districts to $I$ suppose it's a kind of a blend between the two as regard size and person.

CLLR. MELOUGHIN It goes one way.
MR. GEESON I think that's most of the points raised.
CATHAO RLEACH C11r. Fortune.
CLLR FORTUNE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, and thanks to the Chief Executive and Brian for giving us the overview. But, you know, this whole exercise, and to be fair to everybody in the Chamber, Executives and Councillors, it applies to us all, we're basically being given a task here that is unfair, unjust, it's all based on the provision of a lie. And on behalf of our constituents who we all represent, we can't look at this in isolation, just take a look at property tax and 1et's make a decision. I was reading there recently that tax income has gone up over the last ten or twelve years from something like 11.5 biliion to 20-plus billion, so people are being hit left, right and centre. I understand that from an Executive perspective the Local Authority has a responsibility to do certain things but if you look at the local property tax, when that was brought in it was brought in and sold on the basis that it was going to be extra funding coming into the County to do all kinds of stuff, to do
a11 kinds of developments that we couldn't afford up to that. But of course that wasn't the case because as the property tax started to be collected and it's been we11 mentioned by lots of Councillors already, they were taking the local Government fund down so it was reducing all the time. The net effect is there is no extra money and then the 1.7 million that several Councillors were talking about today, now it's back, we paid that as well because the Government didn't put it in. So this whole thing really is, we're thrown into this -- it's a bit of a joke and like also there's a -I have been watching some of the media in the last while, if you look at what's going on, this was brought in in 2013 and changed as we speak now, but it has been put off I think cynically until 2019. If you look at the way the price of property has gone up over the last five or six years, people will be paying 1,600 or 1,700 based on the current rationale. Then, Brian, one of the figures you threw at us, which I was interested in, was that $57 \%$ of properties in the County are valued at 200,000 and under. I found that very interesting because where are they? I know loads of people trying to buy houses at the moment and if we could find out where they are that would be very useful. Any kind of a house that's going up, particularly in North Wicklow now, is costing the guts of 400,000 plus. So that's a very high percentage. But I really think, I mean to be fair to you, we throw a lot of questions up to you and obviously you have to come back and answer us and your
hands are tied and the Chief Executive's hands are tied because you're told by the Department what you have to deliver and you have to put in a balanced budget and everything else. Where if we were running our business here as a business we'd be taking in 17.18 million in property tax and if we were spending that in the County we wouldn't being having this meeting at all. But see the problem is, we're taking this money in, we're not spending it so really what it is is, it's a back-handed tax and people are sick of it. And despite the fact that the economy has picked up and lots of things are going on, people by and large are not better off because there's more tax being taken from them.

So it would be absolutely wrong, I think, for us as Members here today, in my opinion, to increase the property tax. Fundamentally, and I have said this and I'm on record for this and I've said this before, I don't agree with property tax because $I$ think it's an unfair tax. It's not fair equally, in my opinion, to compare property tax to what goes on in other countries because if you're doing that you have to look at all the taxes that happen in other countries and if you do an analysis, take a few countries across Europe and do an analysis versus Ireland. Ireland is far more expensive tax wise than most of these countries. So you can't just look at everything in isolation. I just think the whole thing is wrong. I mean my heart would te11 me to again vote against the property tax, but my
head would tell me that people actually need to be helped because it's there and for that reason I think what C11r. Behan has said in his presentation was on the button. Again, you guys up there have an impossible job. You have to do what you have to do, but we also have to do what we have to do. We're in for our constituents to fight their corner and make their case. That's what I'm trying to do here as well. The whole thing is crazy. I will just finish by repeating what $I$ said at the beginning. This property tax is the biggest con job of all time. It was put in and some of the people who put it in are now gone off to Europe and different places and other people are left to handle it and the Executives here in wicklow are trying to convince us to approve something here today so as you can have a budget and while the budget has -- the Local Government Fund has been reduced over the last 15 years, year-on-year-on-year-on-year, it was reduced during the boom because there was so much money coming in from building and then when the recession came it was being reduced because there wasn't enough funding coming that way. So really, as I said, Chair, I just think this is a whole con job and unfair to us and unfair to the Executive.

CATHAO RLEACH okay. C11r. walsh and then
Cl1r. Matthews and C11r. Timmins.
CLLR. WALSH Just one quick point, Cathaoirleach, I'd like to make in relation to the proposal to reduce the rate and that's to do with our Local Authority housing
stock. As you know, our tenants are exempt from local property tax and I'm sure I would expect a reduction in the tax would impact on the maintenance provision provided for these houses. Last year we had additional expenditure of 25,000 for central heating installations 15:04 in some of the housing stock so I would imagine that situation would be affected and I'm sure our tenants wouldn't thank us if we agreed to that. Thank you. CATHAOI RLEACH C11r. Matthews. CLLR. MATTHEWG: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Cathaoirleach, 15:04 the Director made a submission to the Department a couple of months ago which you circulated to us, a very good submission which made a very good case, outlining how wicklow had been underfunded in general from central funding over the couple of years so I'm just wondering has there been any reply to that?

Secondly, I would just say that people should bear in mind that the national groups such as the ESRI and Social Justice Ireland at the moment are recommending or suggesting that taxes not be cut, that it's better to keep services funded and improve services where possible. It's very easy and it would be popular, you would be the best guy in the County for proposing and supporting the reduction of property tax but it's pretty irresponsible because unless you want to see the reduction of services -- if you reduce the income to the Council, over the next couple of months people would be jumping up and down wondering why the Council
aren't got money to spend on services. So I think we need to be responsible. It may be unpopular. We're talking about the difference here of -- the $10 \%$ increase we're talking about an average, I worked out the figures properly, of about 65 cent per week per household. That's what $10 \%$ would be, and a $15 \%$ reduction would be a bit more than a euro per week but what that would result in is a huge drop in services. I can't sit around here, although it would be popular an easy to do to look for a reduction, I think we need to maintain it as it is. Maintain the services and try and improve those services. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAO RLEACH Okay. C11r. Timmons.
CLLR. TIMMN: Chairman, I'd like to second C11r. Fox's proposal to keep the property tax as is. I 15:06 think at this stage we should look at having a vote on it. I think the arguments have been trashed around and repeated previous years in all due respect. I don't think there is much more to say about it.
CATHAO RLEACH okay. I'm going to go for a vote in a couple of minutes. I want to give everyone an opportunity obviously to talk on this as well. People just be brief and then we can go -- we have two proposals before us proposed and seconded and then I'11 go for it unless somebody comes in I need to say a couple of things myself as well. C11r. Tommy Cullen. CLLR TOMM CULLEN Chairman, my position is consistent that I oppose the tax property.

I don't agree that people who go out and buy their own houses and provide their own shelter and saving, have worked hard, pay a mortgage and pay interest on a mortgage, and pay stamp duty on that property should then be further taxed, penalised. I don't think that's fair on people. If you look in the UK there's no stamp duty on a house unless the house is in excess of two and a quarter million sterling. Most people who pay stamp duty on a house will pay a minimum of 15 years' property tax upfront. And you ask: We11 what services are we getting? We're not getting any services for this money. We're not getting school meals. We're not getting clothes for children in school. We're not getting universal school buses. We're not getting swimming pools in every area. We're not getting community policing in every area. Huge amount of services that normally other countries get for paying property taxes are not here. Simply every hundred euros that is collected, the Government are cutting our capital rates funding by $80 \%$ and that's going away and paying off the German bondholders, or whatever, and then we have to share the remainder with three or four County Councils up in Leitrim, Roscommon or Mayo or
wherever. That's not fair to the people of wicklow. Then we have this review and this review is coming up and this review was done last February and it was talking about $400 \%$ increases in property tax. That
would put an average property tax on each household in wicklow, as cllr. Fortune rightly said, of around 1,600 a year. That's what people are facing. That's the prospect people are facing in October next year. It was supposed to be brought in but it was delayed until next year.

The other thing that's coming down the line is this issue of planning that we have on the agenda for next week. In that proposal from March of next year wicklow is going to be allowed to build something like 3,000 houses in the next eight years and there's about a thousand of those houses already been granted, so that's going to produce probably about 2,000 houses in eight years. (Inaudible) and we're going to have to
dezone land. Think of the planning levies lost in those figures, we're talking about maybe 300 million planning levies lost to this Council over the next eight years. Nobody is talking about that figure. That's devastating for this County and, you know, I think people have to say: Do you support property tax? I fundamentally don't support property tax because I never believe in paying for something that you're not getting a service for. That's my fundamental objection to that but there's another issue here again in the papers on Saturday. We're now told that there's a public service increase of 60,000 more public servants. That's not accounted for in these estimates. That's going to come in on top of this. So where is the money
going to come to pay for this? So we're looking down the road at huge property tax bills for the people of wicklow and I just think that as long as people acquiesce with it and say to the Government: Keep rising the property tax and they're talking about Mayo there was an issue raised, that they're going to go away with that equalisation, but all that would simply mean is that the Government and the Department would simply cut our rates anyway by the same amount, so we're still going to be running faster and faster standing still and not get anything. I can't see any benefit for it. I understand this was an emergency measure brought in at the time when there was an emergency. That emergency has thankfully passed and it is like other emergency issues like the restoration of the public service pay. That has now been restored. I welcome that. But equally this emergency measure, I believe property taxes should be abolished and there is no need for them now and we are now $30 \%$ less funding than we were in 2007. I think we should be arguing that our rates support grant money should be restored like public service wages and pensions have all been restored.

I will just finish, Chairman. This other issue is this 15:12 land tax review that is coming up in 2019. That's another issue that we have to be concerned about.

Chairman, I'm being consistent and I'm going to oppose
both motions supporting the property tax. I don't agree with it. Thank you.
CATHAO RLEACH C11r. o'Neil1 and then C11r. Fitzgerald and then I'm going to for a vote.
CLLR. O NEILL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, I want to support Cllr. O'Brien's motion. I think it's about that time we were held accountable. It's ironic to see former colleagues of mine here today supporting a reduction of $15 \%$ when only last year they voted to maintain the charge. I want to acknowledge c11r. Behan who has been consistent and I know (inaudible) with the election next May and that, but I have been consistent in my five years here that I have voted for this reduction. I'd like to pay tribute to the 23 people that put some issues in here and I'11 stick with them. Go raibh maith agat.
CATHAO RLEACH Okay. Just in regard to that, I can't take that proposal for the simple reason that the reserve function is to vary the rate up our down by $15 \%$ so I can't take that. You are probably aware of that as well. Cl1r. Fitzgerald.
CLLR. FITZGERALD Just, I mean I don't like paying property tax, I pay it on one property, but the fact is I do pay it but what I find galling is this equalisation fund and I see the amount of revenue per capita in some of the Counties that we're supporting. Like C11r. Whitmore mentioned there, we have 638 per capita and the likes of Leitrim 1,114, Mayo 962, Roscommon 960 and I think it's totally unfair and it
has been said there previously that wicklow is underfunded. I think it was stated from the chief Executive. But certainly I won't be supporting a reduction in the property tax, especially as we haven't yet, according to the figures that have come before us, 15:14 there is an 8.6 million deficit in the budget. Then we're going in with a proposal to reduce the property tax by 2.5 million, which gives us 11.1 million to account for. I would be supporting that the status quo persists. I won't be voting for either.
CATHAO RLEACH Cl1r. Oliver o'brien. Briefly now. CLLR OLIVER O BRI EN The word galling was used there by Cllr. Fitzgerald. what I find galling is something that will reduce the adversarial nature of what is going on here today, a proposal I put forward that would stop all this, and people talking down to me and I talking up to people and talking down, give me the right to have an input of my vote, as I am shocked that people can't allow true democracy. Everybody is voting, every 32 councillors should have value and you're saying basically there's no value. I would like you to show me where it says you cannot do this. What Act or law says you can't do it this way? I mean it is a vary up and down. You can vary anything and that's what could happen here. I say if 16 vote for and 16 vote against, then you reduce it by $7.5 \%$. That surely makes sense. Then we'11 get something out of it and there'11 be useful functions involved here, instead of sitting down there for the charade where you might look
at the people you (inaudible). This is wrong. This is not democracy and I want you to produce the Act or the Government or whatever section it says that this proposal can't be put forward. It has been put forward and it has been seconded by C11r. O'Neill and I don't see any reason why it shouldn't go before the floor. CATHAO RLEACH Councillor, I can only do what we're legally entitled to do. I will read out exactly what it is, right.

The Finance (Local Property Tax) Act 2012 Section 20, as amended by Section 5 of the Finance (Local Property Tax) Act 2013 provides that "a Local Authority may, as a reserve function, resol ve to vary the basic rate of the local property tax (LPT) within its function and area by a maxi mum of pl us or minus $15 \%$ "

That's it, right. So it's not legal and I'm not talking.
M. GALLAGER It's not valid.

CATHAO RLEACH I'm not going to let you in anymore. You've had your point on it now. Councillor, I'm going for a vote on this now.
CLLR OLI VER O BRI EN I read that. I have read it. It doesn't say --
CATHAO RLEACH Before you start --
CLLR OLI VER O BRI EN It doesn't say --
CATHAO RLEACH -- I'm going to have a say in regard to this because certainly I have something to say on it as
we11. In regard to a number of issues.

C11r. Behan, I don't think anyone would disagree with C11r. Behan regarding the local property tax and how it was brought in, because it was brought in, as I understood it was going to be additional to the finance that we were getting at the it particular time, not in place of. And I mean if that was the case we would certainly be fairly flush with money. And I don't think anyone, everyone would agree that that's what we believed at that particular time. I think we have to deal with what's before us today whether we like it or not and the fact of the matter is as well that it has been raised here and I think we should yet again raise with the Government again in regard to the equalisation, the $20 \%$ equalisation in regard to this. That is absolutely totally unfair to a county like Wicklow where $20 \%$ of the money raised, that in the local property tax we were always led to be believe at the time that the local property tax would be spent in the area where it was raised and it was actually supposed to be spent in the local area where it was raised as well because we can understand why it would be put all over the County as well. But that was what I understood it as well and $20 \%$, over three million of the money that's collected in wicklow is going elsewhere and I think that is absolutely totally wrong. I think we should send a letter to the Government in regard to this.

In regard to the other thing that's very vital as wel1 in this is the fact that the -- it is envisaged that the property tax will go up with inflation and rising property prices in 2019. I think really and truly that is more serious than whether we go up or down $15 \%$ here today because I can tell you, in certain parts of this County that is going to make a very significant change if that goes up in comparison with the valuations that are in the north of the County and that is something that I think as well that we should raise with the Government in regard to this. Those two issues that I fee1 very strongly about as wel1.

Also in regard to, whether people like it or not we're going to have a budget in November. We're going to have provide money for services as well. I was on the Council in the 1980s when Councillors cut all sorts of budgets and I can tell you now it was the worst experience that $I$ had as a public representative because effectively cutting services that I felt I got elected to provide extra services, not cutting services. It was the worst and I think anyone that was around at that time would tell you exactly the same thing. It is not a good idea. And for people to say that it is possible, it is possible to cut the property tax by $15 \%$ and still have the same type of services out there, that's a fallacy. It just doesn't happen like that. I can tell you now if somebody came up with a figure of what services would be cut for 2.5 million , I
mean people would be scurrying around this Chamber in regard to that because we have one of the best community grant systems in the country and that would be one of the first things and it represents all over the County. That would be one of the areas that would be hit very significantly in this.
when people are voting for this they have to be concerned that that's what they're voting for as well. so in regard to that, I'm happy enough that I think
we'd get agreement from most members anyway in that regard to the equalisation fund and in that regard to the 2019 property revaluation, if we can send a letter if that's agreeable I think most people would agree well that. Cl1r. Whitmore, just briefly I'm going for a vote now.

CLLR. WH TMORE: Can you also include in that the building, the 1.7 million as well, the fact that we have to fund that when other Councils don't. That's an additional cost incurred.

CATHAO RLEACH Okay. I'm going for a vote on this. The first vote I'm going to take it in rotation as they came in. C11r. Behan proposed and C11r. Nicholas Lawless seconded a reduction of $15 \%$ in the local property tax. I'm going for a vote on that and I'm going for a vote that was proposed by cllr. Fox and seconded by Cllr. Edward Timmins that it would stay exactly as it is at the moment.
CLLR BEHAN Are we doing mine first?

CATHAO RLEACH C11r. Behan's proposal will be going first. It will be for or against a reduction of $15 \%$.
All right. [VOTE TAKEN]
MS. GALLAGER: That is ten for; 20 against; and two not present.

I will go on the second motion proposed by
$\mathrm{Cl1r}$. Christopher Fox, seconded by C11r. E Timmins that the standard local property tax remain as is.
[ VOTE TAKEN]
MS. GALLAGER: That's 22 for; five against; two not present; three abstaining.
CATHAO RLEACH Okay. That's it. Thank you very much indeed.
CLLR. FORTUNE: Can I ask a question, at our last meeting we asked could we get an update of a copy of the KWETB report my understanding is that that report is out. Can we get a copy?
CLLR. WH TMORE: I just e-mailed it to cllr. cullen there. It is public.
CATHAO RLEACH We'11 do that. That's no problem.
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| loud [1]-21:28 | $\begin{aligned} & -40: 10 \\ & \quad \text { maximum }[5]- \end{aligned}$ | 5:1 |  |  |  |
| lower [3] |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13:11, 33:14 | 6:24, 13:25, 18:1,$24: 4,47: 16$ | million |  | $25: 28,26: 1,26: 4$ |  |
| 36:3 |  |  |  | 34:11, 34:21,$36: 4$ |  |
| lowest [2] | Mayo [13] - | 2:22, 7:4, 7:12 | MONDAY [2] |  |  |
| 13:15, 29:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 23,30: 27, \\ & 30: 29,31: 2,31: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $7: 23,8: 11,9: 16$ |  |  |  |
| LPT [12]-3:13, |  |  | Monday [1] - |  |  |
| 6:3, 6:23, 6:25, | $31: 8,31: 9,32: 6,$ | 9:19, 9:24, 9:26, | $4: 29$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { must }[10]-6: 13, \\ 5: 26.7: 27 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | non [1] - 15:1 |
| 7:1, 7:5, 12:21, | $33: 4,33: 7,42: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 19,9: 24,9: 26, \\ & 0.2710 .1 \end{aligned}$ | Monday's [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 15,9: 17,10: 18 \\ & 11: 25,12: 17 \end{aligned}$ | non- |
| 14:28, 18:7, | $44: 5,45: 28$ <br> McLoughlin [5] | $10: 4,10: 6,10: 10$ $10: 11.10: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:25 } \\ & \text { money [29] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:1 } \\ & \text { none [2] - 21:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & -19: 16,21: 13, \\ & 21: 14,34: 2,36: 8 \\ & \text { MDs [2] - } 6: 11, \\ & 9: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 10:13, 10:22, <br> 10:29, 11:5, 11:8, <br> 11:10, 11:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 23,11: 18 \\ & \text { 15:19, 15:23, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $24: 22$ |
|  |  | 13:25, 13:29 | 17:10, 21:24, | national [8] - | 42:19 |
| mailed [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { meals [1] - 42:14 } \\ & \text { mean [11] }-4: 13, \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 3:1, 8:17, 10:23, |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { mean [11] - 4:13, } \\ 24: 5,24: 6,26: 27, \end{gathered}$ | 14:27, 14:29 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:15, 28:22, } \\ & 30: 1,30: 6,30: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 16:23, 19:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:20, 37:25 } \\ & \text { north [1] - 49:9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| main [1] - 5:23 | 37:27, 38:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:23, 22:24, } \\ & \text { 24:27, 25:2, 25:8, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 16:23, 19:8, | north [1] - 49:9 |
| maintain [5] | $46: 23,48: 8,50: 1$ |  | 39:19, 41:1,42:14, 43:29, | $40: 19$ <br> nationally ${ }^{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NOT }{ }_{[1]}-42: 1 \\ & \text { note }[2]-7: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| 14:7, 28:19, $41: 11,45: 10$ |  | 24:27, 25:2, 25:8, $25: 20,25: 23$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nationally }[1] \text { - } \\ & 31: 28 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| maintained [1] - | means [3] - | 25:27, 28:24, |  | nature [1] - | notes [1] - 1:21 |
| 14:14 | measure [2] - | 30:28, 31:9, | 49:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:14 } \\ & \text { nearly [5] - } 9: 1, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| maintaining [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:13, 44:17 } \\ & \text { measures [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 17,35: 1, \\ & 35: 18,37: 7,38: 5, \end{aligned}$ |  | nearly [5] - 9:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 21,15: 24 \\ & 15: 26,23: 9,24: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & -14: 5,25: 22, \\ & 29: 12 \end{aligned}$ |  | $42: 10,43: 17$ | $20: 14$ | 10:1, 11:13, | noticed [1] - |
| maintenance [6] | $14: 13$ |  | months [3] - |  |  |
| - 3:29, 4:1, 11:19, | Meath [1] - 29:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 6,46: 8,48: 25 \\ & 49: 29,50: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 33:17, 40:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:29, 21:7, } \\ & \text { 21:23, 22:2, 22:3, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 11:20, 28:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:11, } 37: 12 \\ & \text { meet }[1]-12: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mind }[1]-40: 19 \\ & \text { mine }[2]-45: 8, \end{aligned}$ | morning [1] - | 29:3, 31:20, |  |
| maith [1] - 45:16 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mine [2] - 45:8, } \\ & 50: 29 \end{aligned}$ | 3:21 <br> mortgage [2] - $42: 5,42: 6$ <br> most [11]-5:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 23,31: 27, \\ & 31: 28,32: 14, \\ & 32: 22,39: 1,41: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 12:24, 17:19, |
| major [1] - 30:19 | MEETING 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50:29 } \\ & \text { minimum }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| majority [1] - | $1: 5,2: 1,51: 2$ | $9: 16,35: 27,$ |  |  |  |
| 27:27 | 2:5, 4:25, 5:14, | 42:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:11, 19:28, } \\ & 20: 12,22: 1,29: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 41:10, 41:25, |  |
| Malone [1] - $1: 19$ | meetings [1] - | ${ }_{33} \mathbf{M i n i s t e r ~ [ 1 ] ~}$ |  | negotiate [1] - | 22:20, 23:3, |
| MALONE [1] - |  |  | $36: 9,38: 26$ | 17:3 |  |
| 1:26 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 15 \\ & \text { member }[2]- \end{aligned}$ | 24:9, 24:10 <br> minus [2]-6:24, | $50: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { net [3]-10:23, } \\ & \text { 18:17, } 37: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 8:2, 11:27 $5: 12,19: 27$ members $[1]-$ <br> March $[1]-$ $57: 16$  <br> $43: 10$ $50: 11$ MINUTE'S $_{[1]}-$ <br> market $[1]-9: 8$ Members $[7]-$ $2: 13$ <br> Mary $[2]-2: 8$, $2: 4,2: 15,2: 16$, minutes $[1]-$ <br> 22:16 $5: 6,5: 22,14: 28$, $41: 21$ <br> massive $[1]-$ $38: 16$ mismatch $[1]-$ <br>  memory $[1]-$ $29: 21$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:17, } 37: 6 \\ & \text { never }[1]-43: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 27,10: 27 \\ & 11: 15,11: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | 14:13, 28:12, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 28:13, 33:21, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 33:23 |  |


| 46:12, 47:24, | 41:22 | $29: 1,37: 25$ | 32:11, 36:23, | $37: 26,47: 16$ | $23: 1,23: 14$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 47:27 | ose [2] - | artner [1] - | $37$ | [3] | essure [1] - |
| O'Brien's [2] - | 41:28, 44:29 | 3:16 | 38:10, 38:12, | 20:23, 20:24, | 25:16 |
| 35:10, 45:6 | opposed [1] - | arts [1] - 49:6 | 39:1, 39:12 | 20:26 | pretty [2]-3:9, |
| O'Neill [2] - | 31:6 | passed [1] | 39:13, 40:18, | point [19]-7:22, | 40:26 |
| 45:3, 47:5 | order [2]-10:18, | 44:14 | 40:28, 41:22, | 9:13, 15:22, | prevent ${ }^{\text {[ }}$ |
| O'NEILL [1] | 33:8 | ay [34]-3: | 42:3, 42:8, 42:10, | 15:24, 16:1, | 15:3 |
| 45:5 | otherwise [1] - | 3:2 | 42:26, 43:3, 43:4 | 18:26, 19:10 | previous [3] - |
| objection [1] - | 28:17 | 8:19, 10:23, 15:2, | 43:21, 44:2, 44:3, | 26:14, 27:4, | 7:11, 30:16, |
| 43:24 | urselves | 15:19, 16:13, | 45:14, 46:16 | 31:26, 32:22 | 41:18 |
| OBSERVED [1] - | 18:6, 18:11, 19:5, | 19:8, 20:13, | 46:17, 46:19 | 33:26, 34:1, | previously [3] - |
| $2: 13$ obviously [6] - | 33:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:14, 20:16, } \\ & \text { 20:18, 21:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 1,49: 14 \\ & 49: 24,50: 1,50: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 10,34: 16, \\ & 36: 1,36: 3,39: 27, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3: 14,33: 9,46: 1 \\ \text { price }[1]-37: 16 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:14, 25:4, | 16:12, 25:17 | $22: 8,23: 8,23: 11,$ | $50: 14$people's [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:22 } \\ & \text { points }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { prices [2] - } \\ 26: 20,49: 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| 34:26, 35:5, | outline [3] - | 23:15, 23:17 |  |  |  |
| 37:29, 41:22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 5:24, 6:17, 13:6 } \\ \text { outlined [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | 31:14, 34:4, |  | $15: 21,33: 2,36: 9$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 26:20, } 49: 4 \\ \text { problem [5] - } \end{array}$ |
| 4:19, 5:2, 43:4 | 35:8 | 42:10, 42:11, | 13:14, 13:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:18 } \\ & \text { pools }[1]-42: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $38: 8,51: 21$ <br> process [6] - |
| OF [1] - 1:5 | outlines [3] - | 44:1, 44:16, |  |  |  |
| office [3] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 9:22, } 13: 4,34: 18 \\ \text { outlining [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 14,45: 23, \\ & 45: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 23:16, 28:3, 31:3,31:4, 31:6, 33:12, | popular [2] - | $6: 5,8: 14,28: 26$ |
| $20: 12,20: 15$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:23, 41:9 } \\ & \text { population }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 20:19 } \\ \text { officials }[1] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:13 } \\ & \text { outside [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | payable [1] - $12: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 2,36: 3,36: 4, \\ & 41: 5,41: 7,45: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { population }[3] \text { - } \\ & 28: 17,29: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $17: 17$ |
| 17:12 | 31 | paying [11] - | percent [1]-7:4 | 30:24 <br> position | produce [2] - |
| offset ${ }_{[1]}$ - 35:6 <br> Oliver [2] - | overall [1]-25 overview [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 5,20: 1,24: 20 \\ & 24: 22,27: 11, \end{aligned}$ | percentage [3] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { position [8]- } \\ 7: 11,7: 29,10: 9, \end{gathered}$ | $43: 14,47: 2$ <br> programmes [3] |
| 23:26, 46:11 | 36:13 | 35:18, 37:17 | $23: 28,24: 1$,$37: 27$ | 11:26, 18:7, | programmes [3] |
| OLIVER [4] - | Own [7]-7:15, | 42:19, 42:23, |  | 41:27 | projected [1] - |
| 23:27, 46:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 22,20: 2,20: 11, \\ & 30: 7,42: 3,42: 4 \end{aligned}$ | payroll [1] - 9:29 | period [2]-8:15, |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 47: 24,47: 27 \\ & \text { ON }[3]-1: 9,2: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30:7, 42:3, 42:4 } \\ \text { owners [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | payroll [1] - 9:29 <br> penalised [1] - | 31:9 <br> persists [1] - | positive [1] - 12:4 | 8:20 <br> projects [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:1 } \\ & \text { once }[1]-21: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | $42: 7$ <br> penalising [1] - | 46:10 <br> person [7] - | 15:9, 18:1, 32:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:3 } \\ & \text { proper [2] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ONE [1] - 2:13 } \\ & \text { one [22] - } 7: 1 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 33:9 } \\ & \text { pension [12] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 18,12: 29 \\ & 28: 3,36: 2,36: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 40:23, 49:25 } \\ \text { possibly [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 21:4, 28:15 } \\ \text { properly }[2] \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 4,9: 23,15: 14, \\ & 16: 22,17: 4, \end{aligned}$ | P.M [1] - 1:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 5,3: 8,3: 9 \\ & 8: 24,8: 26,8: 29 \end{aligned}$ | personally [1] - | post [3] - 20:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:10, 41:5 } \\ & \text { properties [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21:15, 23:3, | $\begin{gathered} \text { page }[8]-13: \\ 22: 21,34: 16, \end{gathered}$ | 9:29, 10:24, 19:9, | $25: 12$ | $20: 14,20: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 20,12: 25, \\ & 37: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 28:23, 30:16, | 34:17, 34:28, <br> 34:29, 35:3, 35:8 | pensions [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 36:25 } \\ & \text { picked [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:29, 14:4 } \\ & \text { potentially }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | property [99] - |
| 35:12, 35:23, | paid [6] - 27:14, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { picked [1] - } \\ & 38: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 7,2: 20,5: 25, \\ & 6: 6,6: 21,7: 27, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 8,37: 18, \\ & 39: 27,45: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  | $23: 12,44: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 11 \\ & \text { place }[3]-33: 5, \end{aligned}$ | premises [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 6,6: 21,7: 27, \\ & 8: 11,9: 25,10: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 50:2, } 50: 4,50: 5 \\ \text { one-third }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28: 7,34: 25,37: 9 \\ \text { paper [1] - 12:10 } \\ \text { papers [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { people [65] - } \\ 15: 14,15: 17, \end{gathered}$ |  | 6: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:14, 12:21, } \\ & \text { 12:22, 13:7, 14:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| ones [5]-2:19, | $43: 26$ <br> parents [1] - | 15:18, 15:25, <br> 16:1, 16:2, 16:3, <br> 16:12, 16.13 | places [1] - | $30: 2$ preparing [2] - $2 \cdot 17$ 15:13 | $15: 22,16: 5$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 21:21, 21:22, } \\ 27: 21,32: 2 \end{array}$ | $23: 15$ | 16:12, 16:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 39:13 } \\ & \text { plan }[3]-5: \end{aligned}$ | $2: 17,15: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:14, 18:2, } \\ & \text { 19:21, 19:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| ongoing [1] - |  | 17:26, 19:28,20:12, 20:27, |  | 28:20, 51:5,51:12 | 19:28, 20:2, 21:1, |
| 33:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:28 } \\ & \text { part }[6]-7: 14, \end{aligned}$ |  | Planning [1] |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:7, 21:12, } \\ & \text { 21:27, 22:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 29:29 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { part [6]-7:14, } \\ 8: 7,8: 28,27: 3, \end{array}$ | $22: 12,22: 15$ | $4: 17$ <br> planning [5] - | [11]-4:28, 5:23, | 23:10, 23:24, |
| onus [1] - 19:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:11, 32:17 } \\ & \text { particular [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | 23:7, 23:20, | planning [5] - $4: 28,11: 11,43: 9$ | 15:6, 18:5, 19:7, | 23:28, 24:12, |
| open [1] - 28:26 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { particular [6] - } \\ & 8: 15,14: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 11,24: 18 \\ & 26: 3,26: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $43: 16,43: 18$ | 20:4, 21:15, | 25:12, 25:22, |
| opinion [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 25,31: 26 \\ & 48: 7,48: 11 \end{aligned}$ <br> particularly [4] - | 26:18, 26:29, | $\begin{gathered} \text { plans [2] - } \\ 12: 19,13: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $29: 20,39: 3$ | 25:26, 26:5, 26:22, 26:27, |
| 38:20 |  | 27:10, 27:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:19, 13:8 } \\ & \text { playgrounds [2] } \end{aligned}$ | presented [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 28,26: 29, \\ & 27: 10,27: 12, \\ & \text { 27:15, 27:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { opportunity [3] - } \\ & \text { 17:22, 17:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { particularly [4] - } \\ & \text { 16:12, 26:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 30:26, 31:14, | $\begin{aligned} & -4: 2,11: 23 \\ & \text { plus }[3]-6: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $4: 18$ <br> pressed [2] - |  |


| 27:27, 28:6, 28:7, | 11:20, 14:10, | range [3]-13:9, | 31:27, 32:14 | 35:10, 48:4 | representative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28:12, 29:9, | 14:11, 35:26, | 13:11 | ecommendati | Regeneration | [1] - 49:19 |
| 29:12, 30:18, | 35:28, 36:17, | ranges [2] - | on [3]-4:8, 6:3, | [3]-3:20, 9:14, | representing [1] |
| 30:26, 30:28, | 40:3 | 13:10, 13:14 | 14:27 | 34:8 | - 24:11 |
| 31:12, 31:21, | provisional [2] - | rate [23]-6:2, | recommended | region [1] - 29:7 | represents [2] - |
| 32:4, 32:7, 32:19, | 8:10, 9:18 | 6:6, 6:23, 6:25, | [1] - 17:5 | regional [1] - | 7:4, 50:4 |
| 33:4, 36:19, | public [14]-3:8, | 7:27, 8:4, 12:12, | recommending | 3:22 | reps [1]-29:23 |
| 36:26, 37:3, | 4:2, 8:3, 8:28, | 12:13, 12:18, | [1] - 40:20 | Regional [3] - | requested [2] - |
| 37:16, 38:6, | 11:23, 12:9, | 12:21, 13:23, | record [1] - | 4:17, 4:19, 5:1 | 12:12, 12:13 |
| 38:17, 38:19, | 19:27, 29:23, | 13:24, 14:22, | 38:18 | registered [1] - | requests [3] - |
| 38:21, 38:29, | 43:27, 44:16, | $14: 28,18: 7$ | recruits [1] - 3:7 | $12: 20$ | 11:2, 11:3, 34:21 |
| 39:10, 40:2, | 44:22, 49:19, | $18: 25,25: 13$ | redistributed [1] | regulations [1] - | required [2] - |
| 40:25, 41:15, | 51:20 | 25:23, 26:6, | - 7:9 | 6:25 | 16:11, 33:28 |
| 41:28, 42:6, | public's [1] | 26:10, 39:29, | reduce [14] - | rehashed [1] - | requirement [1] |
| 42:12, 42:20, | 16:20 | $45: 19,47: 14$ | 12:2, 13:28, | $24: 16$ | $-10: 16$ |
| 42:29, 43:1, | published [1] | rates [12]-2:27, | 18:12, 25:26, | reintroduced [1] | requirements |
| 43:21, 43:22, | $31: 17$ | $6: 14,6: 15,8: 13$ | $27: 4,29: 25,$ | $-27: 3$ | [6] - 5:29, 9:14, |
| 44:2, 44:5, 44:18, $45: 1,45: 23,46: 4,$ | purpose [2] | $9: 24,10: 27,13: 4$ | $30: 11,35: 27$ | relate [1] - 10:3 | 11:6, 11:9, 15:3, |
| $46: 7,47: 15,48: 4$ | 18:18, 19:2 pushing [1] | $44: 9,44: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 28,39: 28, \\ & 40: 27,46: 7, \end{aligned}$ | relates [2] - <br> 10:1, 10:26 | $34: 7$ |
| 48:19, 48:20, | 35:20 | rather [2]-22:8, | $46: 14,46: 26$ | relating [2] - | RES [1]-3:15 reserve [3] - |
| 49:3, 49:4, 49:25, | put [17]-4:24, | 33:9 | reduced [12] - | 15:2, 35:15 | 6:22, 45:19, |
| 50:13, 50:25, | 9:6, 14:23, 16:26, | ratio [2] - 12:2, | $9: 4,9: 8,9: 10,$ | relation [15] - | 47:14 |
| $51: 9$ <br> Propert | 22:1, 32:11, 37:9, | 12:5 | 10:14, 10:25, | 2:24, 9:21, 11:5, | resolve [3] - |
|  | $37: 15,38: 3$ | rationale [1] - | 11:29, 15:2, 24:5, | $12: 9,19: 1,19: 4$ | $6: 22,25: 18$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 47:11, 47:12 } \\ \text { proposal [12] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 11,39: 12, \\ & 43: 1,45: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 18 \\ & \text { read }[3]-47: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $34: 6,39: 17$ | $33: 3,33: 21,34: 1$ | $47: 14$ resourc |
| $19: 23,29: 25$,$30: 11,34: 2$, | 46:15, 47:4, | 47:24 | reducing [2] - | $34: 25,35: 23$ | 8:22 |
|  | 48:24 | reading [1] - | 25:19, 37:6 | 39:28 | respect [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30: 11,34: 2, \\ & 39: 28,41: 15 \end{aligned}$ | putting [1]-8:5 | 36:20 | reduction [18] - | relevant [1] - | 5:26, 10:29, |
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