



---

# Community Outcomes Monitoring Report

---

2007/08

---

Rangitikei District Council  
February 2009

---

## Executive Summary

This is the second report on progress towards achieving the Community Outcomes identified by the community in 2005 for the 2006-16 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP). The first report was produced in late 2007. That report highlighted gaps in the data that was available which it hoped could be filled as monitoring progresses: this report confirms that some of that information is not accessible or available enough to be useful.

This report therefore provides the first comparison for whether the District has progressed any of the outcomes.

Since the first Monitoring Report, the Council has developed a condensed set of Community Outcomes and a revised set of indicators which are more readily available and/or meaningful. Overall it is hoped that this will make the next Monitoring Report easier to follow.

Despite the changes, the first and second monitoring reports have established a baseline and, in some case a trend, for some of the indicators and it is intended to build on this in future years. Of particular note is:

- The economy has been performing well in terms of growth in GDP, GST and tourist arrivals and stays in the District relative to other Districts with similar features but lags behind the national average growth;
- Population decline has eased but is still significant. Population growth is unlikely in the foreseeable future.

In other areas, although precise information for the identified indicators is lacking, research into other potential sources of quantitative information and some anecdotal evidence suggests that:

- The natural and managed rural environment continues to be a key asset for the District: both are productive for the District's economy;
- The natural environments are generally in a good condition. Soil erosion is probably the major issue facing the environment;
- Pride in the District's heritage and culture, expressed through activities in the Town Centres and various events and festivals, is strong and growing;
- Access to hospital and specialist health services could be more of an issue than access to primary healthcare. This may not apply across the District since it is likely that access to GPs is not equal across the District;
- Investment in local infrastructure has paid dividends in the case of Taihape Area School with increasing High School enrolments.

## Background

### What are Community Outcomes?

Community Outcomes are goals that the community has identified as being important for the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing both in the present and in the future. There are no right or wrong outcomes – instead, they reflect what the community believes is important for its future well-being.

Community Outcomes have a future focus, and form part of the Council's ten-year plan (Long Term Council Community Plan). Community Outcomes give the Council the opportunity to ensure that it understands the aspirations of the community, and which helps the Council to better plan for the future.

### What is Council's role?

The Rangitikei District Council is responsible for the process of identifying Community Outcomes, and for monitoring and reporting on progress to achieve Community Outcomes at least once every three years.

However, the Council also has a role to play in contributing to achieving Community Outcomes. Many of the functions of Council, such as providing safe water and wastewater systems, roading, or dog control, contribute to the achievement of Community Outcomes. There are also opportunities for the Council to contribute via a number of new projects and initiatives, and in advocating on behalf of the community to central government and other organisations.

### What is the Community's role?

The Council alone cannot achieve the Community Outcomes, but by working together with individuals, organisations, and businesses, more can be achieved. Furthermore, District involvement in achieving the Community Outcomes brings people together, strengthens the various community ties, and improves the capability of the District to meet future challenges.

### How were the Community Outcomes identified?

In 2005, the Council started the process of identifying the Community Outcomes for inclusion in its 2006-16 Long Term Council Community Plan. The process had many different components which culminated in a District-wide vote where each registered voter was mailed a voting form with each of the 15 Community Outcome statements, and asked to indicate how important the statement was.

Over 3000 responses were received, which produced a set of 15 prioritised Community Outcomes. Wherever these Community Outcomes are listed, they are in the order in which they were prioritised by the community.

### Next steps

Since the 2006-16 LTCCP, Rangitikei District Council and other local authorities, in conjunction with agencies such as SOLGM (the Society of Local Government Managers) and Audit New Zealand, have worked to improve the processes around Community Outcomes. Particularly, more work has been done on how progress can be more effectively monitored and reported and how Council activities can better link with the Outcomes.

This was highlighted in the Rangitikei during the first Monitoring Report for 2006/07 where much information for the identified indicators was not readily available. The situation has not markedly improved for this second reporting period. Council has reviewed the Community Outcomes and monitoring regime for the draft 2009-19 LTCCP which is due for consultation in March 2009.

The LTCCP 2009-19 proposes that the 15 Community Outcomes are condensed to six which reflect broader themes and that the monitoring regime provides a greater mix of quantitative and qualitative measures which can reflect the local situation.

In the quantitative instances, a baseline and/or trend has been established. For the qualitative instances, further work is needed in partnership with the community and other agencies. Council has identified several Community Outcomes where it can help to facilitate information gathering and sharing in order to develop better, local services.

#### **Communitrak Survey**

The Communitrak survey, commissioned by Council on a three yearly basis, is a telephone survey of Rangitikei residents who are asked to state their satisfaction with different Council services. The survey is carried out nationally and gives comparisons with national averages and also between Councils that have similarities (a peer group of like-Districts). Using the Communitrak survey is the most efficient way for Council to collect data about people's perceptions. Council will endeavour to ask the same questions every Communitrak survey so that comparisons over time can be made. Some of this can add to our monitoring of Community Outcomes but it needs to be combined with other approaches to gain an understanding of why residents feel relatively satisfied or dissatisfied.

#### **Note on reporting periods**

This is proposed to be a report about progress to achieve the community outcomes for the year from 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008. However, some indicator data is not available on a yearly basis (such as Census data, which is available every five years), or is reported to a different period. Wherever possible, data has been sourced for the year ended 30 June 2008. Care must therefore be taken when assessing trends between indicator data for different reporting periods.

## Progress towards achieving Community Outcomes

**“There will be a full range of local, affordable primary health and other essential services and amenities, and access to specialist services”**

Indicator	Evidence	Frequency	Most Recent measure	Previous Measure
Ratio of General Practitioners to population	NZ Medical Register	Annually	10 registered GPs in the Rangitikei Ratio is 1: 1,495 (December 2008)	11 registered GPs in the Rangitikei Ratio is 1:1,337 (November 2007)
Provision of health services			Data collection not completed	Data collection not completed
Provision of essential services			Data collection not completed	Data collection not completed

### Assessment

The ratio of General Practitioners (GPs) to the population shows capacity within the district for primary healthcare. There are several national benchmarks for this indicator with 1 GP for 1400 people being the ideal ratio and anything from 1 GP for 2000 people meaning there would be considerable strain on the GP to be able to provide effective primary healthcare<sup>1</sup>.

Rangitikei would appear to have a healthy ratio of 1 GP for 1,495 people although the downward trend is worrying. However, the loss of a GP in a rural community can have a much greater impact than in an urban environment since the next closest GP may be some considerable distance away. So, whilst it may appear at first glance from the single indicator that an Outcome around access to health should focus on access to hospital and specialist services rather than access to primary healthcare services, care must be taken with interpretation of the data.

Council still intends to gather information on health and other essential services available in the District, but it will need to focus the data collection so that the task can be done.

Council has also queried whether combining health and essential services in one outcome confuses the issues. It has concluded that the issues around health services are so important that they warrant a dedicated community outcome. The new community outcome suggested for consultation through the draft LTCCP 2009-19 is “Good access to health services: with ready access to health services, whether it be the GP or the hospital”. Other essential services are still addressed through other outcomes.

Access to health services is an issue that Council can affect mainly through its advocacy role and working in partnership with those statutory and community agencies that are actually engaged in the delivery of health services. Council proposes to work with these agencies to gather anecdotal and qualitative information (rather than data) to identify specific local issues and to develop initiatives to meet the needs.

<sup>1</sup> London, M. 2002. New Zealand Annual Rural Workforce Survey. Wellington. Rural Health Consultancy.

**“There will be a safe community through effective partnership with local policing, rescue service, neighbourhood support and local initiatives”**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Most Recent Measure</b>	<b>Previous Measure</b>
Recorded crime <sup>2</sup>	<i>Central Districts Policing Region</i>	Annually	For year ended December 2007 32,760 recorded crime 15,638 resolved crime	For year ended December 2005 30,731 recorded crime 13,555 resolved crime For year ended December 2006 33,018 recorded crimes 14,822 resolved crimes
Respondents' perception that towns in the District are safe	Communitrak Survey	Every 3 years	80% (2007)	Not previously collected

**Assessment**

Data for the Central Districts Policing Region has been included in this report: more local data is not yet available. The Rangitikei District falls within the Central Districts Policing Region, which also includes Wanganui and Palmerston North.

Reporting on the “perception of safety” has been included in the most recent Communitrak survey, and provides a baseline for future surveys. The question will be included in the next triennial survey.

Council is recommending that this Community Outcome remains in the revised set of outcomes presented for consultation in the 2009-19 draft LTCCP. Council has reviewed its activities and the potential contribution that it can make to this Outcome and will be monitoring residents' satisfaction with an identified group of services that contribute to community safety (Emergency Planning, Footpaths and Streetlights and Animal Control) and with resident's perceptions of community cohesion.

Council also believes it can take an advocacy role – as outlined above in the assessment of Community Outcome 1– to work with statutory and voluntary agencies to gather anecdotal and qualitative information to identify specific local issues and to develop initiatives to meet the needs.

---

<sup>2</sup> This measure was included in the 2006-16 Long Term Council Community Plan as “Reported Crime” but has been changed to “Recorded Crime” at the request of NZ Police to align with national reporting terminology.

**“There will be a high quality, local and flexible education system that meets the lifelong needs of all community members”**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Most Recent Measure</b>	<b>Previous Measure</b>
Level of educational attainment	Census	Every 5 years	As at 2006 Census 63% of adults between 20-64 years attained at least a secondary school qualification  9% of adults between 20-64 attained a tertiary qualification	As at 2001 Census 58% of adults between 20-64 years attained at least a secondary school qualification  6% of adults between 20-64 attained a tertiary qualification
<b>Educational achievement</b> Percentage of students achieving Level 1 literacy requirements	NZQA website	Annually	Rangitikei College 80% Taihape Area School 77% New Zealand 77% (2007)	Rangitikei College 67% Taihape Area School 75% New Zealand 75.8% (2006)
<b>Educational achievement</b> Percentage of students achieving Level 1 numeracy requirements	NZQA website	Annually	Rangitikei College 82% Taihape Area School 85.7% New Zealand 84.6% (2007)	Rangitikei College 80.5% Taihape Area School 82.9% New Zealand 82.9% (2006)
Percentage of school-age children remaining within the District for education <sup>3</sup> .	Local School Roll/ Stats NZ x 100	Annually	67% (July 2008)	Not previously collected
Provision of NCEA/NZQA accredited courses			Data not yet collected	Data not yet collected

**Assessment**

From the statistics collected above, the situation seems to be improving. Since the last report, Council has identified some data available from NZQA around literacy and numeracy relating to students at the two state High Schools in the District. As you can see both high schools are both close to the national average in both literacy and numeracy, with Rangitikei College having a significant improvement in literacy achievement from 2006 to 2007. These are a very rough proxy for education achievement. It is not intended as a measure or comment of the effectiveness of the school: clearly there are a huge number of factors contributing to educational achievement.

Originally it was suggested that a community survey was undertaken to find out how many secondary school children were leaving the District for their education. This could be prohibitively expensive for Council and so it is suggested that the total school roll in the District as a percentage of the population of school age residents could be a more readily available indicator.

The final suggested indicator requires an extensive data collection exercise. As with the data relating to the first community outcome on health and essential services, the value of such a data collection exercise is questionable. The intention behind the indicator is to monitor whether the provision of courses matches identified needs (for example, to improve work prospects or meet skills shortages) and/or identified demand (what do our residents want to do with their leisure time that brings them personal growth?).

As above, Council believes it can take an advocacy role to work with employers, statutory education service providers and community agencies to gather anecdotal and qualitative information to identify specific local issues and to develop initiatives to meet the lifelong learning needs of the

<sup>3</sup> Does not include home-schooled students.

resident population. The role of early childhood/kura kohanga in good outcomes for lifelong education is recognised by Council but outside the scope of current monitoring resources – it is hoped that the partnership approach will enable this issue to be raised and considered as part of the spectrum.

**“There will be a thriving district economy supported by forward planning, minimal regulation and specific initiatives for new and existing businesses.”**

Indicator	Evidence	Frequency	Most Recent Measure	Previous Measure
NZ Index of Deprivation 1 = less likely to be deprived 10 = more likely to be deprived	Ministry of Health from Census data	Every 5 years	<u>2006 Census Data</u> Mangaweka: 8 Hunterville: 8 Ratana: 10 Bulls: 7 Ngamatea: 1 Moawhango: 2 Pohonui-Porewa: 4 Lake Alice: 4 Koitiata: 9 Taihape: 7 Marton 8	<u>2001 Census Data</u> Mangaweka: 7 Hunterville: 8 Ratana: 10 Bulls: 7 Ngamatea: 3 Moawhango: 3 Pohonui-Porewa: 3 Lake Alice: 5 Koitiata: 9 Taihape: 8 Marton 8
Building and construction activity - level of residential building via building consents granted.	Rangitikei District Council	Annually	<u>For year ended 30 June 2008</u> Net <sup>4</sup> new residential dwellings by building consents = 58	<u>For year ended 30 June 2006</u> Net new residential dwellings by building consents = 43  <u>For year ended 30 June 2007</u> Net new residential dwellings by building consents = 59
Value added district GDP <sup>5</sup>	BERL	Annually	<u>For year ended March 2006</u> Value added GDP = \$339M	<u>For year ended March 2005</u> Value added GDP = \$314M
District GST <sup>6</sup> <i>For the Manawatu/Wanganui Region</i>	Statistics NZ	Quarterly	<u>For the December quarter 2007</u> Net GST= \$1.3713M	<u>For the December quarter 2005</u> Net GST = \$1.2487M  <u>For the December quarter 2006</u> Net GST = \$1.3422M

### Assessment

As reported in the first Monitoring Report, a number of areas have had minor changes to their deprivation ranks (Mangaweka, Ngamatea, Moawhango, Pohonui-Porewa, and Lake Alice), which may reflect the relatively small and dispersed populations, exaggerating small changes to various factors within the deprivation measure. The change in the Taihape deprivation rank from 8 to 7 may reflect moderate improvement in the socio-economic conditions in that community.

<sup>4</sup> Net new residential dwellings are new buildings less demolitions

<sup>5</sup> From the Regional Database Statistics NZ – now discontinued

<sup>6</sup> From the Statistics NZ Quarterly Review series – now discontinued

Statistics NZ are currently developing new datasets for economic indicators but the Regional Database and Quarterly Review series have been discontinued. BERL (Business and Economic Research Ltd) still undertake a survey and publish Regional Performance Indicators which can be used to compare growth in GDP from year to year between and within Councils. More work will be undertaken to identify appropriate indicators before the next report is published. However, the picture is generally that Rangitikei is experiencing slower growth than nationally but is doing relatively well when compared with neighbouring and comparative Districts.

Looking forward, Council is suggesting that economic indicators for this Community Outcome focus on those sectors of the economy that are important or growing for the District i.e. agriculture, downstream processing and tourism. The indicators for this Outcome could also look at the infrastructure that supports business growth, such as communication (broadband and transport) the regulatory environment (building consents etc) and the attractiveness of the District as a place for businesses to locate. As such, Council is recommending that other Community Outcomes are incorporated into a broad economic Outcome with specific indicators that are of particular relevance to our local situation.

**“There will be a Rangitikei District that is recognised as a viable and attractive place to move to, work, learn and play in.”**

Indicator	Evidence	Frequency	Most Recent Measure	Previous Measure
Number of enrolled students	Ministry of Education	Annually	As at 1 July 2007  963 Secondary School students enrolled at 4 colleges within the district	As at 1 July 2005  904 Secondary School students enrolled at 4 colleges within the district  <u>As at 1 July 2006</u>  860 Secondary School students enrolled at 4 colleges within the district
Net migration (external arrivals – departures)	Statistics New Zealand	Annually	<u>For year ended 30 June 2008</u> Not currently available	<u>For year ended 30 June 2007</u> Net migration = decrease of 25 people.
Number of people leaving the district for retail services, employment, sports and recreation	Community survey		Community survey has not been undertaken for this reporting period.	Community survey has not been undertaken for this reporting period.

**Assessment**

The fluctuation in the number of children enrolled in district secondary schools may reflect fluctuating population trends – however, it is likely that the new development of Taihape Area School in the north of the District in the past year has affected enrolments.

Net migration figures for the year to June 2008 are not readily available although declining population trends continue to affect the District. In December 2008, Statistics New Zealand had this to say “the largest percentage decreases in population between 2006 and 2031 are projected for the districts of Kawerau (down 1.1 percent a year), Wairoa (down 1.0 percent a year), and Ruapehu, South Waikato and Rangitikei (down 0.9 percent). These five areas are all likely to have shrinking natural increase and continuing net migration outflows, although these outflows are assumed to be smaller than experienced historically.”

Population decline continues to be one of the most important determinants of Community Outcomes for the District – it is also reflected in Community Outcome 10.

A community survey was identified as “being useful to identify the extent to which residents need or choose to leave the district for various activities such as shopping, employment, and sports and recreation. Such a survey would also endeavour to identify reasons for such departures, to enable programmes to be considered that may address the issue.”<sup>7</sup> As described previously, such a survey would be an expensive and time-consuming exercise: Council would prefer that such surveys should be seen as an information gathering exercise to identify new initiatives to meet locally identified needs in conjunction with our local public, private and community agencies.

<sup>7</sup> Community Outcomes Monitoring Report 2006/07: RDC

In its review of the Community Outcomes, Council is recommending that the monitoring regime for this Outcome is revised to reflect the “quality of life” aspects of the District. Population growth (or slowing of the decline) is a headline indicator that life in the Rangitikei is good, supported by a full range of local facilities and services (many of which are provided through Council activities) and a sense of pride in place and heritage.

“There will be a more connected Rangitikei District that has a high standard of reliable transport and telecommunications and where people know what is going on.”

Indicator	Evidence	Frequency	Most Recent Measure	Previous Measure
Quality of surface of roading network	Land Transport NZ		<p><b>Surface condition in Rangitikei District</b></p> <p>Notes: the higher the value of 100 - condition index (CI), the fewer the defects in the sealed road surface. CI and the routine for calculating it using the RAMM software, were introduced in the 2002/03 year. Source: RAMM information from Territorial authorities (does not include Transit NZ data).</p>	
Access to private motor vehicle	Census	Every years	5	<p><u>As at 2006 Census</u></p> <p>5,007 households had access to one or more motor vehicles (88.8% of district households)</p> <p><u>As at 2001 Census</u></p> <p>4,875 households have access to one or more motor vehicles (87.4% of district households)</p>
Percentage of population with telephone and internet access	Census	Every years	5	<p><u>As at 2006 Census</u></p> <p>4,770 households had access to a telephone (88.4% of district households) 3,771 households had access to a mobile phone or cell phone (70% of district households) 2,805 households had access to the internet (52% of district households)</p> <p><u>As at 2001 Census</u></p> <p>5,121 households had access to a telephone (95% of district households) 1,560 households had access to the internet (29% of district households)</p>
Quality of broadband connections in the Rangitikei District	Random sampling of Rangitikei district phone numbers through online line speed checker			<p>Data not yet collected.</p> <p>Data not yet collected.</p>

### Assessment

The surface condition of the roading network in the district (excluding State Highways) is shown above in the graph. It shows steady improvement which should continue as the Roding Asset Management Plan is implemented. The measure is indicative of the investment from the Council in

roading which is designed to maintain or improve the roading network. Should Council disinvest in the roading network, then the indicator would decrease.

The other measures are derived from Census figures and relate to access to private motor vehicles and telecommunications (landlines, cell phones and internet). As previously reported<sup>8</sup>, it is noteworthy that internet access has increased from 29% in 2001 to 52% in 2006 compared with an increase in national access over the same period from 37% to 61%. Council has kept abreast of national developments for public access to the internet through the provision of this facility in public libraries. Council has engaged with the Government agenda for improving internet access, the Digital Strategy 2.0, in recognition that the District is lagging behind other areas of the country and yet tele-working and distance-learning may be important factors in the growth of the District.

In reviewing the Community Outcomes, Council has agreed that a reliable transport and telecommunications network makes a vital contribution to economic growth and is recommending that it is seen as an integral part of monitoring the economic buoyancy of the District.

---

<sup>8</sup> Community Outcomes Monitoring Report 2006/07. RDC

**“There will be a Rangitikei District that is known for its heritage, primary production and tourism activities.”**

Indicator	Evidence	Frequency	Most Recent Measure	Previous Measure
Number of “guest nights” and “guest arrivals”.	Statistics New Zealand Accommodation Survey	Annually	<u>For year ended 30 June 2008</u>  Guest nights = 46,291 Guest arrivals = 30,831	<u>For year ended 30 June 2006</u>  Guest nights = 38,940 Guest arrivals = 24,968  <u>For year ended 30 June 2007</u>  Guest nights = 43,665 Guest arrivals = 28,689
Percentage of District land used for primary production			Data not yet collected.	Data not yet collected.
Number of visitors to District museums			Data not yet collected.	Data not yet collected.

**Assessment**

The trend in terms of tourism indicators is very positive with both the number of guest arrivals and “guest nights” (guests staying in accommodation within the district for a night) on the rise. Council’s expressed goal is to treble the number of “guest nights” by 2015/16 (using the June 2006 figure as the baseline) and it has continued to invest as a partner in the Major Regional Initiative (MRI), which includes Wanganui and Ruapehu District Councils. In 2007, the MRI developed a regional brand Te Kahui Tupua to brand a touring route throughout the three districts and increase tourism.

It has not proved possible to date to identify a reliable data source to reflect the percentage of District land used for primary production. There has yet to be meaningful progress with the various District museums to develop a regular process for collecting visitor data.

In revising the Community Outcomes, Council was persuaded that this Community Outcome does not stand alone but should be an integral part of the Outcomes associated with economic buoyancy (particularly for primary production and tourism) and “quality of life” (particularly support for the local heritage organisations). This has been proposed in the new draft LTCCP 2009-19.

## “There will be respected aquatic environments.”

Indicator	Evidence	Frequency	Most Recent Measure	Previous Measure
Level of faecal contamination including E-coli and Enterococci	Horizons Regional Council		As a consequence of discussions (see below), the information relating to this measure is no longer being sought from Horizons Regional Council	Awaiting data from Horizons Regional Council
Water clarity/turbidity	Horizons Regional Council		As above	Awaiting data from Horizons Regional Council
Nutrient Level (Nitrate/dissolved reactive phosphorous)	Horizons Regional Council		As above	Awaiting data from Horizons Regional Council
Cultural Health Index scores for nominated sites	Rangitikei District Council with Horizons Regional Council and district Iwi		Council will continue to explore the use of the Cultural health Index.	Cultural Health Index monitoring has not been established yet

### Assessment

In many ways, this Outcome has been the easiest and yet the most problematic to monitor. The selected indicators are very general measures of very specific measurements. Council staff have been participating in a regional group of Council officers with responsibility for measuring Community Outcomes and which also includes Horizons Regional Council staff. Each authority has its own designated measures around environmental monitoring and all are reliant upon Horizons for the data. Horizons has its own indicators for monitoring progress towards its own community outcomes. The staff group has begun to focus on developing local indicators that fit in with Horizons environmental monitoring programme.

For example, Horizons has a regular programme to sample the region’s rivers at various points from source to sea. The programme measures quality for swimming (presence of pathogens), nutrient enrichment, life supporting capacity and turbidity (which can indicate erosion) to give an overall rating for the water course. Given the importance of the rivers to the District, and perhaps the particular significance of the Rangitikei, it is suggested that the monitoring for our aquatic environments is linked with the Horizons sampling and assessment programme. So, for example, the latest figures from Horizons (2005) relating to the Rangitikei are;

	Presence of pathogens	Nutrient enrichment	Life supporting capacity	Turbidity
Upper Rangitikei (to River Valley Lodge)	Excellent/Good	Excellent/Good	Excellent/Good	Excellent/Good
Middle Rangitikei (to Mangaweka)	Excellent/Good	Excellent/Good	Excellent/Good	Fair
Middle Rangitikei (to Vinegar Hill)	Fair	Excellent/Good	Excellent/Good	Poor

Lower Rangitikei	Poor	Fair	Excellent/Good	Poor
Overall	Moderate issues	Moderate Issues	Minor issues	Moderate issues

Council is proposing a broader environmental Outcome which recognises a broader environmental well-being but is specific to local issues. It is working with Horizons to monitor progress on river quality (as it relates to the Rangitikei as above), sustainable land use (through the Horizons sustainable land use programme) and biodiversity – to protect the District’s natural habitats and environments. The new monitoring will also recognise Council’s role through relevant activities such as the regulation of development and maintaining parks and reserves.

**“There will be residents of the Rangitikei District enjoying a wide range of sporting, cultural and recreational facilities.”**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Most Recent Measure</b>	<b>Previous Measure</b>
Residents (children aged 5-17 and adults aged 18 +) who are physically active for at 30 mins on at least 5 of the preceding 7 days	Community Survey		No further progress has been made on undertaking a Community Survey on this measure.	Community survey has not been undertaken for this reporting period.
Residents who have participated in a cultural experience	Community Survey		As above.	Community survey has not been undertaken for this reporting period.

**Assessment**

As previously reported<sup>9</sup>, both these measures are based on nationally undertaken surveys, the first by Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC) and the second by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage. Neither is carried out with the regularity or local detail needed to effectively measure progress in Rangitikei without undertaking expensive and time consuming local surveys. For example, the latest figure just released for 2007/08 for the percentage of people in SPARC’s Wanganui region (which includes Rangitikei) taking 30 minutes or more of moderate intensity physical activity on at least five days out of seven was 43%. Men were significantly more likely than women (57% versus 32%) and the region lagged behind the national average of 48% with only two regions performing worse – North Harbour and Gisborne. Since the figures are aggregated to the regional level, it is not possible to relate this specifically to the Rangitikei District or to draw any specific conclusions. In that respect it is not a useful indicator.

Council is supporting a Leisure Group that is implementing the Council’s Leisure Plan and would prefer to pursue a process of working with local partners to identify and develop local initiatives which are aimed at increasing access to and participation in sporting, cultural and recreational activities. There is a role for Council in the provision of facilities for these activities and also in supporting local events that promote local heritage and culture.

In revising the Community Outcomes, Council is suggesting that this Outcome is integrated in the “quality of life” Outcome as a particular contributor to enjoying life in the Rangitikei.

<sup>9</sup> Community Outcomes Monitoring Report 2006/07. RDC

## “There will be an increasing resident population”

Indicator	Evidence	Frequency	Most Recent Measure	Previous Measure
Population count	Census data	Every 5 years	<u>As at Census 2006</u>  District Population Count (usually resident population): 14,712  Projected for Census 2011 (medium range): 14,600	<u>As at Census 1996</u> District Population Count (usually resident population): 16,356  <u>As at Census 2001</u>  District Population Count (usually resident population): 15,102

### Assessment

As previously reported<sup>10</sup>, the Census 2006 data shows a decreasing population. However, the decrease of 2.6% is significantly lower than the decrease between 1996 and 2001 (7.7%), suggesting that the decreasing trend may be easing. The population projection for the next Census is for a further decrease within a range of 14,200 – 14,900 so progress can be monitored within this range.

In reviewing the Community Outcomes, Council recognises the importance of keeping people living and working in the Rangitikei. It is suggesting that this measure is one of the headline indicators for “enjoying life in the Rangitikei” but that population growth is unlikely to occur.

<sup>10</sup> Community Outcomes Monitoring Report 06/07. RDC

**“There will be communities that are responsive to the vulnerable sectors of society”**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Most Recent Measure</b>	<b>Previous Measure</b>
Perception of survey respondents who perceived selected groups as being subject to a great deal or some discrimination	Community Survey		No further progress has been made on undertaking a Community Survey on this measure.	Community survey has not been undertaken for this reporting period.
Percentage of people who perceived that the community works together and that people support each other	Community Survey		As above.	Community survey has not been undertaken for this reporting period.

**Assessment**

This Outcome articulates the aspiration for cohesive communities where all members of the community are valued and where their needs are met. More than that, it was intended to provide a measure of people taking action within communities to support and value the more vulnerable members. As stated before, a community survey has not been undertaken and Council is unsure whether the questions originally developed are the right ones. For example, perceptions of discrimination are very personal and difficult to interpret. Perceptions of how well a community works together and supports each other can be a measure of community cohesion and social well-being. Council intends to include a question about this in the next Communitrak survey but will need to think carefully about how the spirit of this outcome can be captured.

Council is proposing that this Outcome and the associated indicator make an important contribution to resident’s perceptions of community safety and trust in their neighbours and their community. It is therefore proposed to include this in that outcome and Council is consulting on this through the draft LTCCP 2009-19.

## “There will be a minimised human impact of the environment”

Indicator	Evidence	Frequency	Most Recent Measure	Previous Measure
Quantity of waste processed at Waste Transfer Stations per capita	Rangitikei District Council		Year ended 30 June 2008 Waste processed at Marton, Hunterville, Taihape Waste Transfer Stations: tonnes: 7,787.43	Year ended 30 June 2006 Waste processed at Marton, Hunterville, Taihape Waste Transfer Stations: 8,149.39 tonnes Year ended 30 June 2007 Waste processed at Marton, Hunterville, Taihape Waste Transfer Stations: 8,278.22 tonnes
Percentage of land being used sustainably	Horizons Regional Council		As a consequence of discussions (see below), the information relating to this measure is no longer being sought from Horizons Regional Council	Awaiting data from Horizons Regional Council
Quality of air sampled at Marton & Taihape	Horizons Regional Council		As above	Awaiting data from Horizons Regional Council

### Assessment

The volume of waste processed at the three waste transfer stations has dropped in this past year. As previously reported<sup>11</sup>, these figures should be read with caution. The intention of using this indicator is to give a sense of the impact on the environment within the Rangitikei. Waste management within the District is delivered by an external contractor and waste from outside the district is also processed at these waste transfer stations. Consequently there is limited scope to influence the direction of this indicator – however, it is all that is available at the moment. The Council will review its Waste Minimisation Plan in the next two years and it is hoped that some more meaningful measures can be determined.

In revising the Community outcomes, Council is proposing that this Outcome can be captured within a broader environmental Outcome that recognises human impact on the environment as both positive and negative. Where Council activities impact upon the environment, it will endeavour to ensure that this is positive and will monitor residents satisfaction with these activities – particularly around rubbish and recycling, and the management of water services (water, wastewater and stormwater).

As outlined above under the section on Aquatic Environments, Council staff are working with Horizons Regional Council staff to develop indicators around biodiversity and sustainable land use.

<sup>11</sup> Community Outcomes Monitoring Report 2006/07. RDC

**“There will be a strengthened rural character of the Rangitikei, by utilising available land in a sustainable, productive and profitable way.”**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Year ending February</b>	<b>Employee count</b>
No. Employees in the agriculture, forestry and fishing sector	Statistics New Zealand	Annually	2000	1620
			2001	1690
			2002	1890
			2003	1810
			2004	1560
			2005	1760
			2006	1750
			2007	1650
			2008	1620

**Assessment**

The data shows a trend of decreasing numbers of employees in the agriculture, forestry and fishing sector in the Rangitikei District. Nonetheless it remains our primary industry and various other local sectors are dependent upon it. As a measurement of progress against this outcome, however, it is insufficient.

Council is proposing that the Outcome is subsumed within the Outcomes around economic buoyancy and environmental sustainability.

**“There will be wide recognition of the integrity of the District’s diverse natural resources.”**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Most Recent Measure</b>	<b>Previous Measure</b>
Trends in water levels and flows, consented water use and actual water use	Horizons Regional Council		As a consequence of discussions (see below), the information relating to this measure is no longer being sought from Horizons Regional Council	Awaiting data from Horizons Regional Council
Dollars spent on Department of Conservation and Council-owned reserves	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry		Data not yet collected	Data not yet collected

**Assessment**

The aspiration contained in this Outcome is once again not fully reflected in the monitoring regime above. In addition, the data is not readily available. A reporting regime that offered narrative about local issues and activities in the context of the wider environmental monitoring that is carried out by Horizons is more appropriate. Council is suggesting that this Outcome is subsumed within the broader environmental one.

**“There will be a stronger sense of people and place within the Rangitikei District celebrated through its stories, history, festivals and fairs.”**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Most Recent Measure</b>	<b>Previous Measure</b>
Percentage of people that identify with the Rangitikei District	Community Survey		No further progress has been made on undertaking a Community Survey on this measure.	Community survey has not been undertaken for this reporting period.
Number of people involved in established district festivals	Community Survey		As above.	Community survey has not been undertaken for this reporting period.

**Assessment**

No national survey is conducted to provide data for these indicators, and so a local community survey would be needed. This would reliably indicate the extent to which the district is perceived a unified and discrete community, and give Council a gauge of community cohesion. It is intended to continue to include a question in the Communitrak survey asking for resident’s satisfaction levels with Council efforts to preserve and protect the District’s history and heritage. The figure in the 2007 survey was 71%.

This needs to be underpinned by Council actions around support for community organisations and events that promote the District for residents and visitors alike.

Council is proposing that this Outcome is subsumed within the “quality of life” Outcome: celebrating the District’s uniqueness makes people feel better about living here.