

# **SECTION 6:** **Additional Information**

---



# Statement on the Development of Māori Capacity to Contribute to Council Decision-Making

## Introduction

Council is committed to working with Maori and Tangata Whenua to build internal capacity and capability, not least to support the requirements given effect to by the Treaty Settlements. While required to have this policy under the Local Government Act, Council is committed to having working relationships with Maori which go above and beyond what is required under the legislative framework.

Clause 8 of Schedule 10 of the Local Government Act 2002 requires that the Council outline any steps it might take to foster the development of Māori capacity building to contribute to its decision-making processes, over the period covered by this plan.

The key provision in the Local Government Act 2002 regarding the Council's relationship with Māori is section 81, which requires all councils to fulfil three primary tasks:

- a) Establish and maintain processes to provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority; and
- b) Consider ways in which it may foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority; and
- c) Provide relevant documentation to Māori for the purposes of the above two paragraphs.

## The Memorandum of Understanding: Tutohinga

The Memorandum of Understanding, initially signed in 1998, recognises the fundamental role of Iwi in the District and the essential partnership between Iwi and the Rangitikei District Council. The key mechanism for delivering on the partnership intent of the Memorandum is Te Roopu Ahi Kaa, a standing advisory committee of the Council. Tangata Whēnua of the District are represented on the Komiti, as is

the Ratana Community. Komiti members are regularly briefed on Council matters and specifically offered a lead role in reviews of policies/statements of particular relevance to Māori. Members of the Komiti are also provided with a training budget in order to build capacity and capability among the group.

To give effect to the intent of the Memorandum of Understanding: Tutohinga, the Council and Te Roopu Ahi Kaa are committed to looking for more effective ways to ensure that Māori are well informed, have an ability to have input into processes and, when they do so, understand the reasons for the Council's response. A Māori community development programme was undertaken during 2011-2014, and provided for facilitated Hui of iwi/Hapu from the northern rohe to pre-caucus before Komiti meetings. A budget is allocated for the Māori Community Development Programme and is to be distributed by the Komiti in accordance with its own processes. This programme is designed to increase the capacity of Māori to contribute to local decision-making, and strengthen relationships between iwi organisations/marae and Council (including through the development of individual MOU). As a result, Council developed a policy for unlocking Māori landlocked land and a policy to recognise iwi/hapu interests in Council-owned land that is declared surplus.

The Memorandum of Understanding: Tutohinga is subject to review at the same time as each Representation Review. The last review was in 2012 and the next will begin in 2018<sup>47</sup>.

## Strategic Planning

Te Roopu Ahi Kaa has adopted a strategic plan which is subject to regular review. This plan identifies a number of actions to achieve three goals – building stronger relationships between Council and Te Roopu Ahi Kaa, building stronger relationships between Council and Iwi, hapu, whanau and Māori communities, and building cultural awareness.

<sup>47</sup> In between these times of comprehensive review, the Komiti may recommend changes to its membership to reflect the needs and views of Iwi/hapu of the District.

Every three years, Council adopts the Long Term Plan, supplemented annually with an Annual Plan. Council will ensure that there is an annual opportunity for iwi to engage with Council's strategic planning process, including the schedule of capital and renewal works, major programmes, policy review development etc.

Council will also ensure that other tributary strategies – for example, arts, heritage, and economic development – receive particular input from iwi/hapu and from Te Roopu Ahi Kaa

Council will welcome the opportunity to receive the strategic and other management plans from iwi/hapu in order to ensure alignment of its own strategies and plans where possible and appropriate, and with particular reference to the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991.

## Iwi Liaison Officer

Te Roopu Aha Kaa suggested that this new role would facilitate effective communication with Tangata Whenua and manage relationships in order to assist with the development and analysis of Council policy. Implementing and potentially reviewing Te Roopu Ahi Kaa's strategic plan forms part of this role. Details are currently being worked out.

## Representation

One of the early components of the Representation Review is consideration whether one or Māori wards should be established in the District. Assuming the current statutory provisions remain in force, Council will continue to refer this matter to the Komiti for its consideration at each Representation Review. At the most recent review in 2017, the Komiti did not make a recommendation on this proposal. Instead it resolved that the future of Te Roopu Ahi Kaa as an advisor group be considered against the value of direct relationships between Iwi and Council.

This is not an 'either-or' question but one of establishing complementary relationships, understanding both the potential advantages and disadvantages of both. The Komiti advocates that Te Roopu Ahi Kaa achieves a sense of tribal

accountability, which is important for a district with multiple iwi. The Komiti is therefore in agreement that Maori Wards would not negate the need for Te Roopu Ahi Kaa. Council expects this discussion to be ongoing and to develop as the relationship between Council and iwi organisations in the district matures.

In 2017, Council decided to invite Te Roopu Ahi Kaa to nominate one of its members to be a member of the Assets/Infrastructure Committee with full voting rights. This arrangement will be extended in 2018 to include representation on the Policy/Planning and Finance/Performance Committees. This is viewed by the Komiti as being a form of meaningful participation in Council business.

## The Post Treaty Settlement Environment

Finalisation of Treaty claims is a significant development in the Rangitikei. The Council is aware that in a post-settlement phase, iwi with Mana Whēnua have obligations to all people in the rohe.

Ngati Apa's claim is the first claim to be settled in the District and so is of particular significance to the District. It has resulted in addressing a number of longstanding grievances that some Iwi and Hapu in our District have had with the Crown. The settlement will also result in commercial and cultural redress that is likely to change the business, and cultural landscape within the region. Council will seek to establish a Memorandum of Understanding with Ngati Apa which supports the realisation of these benefits and Ngati Apa have also expressed interest in seeking closer working relationships with Council.

Ngati Rangi is quickly approaching settlement and the Taihape claims are anticipated in the near future. Once these settlements are complete, they are likely to promote stronger working relationships with Council, particularly in the economic and industry space. The impacts of the Settlements/Acts on Council's business, resourcing levels and processes are not fully known at this stage.

The Iwi Advisory Komiti is an opportunity for Iwi/hapu without the capacity to engage independently to engage in a relationship with Council. However, the Iwi Advisory Komiti does not pre-empt the opportunity for individual Iwi/hapu to have a direct relationship with Council.

# Significance and Engagement Policy

## Purpose and Scope

To enable the Council and its communities to identify the degree of significance attached to decisions around particular issues, proposals, assets and activities.

To provide clarity about how and when communities can expect to be engaged in decisions made by Council.

To inform the Council and the community, from the beginning of a decision-making process, about the extent, form and type of engagement required.

## Legislative Context

Every decision made by a local authority must be made in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002.

Councils are required to adopt a Significance and Engagement Policy to enable it to determine the significance of the decision to be made and, where appropriate, engage with its community<sup>48</sup>.

The Council will not make a decision or proceed with a proposal which it considers to be significant, unless it is first satisfied that the following requirements have been met:

### Requirements in relation to decisions<sup>49</sup>

- Identify all reasonably practicable options for the achievement of the objective of a decision
- Assess the advantages and disadvantages of the options.
- Take into account the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land, water, sites, waahi tapu, valued flora and fauna, and other taonga.

### The views of those affected<sup>50</sup>

- In the course of decision making the views of persons likely to be affected or likely to have an interest in the matter must be considered.

### Contributions to decision-making by Maori<sup>51</sup>

- Processes to encourage and foster participation in decision-making by Maori<sup>52</sup>

### Principles of consultation<sup>53</sup>

- Provide reasonable access to relevant information in a manner and format that is appropriate to the preferences and needs of persons likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in, the matter
- Encourage affected/interested persons to present their views to the local authority
- Provide reasonable opportunity to present those views to the local authority and clear information by the local authority concerning the purpose of the consultation and the scope of the decisions to be taken following the consideration of views presented
- Receive the views with an open mind and provide a clear record or description of relevant decisions made by the local authority and explanatory material relating to the decisions.

When Council makes a decision that deviates from this policy, it will clearly identify the inconsistency, the reasons for the inconsistency and any intention to amend the policy to accommodate the decision<sup>54</sup>.

## Community Engagement

The Council believes that public engagement is an essential part of good local government. Good consultation and engagement processes allow individuals and organisations to contribute to democratic local decision-making

<sup>48</sup> Section 76AA

<sup>49</sup> Section 77

<sup>50</sup> Section 78

<sup>51</sup> Section 81

<sup>52</sup> See the Development of Maori Capacity to Contribute to Council Decision-making Policy

<sup>53</sup> Section 82

<sup>54</sup> Section 80 of the Local Government Act 2002

## Special Consultative Procedure

The following decisions require consultation through the special consultative procedure:

- Establishing a council-controlled organisation.
- Making, amending or revoking a bylaw which is of significant public interest or likely to have a significant impact on the public.
- Before adopting a long term plan, using the consultation document.
- Before amending a long term plan, using the consultation document.
- Before adopting an annual plan, using the consultation document (unless there are no significant or material differences to the long-term plan projections for that year).
- Assessing Council's water and other sanitary services.
- Setting administrative charges under the Resource Management Act (and making a policy for discounting administrative charges)<sup>55</sup>

The special consultative procedure requires consultation for at least 1 month, the development of a 'statement of proposal' outlining the proposal, a summary of the information contained within the statement of proposal, information about how anyone interested in the proposal may present their views, and the opportunity to present their views in a way that allows for spoken (or New Zealand sign language) interaction with the Council<sup>56</sup>.

## Non-SCP Engagement

Council will decide on the scope and scale of engagement for decisions which do not require the use of the special consultative procedure on a case-by-case basis. The level of community engagement on a particular issue or decision will be decided by considering the following three factors:

- A. The level of significance of the matter.
- B. Whether the issue is District-wide, or only affects easily identified communities.
- C. The desired level of participation.

An Engagement Plan (schedule 2) will be prepared and approved for every consultation process.

## A. Determining Significance

Council will use the criteria identified below and the potential effects on Council's strategic assets as a guide to determining the significance of a decision. This criteria will be used in other Council decisions for significance.

### Criteria

In considering the degree of significance of every issue requiring a decision, Council will be guided by the following criteria to help determine if specific proposals are significant:

	DEGREE OF SIGNIFICANCE		
	Low (minor and/or short-term)	Medium (moderate/ mid-term)	High (major and/or long term)
The potential effect on Council's ability to act in accordance with the statutory principles relating to local government			
The potential effect on the delivery of the statutory core services			
The level of community interest in the issue			
The financial costs/risk associated with the decision			
The non-financial costs/risk associated with the decision			
The number of people likely to be affected			

<sup>55</sup> Resource Management Act 1991, sections 36 and 36AA.

<sup>56</sup> Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2002. This also provides that Council may allow people to present their views using an audio link or audio-visual link.

## Strategic Assets

The following is a list of assets which are considered to be strategic assets<sup>57</sup>. These assets are needed to maintain Council's capacity to achieve or promote outcomes that it determines to be important to the well-being of the community.

- Sections of the roading network where:
  - Loss of that section would create significant disruption (time for an alternative, number of vehicles affected).
  - There are no alternative routes.
- Each bridge within the District
- Street-lighting
- Water treatment, storage, and supply networks in Ratana
- Water treatment, storage, and supply networks in Bulls
- Water treatment, storage, and supply networks in Marton
- Water treatment, storage, and supply networks in Hunterville
- Water treatment, storage, and supply networks in Mangaweka
- Water treatment, storage, and supply networks in Taihape
- Wastewater network and treatment plant in Ratana
- Wastewater network and treatment plant in Bulls
- Wastewater network and treatment plant in Marton
- Wastewater network and treatment plant in Hunterville
- Wastewater network and treatment plant in Mangaweka
- Wastewater network and treatment plant in Taihape
- Stormwater networks in Ratana
- Stormwater networks in Bulls
- Stormwater networks in Marton
- Stormwater networks in Hunterville
- Stormwater networks in Mangaweka
- Stormwater networks in Taihape
- Community amenities
- Community housing<sup>58</sup>
- District libraries
- Marton administration building
- Emergency Operation Centres
- Recreation facilities
- District cemeteries

## B. District-wide issue

Where an issue or decision has effects which are district-wide, then Council will consult with the whole District. Where an issue or decision is only likely to impact on an easily identified group (e.g. a decision that affects only a specific community) localised engagement only with this group may occur.

## C. Degree of Participation

The degree of participation will be determined using the Public Participation Model (schedule 1). The model will be used in conjunction with the consideration of the following factors:

- The extent to which the current views of parties who will, or may be affected by, or have an interest in, the decision are known.
- The costs and benefits of any engagement process.
- Statutory timeframes.
- If there is an increased risk to health and safety from delaying the decision.
- Whether the decision aligns with previous Council decisions.
- Community preferences for engagement on specific issues.

## Engagement Principles

4.1 When undertaking engagement, the Council will use the following set of principles:

- Select appropriate tools and techniques for engagement, depending upon the level of engagement sought and the impact of the issue being consulted upon.
- Use simple and straightforward language when asking for feedback on proposals.
- Ensure that documents are accessible.
- Encourage councillors, community boards and community committees to engage with local communities and assist Council in consulting on public proposals.

<sup>57</sup>As required by section 76AA and required by section 76AA(3) of the Local Government Act 2002

<sup>58</sup>Any land or building owned by the local authority and required to maintain the local authority's capacity to provide affordable housing as part of its social policy. (LGA 2002, s5)

## Schedule 1 - Public Participation Model

	COUNCIL DECIDES	COUNCIL SEEKS OPINIONS	DISCUSSION AND INVOLVEMENT	PARTNERSHIP	COMMUNITY DECIDES
<b>What does it involve</b>	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, options, or solutions	To obtain public feedback on options or proposed decisions	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that concerns are understood and considered prior to decision making	To partner with the public in aspects of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of preferred solution(s)	To place the final decision-making in the hands of the public
<b>Types of issues it might be used for</b>	Annual report Procurement of goods and services Opening hours of Council facilities Upcoming legislative changes	Bylaws Statutory policies Long Term Plan consultation phase Annual Plan consultation phase	District Plan Review Long Term Plan development phase Major projects that have a significant impact on the community.	Community development projects	To elect representatives (Councillors, Community Board members, Community Committee members)
<b>Tools Council might use</b>	Website Newspaper adverts and inserts Public meetings Social media	All tools from 'Council decides' and potentially the following: Written submissions Oral hearings Public meetings Stakeholder meetings Letters to affected parties	Workshops Stakeholder meetings Social media	External working groups Social media Website Displays	Referendum Local body elections Election (show of hands or ballot) at public meeting
<b>When the community might expect to be involved</b>	Council will generally advise once a decision has been made	Council will generally advise the community once a draft decision is made. Council would generally provide the community with up to 4 weeks to participate and respond	Council will generally provide the community with greater lead-in time to allow them to be involved in the process	Council will generally involve the community at the start to scope the issue, after information has been collected, and when options are being considered	Council will generally provide the community with sufficient lead in time to be involved in the process.

## Schedule 2: Engagement Plan template

### Project description and background

This will describe the nature of the engagement to be undertaken, clarify the decision to be made, the circumstances that led to it, related council decisions already made, and legislation applying.

### Engagement objectives

Identify what feedback or decisions we want from communities.

What decisions will be made by council that needs to be informed by the community's input?

### Timeframe and completion date

Describe each stage of the project, including when key decisions need to be made by Council.

### Communities to be engaged with

List the communities and key stakeholders to engage with.

### Engagement tools and techniques to be used

Describe the tools and techniques that will be used to engage with each of the identified communities and stakeholders. Refer to the IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation to determine the level of engagement for each (Inform Empower).

### Resources needed to complete the engagement

This includes time allocations for Council staff and Councillors and costs involved to undertake the selected engagement tools and techniques.

### Communication planning

This outlines any potential reputation risks associated with the project and mitigations. It will outline the key messages to be communicated to the public, and where necessary will include a communications plan.

### Basis of assessment and feedback to the communities involved

This will describe how the community input will be analysed and how results will be communicated to the Council and to participating communities. Also includes an indication of when this feedback will occur – prior to, or after Council decisions are made.

### Project team roles and responsibilities

This identifies who will be involved in this project, excluding external providers, and who the key contact point within Council will be.



RSA planting in Marton.



Recent roading project – Broadway, Marton.

## Changes to Levels of Service

**This section identifies intended changes to the level of service provided in 2016/17 and the reason for the change.**

The following descriptions are used:

- 'Continued' means the level of service in 2017/18 is carried through into the Long Term Plan (although the performance measures may be different).
- 'Modified' means the presentation of the level of service in 2017/18 has changed in this LTP – it may be different wording, it may form part of the performance measures, or it may be represented in the forecasting assumptions.
- 'Increased' means an additional level of service has been introduced – either in an existing activity or by undertaking a new activity.
- 'Decreased' means the level of service has declined.
- 'New' – represents a new measure.

LEVELS OF SERVICE - 2017/18 ANNUAL PLAN	LEVELS OF SERVICE - 2018/28 LONG TERM PLAN (continued, modified, increased, decreased, new)	REASONS FOR CHANGE
<b>Community Leadership</b>		
Make decisions that are robust, fair, timely, legally compliant and address critical issues, and that are communicated to the community and followed through	Continued/Increased	<p>The levels of service from the 2017/18 Annual Plan remain unchanged for the Long Term Plan. However, three new performance standards have been added to reflect Council's increased focus in the following areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication</li> <li>• Value for money</li> <li>• Satisfaction</li> <li>• Iwi</li> <li>• Engagement with sector excellence programmes</li> </ul>
<b>Roading</b>		
Provide a sustainable roading network which is maintained in accordance with each road's significance for local communications and the local economy, taking into account the lone Roding Network Classification and funding subsidies	Decreased	The roading network in places affected by heavy vehicles (particularly forestry) will be maintained through a 'fix as you go approach', where potholes will be filled at the time, and reinstatement occurring afterwards.
Be responsive to community expectations over the roading network and requests for service	Continued	Not applicable
<b>Water Supply</b>		
Provide a safe and compliant supply of drinking water	Continued	Not applicable
Provide reliable and efficient urban water supplies	Continued	Not applicable
Be responsive to reported faults and complaints	Continued	Not applicable
Maintain compliant, reliable and efficient rural water supplies	Modified	A performance measure which measures water loss from the rural schemes has been removed as water loss from Council's water schemes is unable to be measured.
Ensure fire-fighting capacity in urban areas	Continued	Not applicable

LEVELS OF SERVICE - 2017/18 ANNUAL PLAN	LEVELS OF SERVICE - 2018/28 LONG TERM PLAN (continued, modified, increased, decreased, new)	REASONS FOR CHANGE
<b>Sewerage and the Treatment and Disposal of Sewage</b>		
Provide a reliable reticulated disposal system that does not cause harm or create pollution within the existing urban areas.	Continued/Increased	Council's proposals to implement discharges to land rather than rivers and stream will, when implemented, reduce harm or pollution in waterways.
Be responsive to reported faults and complaints	Continued	Not applicable
<b>Stormwater Drainage</b>		
Provide a reliable collection and disposal system to each property during normal rainfall	Continued	Not applicable
Be responsive to reported faults and complaints	Continued	Not applicable
<b>Community and Leisure Services</b>		
Provide a "good enough" range of "good enough" community and leisure assets at an appropriate proximity to centres of population	Increased	The level of service has been amended to better reflect Council's goal of providing fit-for-purpose community and leisure assets.  In addition a number of performance measures have been added. This will enable Council to better track progress towards meeting this level of service.
Secure high use of staffed facilities	Continued	Council continues to encourage the community to use staffed facilities.
<b>Rubbish and Recycling</b>		
Make recycling facilities available at waste transfer stations for glass, paper, metal, plastics and textiles. Special occasions for electronics (e-waste). Extend recycling to include green/biodegradable waste facility at Taihape, Bulls and Marton waste transfer stations.	Continued/Increased	If Council's proposal for kerbside recycling is implemented, it should mean a reduced amount of waste going to landfill (because of the greater convenience of kerbside v. having to go to a waste transfer station).
<b>Environmental and Regulatory Services</b>		
Provide a legally compliant service	Continued	Not applicable
Provide regulatory compliance officers	Continued	Not applicable

LEVELS OF SERVICE - 2017/18 ANNUAL PLAN	LEVELS OF SERVICE - 2018/28 LONG TERM PLAN (continued, modified, increased, decreased, new)	REASONS FOR CHANGE
<b>Community Well-being</b>		
Provide opportunities to be actively involved in partnerships that provide community and ratepayer wins	Modified	The way that the performance measure is measured has been amended from the Report Card statements associated with the Annual Survey, to a measure based on the satisfaction of governing bodies of MOU agencies with Council support.
Identify and promote opportunities for economic growth in the District	Modified	The level of service has remained the same; however, it will be affected by the selected economic strategies. Performance measures have been amended. The measurement for GDP has been amended to provide a more accurate representation in relation to other similar economics. A new measure has been added for rangitikei.com given Council's increased involvement.
	New	A new level of service for youth has been added. This is a result of Council's increased focus on contributing to effective youth support.
	New	A new level of service for civil defence has been added. This is a result of Council's increased focus in ensuring civil defence capability throughout the organisation.

# Significant Forecasting Assumptions

Bearing in mind the District overview, the strategic environment and current key issues, Council has developed a set of significant forecasting assumptions which underpin this LTP.

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
<b>1 Government</b>			
That the current Territorial Authority boundaries are unchanged i.e. that Rangitikei District continues to be a separate administrative entity.	A government drive towards amalgamation sets aside the normal processes for communities to determine the boundaries for their local government.  The Council will waste time and money worrying about this.	Low	The local services provided by the Council will still need to be provided locally, so the cost of the service provision is unlikely to change significantly
That the regulatory functions assigned to local councils will not be centralised.	The government will centralise (or regionalise) some regulatory functions of local councils. Council invests resources to continue a function, or divests resources to discontinue a function, and the change does not proceed as planned.	Low	There has been vacillation over these discussions but no evidence yet that it is a priority for the new government.  The impact on Council is that budget projections for such functions may prove to be inaccurate.
Levels of Service – Changes in government legislation and regulation will impact on assets development and operating costs and that Council has anticipated and/or planned for these changes.	That Council will overlook an important piece of regulation or legislation in its planning, or that the impact of new regulations/legislation has not been identified.	Low	Information circulated within the sector makes it unlikely that such an oversight would occur.
That implementation of the Drinking Water Standards remains mandatory for the Council's water supply schemes and that there will be greater focus on compliance as a result of government decisions on the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry	Council's six urban water supply schemes do not achieve compliance with a more rigorous standard (or stricter enforcement of the standard).  It is not yet clear whether the drinking-water standard will be extended to rural non-potable (i.e. currently untreated supplies).	Medium	While all six urban water supply schemes are chlorinated, there could be additional cost from a more rigorous standard; financial penalties might be imposed; and a revised capital programme may be necessary.  Requiring rural (non-potable) schemes to meet the drinking-water standard could be a significant cost for the subscribers to these schemes.

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
That reduction of water losses from reticulated supplies is made mandatory	That the water loss reduction requirements set mean the Council's renewal programme for reticulation has to be substantially accelerated. More frequent (than annual) reporting may be required	Low	The priority for government action is unknown (but the data is readily accessible in the annual reporting of the mandatory performance measures for all councils). An accelerated programme could be very costly.
That the statutory requirements for earthquake-strengthening of public buildings will continue under the new government.	That Council does not secure adequate external funding for new public buildings to replace those that need strengthening.	Medium	<p>There is strong competition for external funding. If sufficient external funding is not secured, some earthquake-prone buildings may have to be strengthened or demolished. It was estimated in 2014 that strengthening of Council-owned buildings would cost between \$20 and \$35 million. o</p> <p>However, following the required public consultation, Council resolved that there were no priority areas within the District, meaning the prescribed times to meet strengthening requirements have not been reduced.</p>
Conditions on Council's resource consents renewals will be met and all consents will be renewed.	<p>That conditions on resource consents are changed to the point that the investment required from the community is too high/ unaffordable.</p> <p>Council may face substantial fines (and even litigation) for continuing non-compliance. Investigations before a resource consent is granted may push upgrade costs beyond what has been budgeted.</p>	Medium/High	Council has committed to a capital programme which sets targets for compliance for all discharges. There is a strong co-operative working relationship between staff at Rangitikei and Horizons, essential to secure the most cost-effective technical solution for each site
NZTA will approve the programmes proposed for minor improvements on the roading network and bridge replacements	The programmes will not be approved. This risk is greater for the proposed bridge replacement programme as these are deemed capital works by NZTA and are prioritised on a regional basis.	Low/ Medium	The projected rates requirement for the local share of either (or both) of these programmes will not be used or needs to be increased to cover the lack of NZTA funding.

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
NZTA will extend the current financial assistance rate to footpaths	The programme will be determined by NZTA criteria rather than local preferences	Low	The extent of co-investment may change. Council may seek to increase the unsubsidised footpath or roading programme rather than treat the co-investment as reducing the local share (i.e. rates) requirement.
The new criteria for emergency works on the roading network will leave a funding shortfall despite the enhanced basic Funding Assistance Rate (or 'FAR') from NZTA (currently 63%)	Council will require greater ratepayer contribution to ensure the necessary emergency works.	Medium	The emergency FAR paid for damage from the storm event in June 2015 averaged about 85% . The flood damage reserve as at 30 June 2017 was \$728,000. It is being increased by \$250,000 in 2017/18 and 2018/19.
The Government subsidy of rates for ratepayers on low income will remain at current levels.	The Government reduces or abolishes this ratepayer subsidy.	Low	The tight economic climate makes this subsidy vulnerable, particularly if it is viewed as a means by which local councils can set a higher level of rates than would otherwise be the case.
<b>2 Demographics</b>			
Population Change – The population of the District will change in accordance with the high projections from the Statistics NZ projections based on 2013 Census (14,550 in 2013). This shows an increase to 15,600 by 2023 and to 15,900 by 2043.	The risk is twofold. If the medium projection is what materialises, this shows an increase to 14,900 by 2033 but a decrease to 13,550 by 2043. A greater than expected population decline would increase pressure on remaining ratepayers.	Low	The results of the Census in March 2018 (expected to be available by October 2018) could show a different demographic. In addition, the reasons for the growth (largely internal migration) may not continue to apply. However, the likely range of population change would not significantly impact on provision of infrastructure, facilities or services.
Ageing population – The average age of the population of the District will continue to increase and this will impact upon the Level of Service in most activity areas.	The risk is that this age group leaves the District to establish themselves in larger service centres in anticipation of the need for services. Investment in upgrade or replacement of community facilities may prove to be mis-targeted.	Low	The ageing population trend is demonstrated over a substantial period and is reflected at the national level.

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
That the community's resilience to recover from events such as natural disasters is adequate.	That the community is not able to respond to or recover from a major event. The current level of community resilience may be compromised by the severity and/or frequency of major events and ageing nature of the local population. People may leave the District permanently, meaning a reduced ratepayer base.	Low/Medium	Council has recognised the need to invest in activities that promote community cohesion and resilience, and is increasing its investment in emergency management capability.
Skills Shortage: There will be no significant impact on the Council's ability to deliver programmes and projects as a result of a skills shortage.	That there will be a problem in securing critical skills to keep the Council's planned activities on track.	Low	The shared services arrangement for infrastructure provides a larger and more varied work structure which helps recruitment. The quieter lifestyle in the Rangitikei compared with New Zealand's metro areas is also a drawback.
<b>3 Physical and natural environment</b>			
Climate change - An increasing number of storm events will mean greater damage to the roading network, heavier demand on stormwater systems and more call on staff and volunteers to be available for emergency management and rural fire activities	That severe storm events occur so frequently or so close to one another that Council is unable to fund all the necessary repairs in a reasonable time without breaching its liability management policy.  Capital work on water and wastewater plants may be delayed and mean Council is non-compliant with its resource consents..	Low/Medium	Storm events are occurring more frequently and erratically.  Borrowing beyond the parameters in the Council's liability management policy could pose issues with prudent management.
Fuel prices will rise in line with BERL projections, allowing the present use of roads as the predominant mode of transport within the District for goods and people will continue to be viable.	Petrol and diesel could become increasingly unaffordable marginalising businesses (including farms) remote from the larger centres of population and access to rail. Agricultural production prices would rise.  The ratepayer base could fall as a result.	Low	BERL estimates have been carefully researched. However, there has been a historical volatility to petroleum prices on the world market. The take-up of electric vehicles for heavy road haulage is uncertain.

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
All natural disasters requiring emergency work will be funded out of normal operating budgets or reserves created for this purpose or (in the case of infrastructure) Council's insurance policies or government subsidies for emergency work on roads.	That there will be a major natural disaster requiring significant additional unbudgeted expenditure and financing.  The present level of government subsidy for emergency roading works may be reduced.  Council may not be able to obtain (or afford) insurance sufficient cover for its infrastructure assets.	Medium	The timing and scope of natural disasters cannot be predicted. However, government subsidies and Council's own reserves provide some assurance that there will be sufficient funds for emergency work.  Currently Council is part of an insurance scheme negotiated with neighbouring councils for above-ground and below-ground assets, so the risk is shared.
Changes to land use reflecting economic conditions or concern for environmental impacts will have minimal effect on rates revenue	That the changes are of significant scale and lead to decreases/increases in population and/or the District's valuation.	Low	Land use conversion (e.g. to manuka honey) or retiring hill country land from pasture are largely influenced by the market and government policy. There could be impacts on rating values and jobs – the latter potentially changing the District's demographics.
<b>4 Financial environment</b>			
Inflation – The financial information is based on inflation figures from 2019/20 onwards using the BERL indices for inflation. <sup>59</sup> Infrastructure inflation adjustment adjustors are based on forecasted category adjustors; staff costs are inflated based on the Local Government Cost Index (LGCI): all salary and wage rates 'Local Government Sector and Other' inflation rates are based on LGCI, average annual % change (Total).	That inflation (CPI) is greater than predicted or that operational costs do not vary in line with the BERL estimates.	Low/Medium	The new government may introduce policies which cause variations from the BERL indices.

<sup>59</sup> Business and Economic Research Ltd (BERL), 'Forecast of price level change adjustors – 2017 update: Note to Society of Local Government Managers', September 2017.

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
Interest – Interest on external borrowing is calculated at 4.72% for each of the first three years, increasing to 4.82%, 4.92%, 5.22%, 5.42%, 5.82%, 5.82% and 6.42% over the following seven years.	That interest rates will change from those used (as researched by Council).  Actual costs of external borrowing may be higher than projected. However, because Council borrows in tranches, the impact of higher rates will normally be small in comparison to the total interest being paid in any one year.	Low/Medium	Economic conditions may change. If interest rates increased (or decreased) by 1% in (for example) 2024/25 (where finance costs are projected to be \$1.791 million), total interest payable would increase (or decrease) by \$340,227 which represents 1.25% of the projected rates for 2024/25.
Three-yearly revaluation of infrastructure assets (i.e. excluding land and buildings) are based on projections from BERL.	That the BERL estimates are greater or less than the actual rates of inflation for those assets.	Low/Medium	BERL's estimates have been carefully researched – but economic conditions may change.
Three-yearly revaluation of land and building assets are undertaken on a consistent basis using the BERL inflation adjusters.	That the assumed value of these assets over the period of the Plan is incorrect – the actual revaluation may be greater or less than this.	Low	Economic conditions may change. Valuations for earthquake-prone buildings may fall at a disproportionate rate.
Capital Works Contracts – There will be no variations in terms of price and performance of capital works programmes.	There is significant change in price levels of capital works programmes which may affect the affordability and/or level of service provided.	Low	Council's capital works contracts have tight provisions governing price variations. Council has committed to develop an integrated contract management policy (based on the Contract Management Guidelines issued by the Municipal Association of Victoria).
Interim consents for wastewater discharges at Bulls, Marton and Ratana – Horizons will grant interim consents for five years to allow full consideration of the most cost-effective options in each of these places.	That Horizons does not agree to grant interim consents or requires stringent conditions.	Medium	The granting of interim consents is at the discretion of Horizons. Not granting them or requiring stringent conditions would impose additional costs.
That Council will be able to obtain collaboration contracts for roading allowing the Level of Service to be provided at constant prices three years at a time.	That the inflationary costs associated with roading cannot be absorbed into collaborative fixed price contracts and that there is unbudgeted expenditure associated with these inflationary increases.	Low/Medium	Economic conditions may change.

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
That District-wide rates will continue throughout the period of this LTP, and that there will continue to be a “public good” component in funding for the network utilities	That the balance between public/private benefit is not correct and either component becomes unaffordable to those required to contribute, that willingness to pay is confused with affordability under either scenario.	Low	The uncertainty depends on the robustness of the estimated costs for upgrading and replacing the 3 waters infrastructure and community /civic centres.
<b>5 Council performance</b>			
Levels of Service – Changes in customer expectations regarding level of service will impact on assets development and operating costs, and that Council has anticipated and/or planned for these changes.	That Council has not consulted adequately with communities to understand fully their expectations and so has planned to deliver Levels of Service that are not acceptable to the ratepayer (too high or too low).	Low	Recent residents’ surveys do not show strong desire for increased level of service
Liaison with Māori – that there will be progressive inclusion and engagement of Iwi and Māori.	The urgency and extent of engagement will be viewed differently by Council and Iwi: proposals for change may create tension and ill-feeling which will be counter-productive. Joint ventures (Council and Iwi) may fail. Iwi intent to use the Mana Whakahone o Rohe process is not known. The extent of ongoing Council’s commitment in the Ngati Rangi settlement over the Whangaehu River has yet to be clarified.	Medium	The Ngāti Apa claim was settled in 2010. The Ngati Rangi claims was settled in 2017. It is anticipated that WAI 2180 (concerning Iwi around Taihape) will be settled well before 2022. However, there is uncertainty on the extent to which Iwi whose Waitangi claims are settled will seek to collaborate and partner with the Council. Council appointed a Strategic Adviser Iwi/hapu effective 11 June 2018.
Liaison with the Samoan community (Marton) – that there will be progressive inclusion and engagement of the Samoan community in Marton.	The urgency and extent of engagement will be viewed differently by Council and Samoan leaders: proposals for change may create tension and ill-feeling which will be counter-productive.	Low/Medium	The Samoan community is increasingly well-established within Marton and finding its voice to engage effectively with Council and other statutory stakeholders.
Replacement of existing assets does not mean an increase in levels of service, unless otherwise stated	Technological advances in replaced assets or higher national standards lead to increase levels of service	Low	Such changes would typically be highlighted in a report to Council seeking approval for the upgrade or replacement.

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
Useful lives of assets are described in the Statement of Accounting Policies and have been derived from accurate predictions contained in the Asset Management Plans	<p>That information about the condition of assets that informs their useful life is not completely accurate – for example, historical information about construction dates and pavement subsurface formation details and below-ground water, wastewater and stormwater reticulation systems</p> <p>There will be insufficient (or excessive) provision of depreciation.</p>	Medium	<p>While there has been improvement in asset data capture and in asset management plans, but there are still uncertainties with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>major previously unknown faults are identified needing urgent attention;</li> <li>information/data required to plan for future demand is not sufficiently accurate to ensure adequate provision i.e. that provision will exceed/not meet forecast demand; and</li> <li>predicted savings in operating costs are not realised because performance of the assets has been wrongly assessed.</li> </ul>
Depreciation rates are factored into planned asset acquisitions – the average lifespan of assets has been used to calculate rates as stated in the note on depreciation in the Statement of Accounting Policies.	Once costs for specific items are known, the depreciation may turn out to have been over-/under-stated.	Low	Because of the long lifespan of infrastructural assets, any changes in actual depreciation compared to forecast should be minimal.
Funding sources for the future replacement of significant assets disclosed in the Revenue and Financing Policy, Financial Strategy and Infrastructure Strategy are achievable.	Some user charges may not be achievable. Ratepayers may press for a different 'mix'.	Low	There has been considerable work in modelling funding sources in preparing for this LTP.
External funding will continue to be sourced to supplement Council funding for activities in the District that contribute to community outcomes.	That external funding is not available and that Council must either increase its contributions or lower expectations of its activity in achieving the community outcomes.	Medium	<p>Success in securing external funding is not predictable. If external funding is used for what is perceived to be essential services, then there is a real danger that the community will feel let down if these services are withdrawn.</p> <p>The relevance to the Provincial Growth Fund of Council's proposals for opening up land-locked land and improving community infrastructure and employment opportunities have yet to be determined</p>

FORECASTING ASSUMPTION	RISK	LEVEL OF UNCERTAINTY (in respect of the LTP)	REASONS AND FINANCIAL EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY
Shared Services Arrangements: Rangitikei District Council will continue to seek shared services arrangements where the needs of the community are best served by such arrangements.	Existing Shared Services arrangement may prove less attractive than when they were entered into. The cost and the needs of the Rangitikei community may not best served by such arrangements	Low	These arrangements are typically flexible and have exit provisions.
<b>6 Economic performance</b>			
That Council is able to influence small scale changes in the local economic environment which will add up to make an impact on the District's economic development	That Council will apply resources to secure economic development but is ineffective in the face of global economic trends	Medium	Council will take a measured, evidence-based and risk averse approach to economic development initiatives and collaborate with neighbouring councils and relevant agencies.



Table 3.2: Adjustors: % per annum change

Label	Adjustors				
	Planning and regulation	Roading	Transport	Community activities	Water and Environmental
	PR	RD	TR	CA	WE
Year ending	% change (on year earlier)				
Jun 15	1.5	2.3	1.6	1.8	3.2
Jun 16	0.8	1.4	1.1	1.6	2.1
Jun 17	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.2
Jun 18	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.8
Jun 19	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.7	2.3
Jun 20	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.5
Jun 21	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.3
Jun 22	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.4
Jun 23	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.4
Jun 24	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.5
Jun 25	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.6
Jun 26	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.6
Jun 27	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.7
Jun 28	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.8
20-year avge %pa	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.6

20-year average calculated using 2007 to 2027 actuals and forecasts

BERL

Extract from BERL Forecasts of Price Level Change Adjustors – 2017 Update



July 2017 snow event.



Marton dam.

## Variation between the Council's LTP and its assessment of water and sanitary services and waste management plans<sup>60</sup>

Rangitikei District Council last completed a Water and Sanitary Services Assessment (WSSA) in December 2004. Section 125 of the Local Government Act 2002 requires Council to, "from time to time", review this assessment. Council has not indicated a specific timeframe for review, but will review its WSSA as appropriate.

---

<sup>60</sup> Clause 6, Schedule 10, Local Government Act 2002. Note: Councils Waste Management Plan is contained as the LTP activity statement, therefore, there is no variation to report.

WATER SUPPLY	TREATMENT		DWSNZ GRADING		DWSNZ COMPLIANCE CRITERIA	
	2005	2018	2005	2018	2005	2018
<b>Bulls</b>	Chlorination UV Disinfection Aeration Dual media rapid sand filters	Aeration Filtration Chlorination UV disinfection	Da	Uu	Did not conform to Protozoa or E.coli criteria mainly due to inadequate or insufficient sampling.	Bacteriological: non-compliant for number of samples taken from plant. Protozoal: non-compliant.
<b>Hunterville Urban</b>	Microfiltration Post Chlorination	Pressure media filtration Cartridge filtration UV disinfection Chlorination	Ed	Uu	Conformed to E.coli criteria but not the Protozoa compliance criteria.	Bacteriological: non-compliant for FACE/turbidity during Criterion 2A monitoring period (compliant once changed to Criterion 1). Protozoal: non-compliant.
<b>Mangaweka</b>		Pressure media filtration Cartridge filtration UV disinfection Chlorination	Aa <sup>-</sup>	Uu	Conformed to E.coli criteria but not the Protozoa compliance criteria.	Bacteriological: non-compliant for number of samples taken. Protozoal: non-compliant.
<b>Marton</b>	Coagulation Filtration Chlorination	Coagulation Clarification Filtration UV disinfection Chlorination	Ua	Uu	Tutaenui dams and Marton Treatment Plant conformed to both the E.coli and the Protozoa compliance criteria.	Bacteriological: non-compliant for FACE/turbidity, and number of samples taken. One apparent E. coli transgression, at Calico Line bore in Marton, which is not in use. Three follow-up samples were clear. Protozoal: non-compliant.

WATER SUPPLY	TREATMENT		DWSNZ GRADING		DWSNZ COMPLIANCE CRITERIA	
	2005	2018	2005	2018	2005	2018
<b>Rātana</b>	Aeration Chlorination Clarification Filtration	Aeration Sand filtration Chlorination	Ba	Uu	Conformed to both E.coli criteria and Protozoa compliance criteria.	Bacteriological: non-compliant for number of samples taken. Protozoal: non-compliant.
<b>Taihape</b>	Coagulation/ Flocculation Up-flow clarification AVG filtering Pre and post chlorination Post pH control	Coagulation Clarification Filtration UV disinfection Chlorination	Aa	Uu	Conformed to both E.coli criteria and Protozoa compliance criteria.	Bacteriological: non-compliant for number of samples taken. Protozoal: non-compliant.
<b>Erehon Rural Water Supply</b>	Rural Water Supplies have not historically needed to demonstrated compliance against the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards. However, with the release of the Rural Agricultural Drinking Water Supply Guideline 2015, compliance will need to be demonstrated. Compliance for Rural Water Supplies does not necessarily mean that treatment is required; it may be achieved with a Water Safety Plan approved by the Drinking Water Assessor. Council has indicated its preference to continue to operate these as non-potable supplies. To this end, further education of consumers is in progress. A final decision regarding treatment is expected as part of the Long Term Planning process.					
<b>Hunterville Rural Water Supply</b>						
<b>Omatane Rural Water Supply</b>						
<b>Putorino Rural Water Supply</b>						

## Current and Estimated Future Demand for Water Services within the District

WATER SUPPLY	CURRENT AND ESTIMATED FUTURE DEMAND	
	2005	2018
<b>Bulls</b>	Water supply in Bulls is sufficient to meet current demand. However, it will be limited in future by the resource consent. The peak daily demand is around 88% of the maximum water take allowed by the consent. This is currently under review by Horizons Regional Council. Reduced recharge levels for the two shallow bores in the summer indicate further water restrictions need to be applied. The meat processing plant in Bulls uses up to half the maximum demand highlighting the need for additional water storage capacity.	Development is occurring in the south of the District, primarily in or around Marton and Bulls. Council has agreed in principle to the water networks for these towns being extended accordingly, within Rural Lifestyle zones. At this stage, extensions are occurring on a case-by-case basis.
<b>Huntermville</b>	Huntermville water supply is sourced from the Huntermville Rural Water Supply (HRWS). Currently the urban water scheme purchases 370 m <sup>3</sup> /day, which is less than the peak demand of 380 m <sup>3</sup> /day. More water can be purchased from the HRWSS if required. However the treatment plant has a maximum sustainable production of 220 m <sup>3</sup> /day and therefore extra demand will reduce the quality of water supplied. Water meters are being installed on commercial properties and other large users and these properties will pay for water on a volumetric basis.	Demand in Huntermville is not expected to increase significantly. Any demand reductions that can be achieved could theoretically allow less water to be taken from the Huntermville Rural Water Supply, which may then be able to re-allocate this water to other locations. Preliminary investigations have determined that this is feasible.
<b>Mangaweka</b>	Peak demand for water at Mangaweka at 190 m <sup>3</sup> /day frequently exceeds the maximum allowed by the resource consent for 90 m <sup>3</sup> /day. The consent is currently under review by the Regional Council. Static pressure in the reticulation is good indicating that the reticulation meets the current demand. However, this may need reviewing once new fire fighting regulations for domestic supply are confirmed in the future. A plan is currently in place to replace old pipes that have poor structural strength.	Significant demand management actions have been undertaken in Mangaweka in order to comply with resource consent conditions. Although the population of Mangaweka is small, there are farms and other commercial premises connected to the supply, increasing demand. Council is planning for higher visitor numbers to Mangaweka. It is conceivable that demand could increase, and in accordance with this an application for a consent with higher daily volume limits has been made.

WATER SUPPLY	CURRENT AND ESTIMATED FUTURE DEMAND	
	2005	2018
<b>Marion</b>	<p>The scheme operates with sufficient capacity to supply the peak demand (4,500 m<sup>3</sup>/day) and has not been subject to water restrictions in the recent past. However there is insufficient storage should there be a major fire in town. Use of Bore No. 1 in the case of emergency will solve this problem.</p> <p>The clear water reservoir currently has a capacity of 5-8 hours in summer, which is insufficient to maintain supply in the event of plant failure and therefore should be increased to 24 hours to reduce the risk. AC pipes used in the reticulation in Marion are nearing their expected design life and some steel pipes are also causing problems, perhaps due to soil conditions. Both should be replaced. However this work has not been scheduled as yet.</p>	<p>Development is occurring in the south of the District, primarily in or around Marion and Bulls. Council has agreed in principle to the water networks for these towns being extended accordingly, within Rural Lifestyle zones. At this stage, extensions are occurring on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Alongside this, investigations are underway into a potential new Tutaenui Rural Water Supply in the area around Marion.</p>
<b>Rātana</b>	<p>Peak daily demand for drinking water in Rātana is 185 m<sup>3</sup>/day, whilst the resource consent is limited to 130 m<sup>3</sup>/day. However this can be extended to 300 m<sup>3</sup>/day during the Rātana Festival. Supply is considered sufficient to meet current demand in Rātana as the water supply scheme is intended to supplement the private collection of rainwater for most residents. The Rātana Festival does however place a strain on the capacity of the treatment plant.</p> <p>The last Fire Service Report indicated that Rātana did not meet the requirements of the Area Commander. This could mean that a pump station will need to be installed to boost town flow rates or additional hydrants are required. Valves in the reticulation supply in Rātana are affected by sediment settling which necessitates the shutting down of the water supply to large number of consumers. Investigation into the replacement of these valves is being undertaken.</p>	<p>A new Rātana Water Treatment Plant is under construction with the assistance of CAP funding from the Ministry of Health. A new bore source has been developed, and a new reservoir will be constructed. The plant has been designed to cater for peak demand during Festival week, and has the ability for capacity to be increased to supply the proposed 60-120 lot subdivision as well. This work should ensure that water supply at Rātana is sufficient for the town's current and predicted future demands, including fire flows.</p>

WATER SUPPLY	CURRENT AND ESTIMATED FUTURE DEMAND	
	2005	2018
<b>Taihape</b>	<p>The water supply scheme in Taihape is sufficient to meet current demand. Peak daily demand is around 57% of the maximum sustainable production from the treatment plant and is 33% of the maximum take allowed by the resource consent. The system also has capacity for three days storage.</p> <p>Two rural subdivisions on the outskirts of Taihape are supplied by way of a low-pressure system. This could be upgraded to a high-pressure system if the community is willing to pay for the improvement works. In the town reticulation, there are very few valves, which mean that maintenance work necessitates shutting down large numbers of consumers. More valves are currently being installed to correct the problem.</p>	<p>Pipeline hydraulics mean that currently more water is abstracted from the source than allowed by consent limits. Horizons is aware of this, and has approved remedial works that will resolve this situation. There are no foreseeable supply issues, as the consent limit is in excess of the average daily demand for the town. The population in Taihape has decreased markedly over recent years, and this trend is expected to continue to an extent, further reducing demand. In addition to this, renewals are programmed to reduce leakage.</p>

## Quantity and Quality of Wastewater Discharged from Wastewater Treatment Plants

SCHEME	QUANTITY		QUALITY	
	2005	2018	2005	2018
<b>Bulls</b>	<p>The Bulls plant currently serves a population of 1,800. However the treatment system was designed for a larger population providing security for possible growth or infiltration. Effluent discharge is limited by the resource consent to 515 m<sup>3</sup>/day.</p>	<p>No significant issues with exceedances of flow conditions from discharge consent.</p>	<p>The quality of the final effluent generally meets the conditions of the resource consent with no recorded cases of non-compliance.</p>	<p>Discharge consent expired; currently being renewed. Plant is compliant with existing use rights i.e. conditions from expired consent.</p>

SCHEME	QUANTITY		QUALITY	
	2005	2018	2005	2018
<b>Huntermville</b>	The resource consent for Huntermville currently allows a daily discharge of 175 m <sup>3</sup> /day. The treatment plant serves a population of 400 people.	Issues at Huntermville are around frequency of emergency discharges. This is under investigation, and money has been budgeted in the draft Long Term Plan to deal with Inflow & Infiltration issues that are causing these non-compliances.	The effluent discharged to Porewa Stream meets all resource consent requirements.	Discharge consent conditions relating to phosphorus concentrations are strict, to the extent that at times the wastewater discharge is required to be lower in phosphorus than the receiving environment. This is difficult to achieve at this plant, and from time to time there are exceedances. The more pressing concern at Huntermville is the emergency discharge.
<b>Mangaweka</b>	The newly constructed treatment plant at Mangaweka serves a resident population of 250 people. The resource consent limits discharge of effluent to 90 m <sup>3</sup> /day, with a peak flow of no more than 20 m <sup>3</sup> /h. The reticulation suffers from high levels of inflow and infiltration (I/I), which have affected the performance of the septic tank in the past.	No significant issues with exceedances of flow conditions from discharge consent.	The new system is likely to conform to the conditions of the resource consent.	Mangaweka WWTP is compliant with discharge consent conditions.
<b>Marton</b>	The Marton wastewater treatment plant currently serves a population of 5,500 people. There is no limit on the discharge volume from the treatment plant. However the plant capacity is 3,600 m <sup>3</sup> /day. Again there is evidence that I/I in the network is causing overloading of the treatment plant.	No significant issues with exceedances of flow conditions from discharge consent.	The Marton Wastewater Treatment Plant is failing to meet the consent requirement for ammonia. There are also occasional peaks in CBOD5, but generally the Plant operates within these limits.	The discharge from Marton WWTP is non-compliant due to the levels of ammoniacal nitrogen. An independent report has established that the prime culprit for these non-exceedances is the acceptance of leachate from Bonny Glen landfill, and the inability of the existing plant to treat it to the required standard. Options are being investigated for how to deal with this issue.

SCHEME	QUANTITY		QUALITY	
	2005	2018	2005	2018
<b>Rātana</b>	The Rātana scheme is limited to a discharge of 136 m <sup>3</sup> /day by the resource consent. It currently serves a population of 450 people which is only slightly less than the design population of 500 people. There are currently no problems with the capacity of the Rātana scheme.	The existing Rātana WWTP has sufficient hydraulic capacity, although discharge quality during the peak demand period of the Rātana religious festival can suffer. There is a 60-120 lot subdivision planned for Rātana, and the plant upgrade that is currently being considered will address this increased demand for services.	The Rātana Plant generally meets the conditions of the resource consent for Dissolved Oxygen and Enterococci. Suspended Solids, Ammonia and CBOD5 are averaged on a yearly basis. Recent yearly results have shown that Suspended Solids Ammonia and CBOD5 are also within guidelines set by the resource consent.	The Rātana plant is generally compliant, although it is known that there have been non-compliances in the past for nitrogen and phosphorus. Funding has been obtained from the MfE Te Mana O Te Wai fund to enable an upgrade to address these issues, and cater for future resource consent requirements.
<b>Taihape</b>	The wastewater treatment plant at Taihape holds a consent to discharge 3,873 m <sup>3</sup> /day. However the total daily flow is 4,546 m <sup>3</sup> /day. It serves a population of approximately 2,200 people. The consent is currently under review by Horizons Regional Council.	The main issue at Taihape WWTP is the high flows received at the plant, and the resulting frequency of emergency discharges. Similarly to Hunterville, significant budgets have been set aside to deal with Inflow & Infiltration to the ageing sewer network in this town.	The effluent meets with the standards of the previous resource consent. However it is expected that further conditions will be imposed before another consent is granted.	The main concern at Taihape is the quantity of wastewater received. This can have knock-on effects for discharge quality as treatment efficiency is compromised.
<b>Dudding Lake</b>	No information is currently available on the discharge of effluent from the camping ground at Dudding Lake. However the resource consent limits the discharge of effluent to 15m <sup>3</sup> /day.	This system is no longer operated by Council.	Results of effluent quality monitoring were unavailable for inclusion in the assessment.	This system is no longer operated by Council.
<b>Koitiata</b>	The population of Koitiata fluctuates throughout the season with a normally resident population of approximately 111 people, which increases substantially during the summer months. As a consequence, the oxidation lagoon often operates well below the design capacity. There is no resource consent to discharge effluent.	The existing WWTP has capacity to deal with inflows. The major issue is that the system only serves a small proportion of the town. Investigations have been made as to the future of wastewater services for the town, and whether a reticulated system will be installed for the entire community. At the moment, Council is content to retain the status quo.	As the final effluent is discharged by air (by evapotranspiration), resource consent is not required. This meets with all relevant environmental standards.	Monitoring data on Koitiata is still being compiled. There are no obvious environmental effects resulting from the discharge, and the discharge from the plant was compliant for the 2017-2018.

## Current and Estimated Future Demand for Water Services (Discharges of Sewage) within the District

SCHEME	CURRENT AND ESTIMATED FUTURE DEMAND	
	2005	2018
<b>Bulls</b>	The treatment plant at Bulls is operating within the conditions of its resource consent with no recorded cases of non-compliances. The treatment ponds are oversized for the community hence providing extra security for population growth or infiltration.	Council is looking at a holistic solution for wastewater in Bulls and Marton, by investigating the option of conveying Marton wastewater to Bulls for treatment. This would be a major change to the demand at Bulls, and upgrades would be necessary. Aside from this, major changes are not expected.
<b>Huntermville</b>	Huntermville treatment plant serves a population of around 400 people. The effluent discharge consistently meets resource consent conditions, and therefore there are no upgrades planned. However the reticulation system is old and there are significant I/I problems. Even without I/I considerations, the system is undersized. There is a need to upgrade the capacity to manage the ongoing problem.	Issues at Huntermville are around frequency of emergency discharges. This is under investigation, and money has been budgeted in the draft Long Term Plan to deal with Inflow & Infiltration issues that are causing these non-compliances. Demand on the system will need to reduce through this project in order to bring the emergency discharge into compliance. An application has also been made to Horizons Regional Council to vary this consent, and make quantity limits more achievable.
<b>Mangaweka</b>	<p>The community of Mangaweka has a population of around 250. This figure is not expected to increase over the next few years. The community septic tank suffers from poor detention time due to high levels of I/I, and regular sludge removal is necessary to optimise effluent quality.</p> <p>Although there are currently no conditions on the resource consent, this is currently under review by Horizons Regional Council. Investigations into a distributed treatment strategy are being undertaken to allow for eventual replacement of this structure. The Mangaweka Camping Ground is experiencing increasing popularity over the summer months. This has been dealt with to date by the construction of a filter bed. High levels of I/I mean that the reticulation system is under capacity.</p>	There are not anticipated to be any increases in demand for wastewater services in Mangaweka.

SCHEME	CURRENT AND ESTIMATED FUTURE DEMAND	
	2005	2018
<b>Marion</b>	The need for capacity upgrades in Marion is not likely to be driven by population growth. The current population is around 5,500 people and this is expected to remain static over the next few years. However high levels of I/I from poor condition earthenware and concrete pipes are known to be causing overloading of the treatment ponds.	The ability to cater for new industry in areas such as Marion is a consideration for wastewater as well as water. New industrial developments could require additional investment in reticulation as well as treatment, depending on their nature, and this must be included in future planning. The acceptance of leachate from the Bonny Glen landfill is under investigation at the moment. Any future expansion of the landfill could affect demand for wastewater services to an extent.  Council is looking at a holistic solution for wastewater in Bulls and Marion, by investigating the option of conveying Marion wastewater to Bulls for treatment.
<b>Taihape</b>	As with Bulls, the treatment plant at Taihape is oversized for the community it serves providing an extra level of security for possible growth or infiltration. While it is currently meeting the standards of the resource consent, this has expired and is under review by the Regional Council. It is expected that when a new consent is granted the conditions will necessitate an upgrade to the treatment plant. High levels of I/I in the reticulation are likely to be due to the age of the network.	The main issue at Taihape WWTP is the high flows received at the plant, and the resulting frequency of emergency discharges. Similarly to Hunterville, significant budgets have been set aside to deal with Inflow & Infiltration to the ageing sewer network in this town, in order to reduce demand on the network.
<b>Rātana</b>	Rātana has a declining population and the wastewater scheme is relatively new. Therefore both the reticulation and the treatment plant have no issues relating to capacity. The system is slightly oversized for the resident population. However during the annual Rātana Festival the system is at full capacity.	The discharge consent for this plant expires on 31 July 2018. As part of renewing this consent, the plant will be upgraded to address quality issues and also account for increased demand from the proposed 60-120 lot subdivision. The future plant will be designed and operated such that it can accept peak demand during Festival week without breaching consent limits for quality or quantity.
<b>Dudding Lake</b>	The wastewater scheme at Dudding Lake is currently undergoing a major upgrade following the granting of a consent in 2003. Population growth due to holidaymakers may place pressure on the system in the future.	This system is no longer operated by Council.
<b>Koitiata</b>	The wastewater scheme at Koitiata operates for most of the time at a level well below the design capacity. Increasing popularity of the area as a holiday destination may place pressure on the system in the future.	The major foreseeable demand change at Koitiata is the potential to extend the reticulated network to encompass the entire community. At the moment, Council has indicated it will retain the status quo.
<b>Non-reticulated Communities</b>	Overall the population of non-reticulated communities in Rangitikei District is expected to decline over the next few years. However, as for the reticulated communities, the demand for wastewater services may increase due to I/I.	Population in non-reticulated communities of the Rangitikei has stabilised, but is not expected to increase. There has been no indication that additional reticulated wastewater schemes will be established within the District.

# Issues Raised in the 2017/18 Annual Plan

**Consultation Document for the 2017/18 Annual Plan ('What's changed, what's the plan...?') invited ideas about other issues for Council to consider as part of this planning for 2017/18. In its deliberations on submissions on 27 April 2017, Council resolved to consider the following matters in developing the 2018-28 Long Term Plan:<sup>61</sup>**



- The findings of the Whangaehu Flood Resilience Project;
- Council's role in promoting the District and the way in which it is to be funded;
- The arrangement to support Town Centre Co-ordinators through a Memorandum of Understanding with local community development agencies;
- The need for 24/7 toilets in Marton;
- Upgrading the playground at Marton Plunket;
- Upgrading the playground at the Taihape Outback;
- The feasibility of a bike trail at Taihape Memorial Park;
- Cost of getting tracks to Department of Conservation standards on Mt Stewart, Taihape;
- Upgrading road access into the Ratana cemetery and co-management of both parts of the cemetery and future expansion;
- Upgrading the Ratana playground

In addition, at its meeting on 31 August 2017, Council resolved that:

- a proposal for a voluntary targeted rate for insulation of residential homes be included in the draft Consultation Document for the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.<sup>62</sup>
- consideration of the recommendation of the Hunterville Rural Water Supply Management Subcommittee 'that it continues the present arrangements to support the Scheme [i.e. having regard for the LGA 2002 s.17A analysis]' be part of the development of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.<sup>63</sup>
- drainage improvement works at Scotts Ferry be part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Resolutions 17/RDC/119-127.

<sup>62</sup> Resolution 17/RDC/273.

<sup>63</sup> Resolution 17/RDC/286.

<sup>64</sup> Resolution 17/RDC/287.