



Rangitikei District Council

Telephone: 06 327-0099

Facsimile: 06 327-6970

Rangitikei
UNSPOILT...

Finance/Performance Committee Meeting

Order Paper

**Thursday, 30 April 2015,
9.30 am**

**Council Chamber, Rangitikei District Council
46 High Street, Marton**

Website: www.rangitikei.govt.nz

Email: info@rangitikei.govt.nz

Chair

His Worship the Mayor, Andy Watson

Deputy Chair

Cr Nigel Belsham

Membership

Councillors Cath Ash, Tim Harris, Dean McManaway, Rebecca McNeil, Soraya Peke-Mason, Ruth Rainey and Lynne Sheridan

Please Note: Items in this agenda may be subject to amendments or withdrawal at the meeting. It is recommended therefore that items not be reported upon until after adoption by the Council. Reporters who do not attend the meeting are requested to seek confirmation of the agenda material or proceedings of the meeting from the Chief Executive prior to any media reports being filed.



Rangitikei District Council

Finance/Performance Committee Meeting

Order Paper – Thursday 30 April 2015 – 9:30 a.m.

Contents

1	Welcome	2	
2	Council prayer	2	
3	Apologies/leave of absence	2	
4	Confirmation of order of business	2	
5	Confirmation of minutes	2	Attachment 1, pages 6-10
6	Chair's report	2	<i>To be tabled</i>
7	Financial Highlights and Commentary to 31 March 2015	2	Attachment 2, pages 11-41
8	Nine-month Statement of Service Performance	2	Attachment 3, pages 42-63
9	Review of Criteria for Funding Events through Council's Contestable Funding Scheme	3	Attachment 4, pages 64-70
10	Update on Strategic Water Assessment and review of the Hunterville Rural Water Supply Scheme	3	<i>Verbal</i>
11	Late items	4	
12	Future items for the agenda	4	
13	Next meeting	4	
14	Meeting closed	4	

The quorum for the Finance/Performance Committee is 5

At its meeting of 28 October 2010 Council resolved that 'The quorum at any meeting of a standing committee or sub-committee of the Council (including Te Roopu Ahi Kaa, the Community Committees, the Reserve Management Committees and the Rural Water Supply Management Sub-committees) is that required for a meeting of the local authority in SO 2.4.3 and 3.4.3.'

1 Welcome

2 Council prayer

3 Apologies/leave of absence

4 Confirmation of order of business

That, taking into account the explanation provided why the item is not on the meeting agenda and why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting, be dealt with as a late item at this meeting.

5 Confirmation of minutes

Recommendation

That the Minutes of the Finance/Performance Committee meeting held on 26 March 2015 be taken as read and verified as an accurate and correct record of the meeting.

6 Chair's report

A report will be tabled.

File ref: 3-CT-14-1

Recommendation

That the Chair's report to the Finance/Performance Committee meeting on 30 April 2015 be received.

7 Financial Highlights and Commentary to 31 March 2015

The Financial results for February are attached together with commentary and detailed analysis on variances.

File ref: 5-FR-4-1

Recommendation

That the report 'Financial Highlights and Commentary to 31 March 2015' be received.

8 Nine-month Statement of Service Performance

The nine-month Statement of Service Performance is attached. This includes the preliminary findings from the March 2015 annual surveys of residents and stakeholders.

File ref: 5-FR-1-2

Recommendation

That the nine-month Statement of Service Performance to 31 March 2015 be received.

9 Review of Criteria for Funding Events through Council's Contestable Funding Scheme

A report is attached.

File ref: 3-GF-8

Recommendation

- 1 That the report "Review of Criteria for Funding Events through Council's Contestable Funding Scheme" be received.
- 2 That a further report is brought to the Finance/Performance Committee's meeting in May 2015 with a draft Event Sponsorship Application Form prepared in line with the conclusions in the report "Review of Criteria for Funding Events through Council's Contestable Funding Scheme" [without amendment/as amended], viz:
 - Council will consider developing sponsorship arrangements with any organisation seeking financial support for an event in the District;
 - Council will consider recurring sponsorship arrangements where an event has the potential to gain considerable community interest and/or achieve a high profile outside the District;
 - The normal maximum term of any sponsorship arrangement (reviewed annually) will be 5 years, at which time Council and the event organisers will jointly review the value of the event and its future potential (after which Council may develop a further sponsorship arrangement);
 - Events will be classified as community, community/high profile or high profile based on actual and/or estimated numbers and locations of participants/attendees;
 - Applicants will be required to outline their strategies for maximising interest in attending the event and for income generation strategies (including the potential for the event to be self-funding);
 - Successful applicants will be required to complete a Post-Event report form which includes financial and attendance data;
 - Council will commission an independent economic impact report for all high profile and high profile, community events
 - Evaluation of events will be incorporated into the annual residents' survey.

10 Update on Strategic Water Assessment and review of the Hunterville Rural Water Supply Scheme

An oral update will be provided to the meeting.

11 Late items

12 Future items for the agenda

13 Next meeting

Thursday 28 May 2015, 9.30 am

14 Meeting closed

Attachment 1



Rangitikei District Council

Finance/Performance Committee Meeting

Minutes – Thursday 26 March 2015 – 9:36 a.m.

Contents

1	Welcome.....	2
2	Council prayer.....	2
3	Apologies/leave of absence.....	2
4	Confirmation of order of business.....	2
5	Confirmation of minutes.....	2
6	Chair's report.....	2
7	Financial Highlights and Commentary to 28 February 2015.....	2
8	Community Initiatives Fund – review of assessment criteria, marking sheets and application forms.....	3
9	Late items.....	4
10	Future items for the agenda.....	4
11	Next meeting.....	4
12	Meeting closed – 10.59 am.....	4

Present:

His Worship the Mayor, Andy Watson
Cr Nigel Belsham
Cr Cath Ash
Cr Tim Harris
Cr Dean McManaway
Cr Soraya Peke-Mason
Cr Ruth Rainey
Cr Lynne Sheridan

In attendance:

Mr Ross McNeil, Chief Executive
Mr Michael Hodder, Community & Regulatory Services Group Manager
Mr George McIrvine, Finance & Business Support Group Manager
Ms Denise Servante, Senior Policy Analyst
Ms Samantha Whitcombe, Governance Administrator

Tabled Documents:

Item 6 Chair's Report
Item 7 Financial Highlights and Commentary to 28 February 2015
(commentary)

1 Welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2 Council prayer

Cr Peke-Mason read the Council prayer.

3 Apologies/leave of absence

That the apology for lateness from Cr Harris be received.

Cr Belsham / Cr Ash. Carried

4 Confirmation of order of business

The Chair informed the Committee that there would be no change to the order of business from the set out in the agenda.

5 Confirmation of minutes

Resolved minute number	15/FPE/005	File Ref
-------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------

That the Minutes of the Finance/Performance Committee meeting held on 26 February 2015 be taken as read and verified as an accurate and correct record of the meeting.

Cr Ash / Cr Sheridan. Carried

6 Chair's report

His Worship the Mayor provided further detail on the item in his report on MP's salaries.

Resolved minute number	15/FPE/006	File Ref	3-CT-14-1
-------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	------------------

That the Chair's report to the Finance/Performance Committee meeting on 26 March 2015 be received.

His Worship the Mayor / Cr Sheridan. Carried

7 Financial Highlights and Commentary to 28 February 2015

Mr McIrvine spoke briefly to the report and gave an overview of the commentary provided in the tabled document.

The Committee asked if the unused expenditure within the repairs area of the Cemeteries budget, could be used within the maintenance area of the Cemeteries budget.

The Committee asked that the answers to the questions raised by the Assets/Infrastructure Committee be also made available to that Committee.

Resolved minute number **15/FPE/007** **File Ref**

That the Finance/Performance Committee looks to review the Investment Policy, noting that at present there is more investment in short term loans than the current Policy permits.

His Worship the Mayor / Cr Belsham. Carried

Cr Harris arrived 10.03 am

Resolved minute number **15/FPE/008** **File Ref** **5-FR-4-1**

That the report 'Financial Highlights and Commentary to 28 February 2015' be received.

Cr Belsham / Cr Sheridan. Carried

8 Community Initiatives Fund – review of assessment criteria, marking sheets and application forms

Ms Servante spoke to the report, giving a brief overview of its contents and the appendices.

Discussion was held around the following points:

- Ratepayers support initiatives to promote more business for local retailers.
- Stallholders can be very 'nomadic'; monies spent at these stalls could be taken out of the District.
- There is a need to encourage local retailers to become more involved with local events, especially when held outside normal retail hours.

Resolved minute number **15/FPE/009** **File Ref** **3-GF-8**

That the report "Review of Criteria for the Community Initiatives Fund" be received.

Cr Peke-Mason / Cr Ash. Carried

Resolved minute number **15/FPE/010** **File Ref** **3-GF-8**

That a further report is brought to the Finance/Performance Committee's meeting in April 2015 with proposals for criteria to fund events (new and recurring) in line with the comments in the report "Review of Criteria for the Community Initiatives Fund".

Cr Peke-Mason / Cr Rainey. Carried

9 Late items

Nil

10 Future items for the agenda

Nil

11 Next meeting

Thursday 30 April 2015, 9.30 am

12 Meeting closed – 10.59 am

Confirmed/Chair: _____

Date: _____

Attachment 2



MEMORANDUM

TO: Ross McNeil

COPIES: Council

FROM: George McIrvine

DATE: 24 April 2015

SUBJECT: **Financial Highlights and Commentary to 31 March 2015**

FILE:

Attachments: Statement of Financial Position and Financial Performance, Strategic Perspective Operating Results, Group Activities accounts.

Operating Results

Operating results for month of March are in line with budget in most activities, with revenue being close to \$653K ahead of year to date budget. Refuse revenue is behind by \$22K, with the main positive variances being in Roothing, the 3 Waters and Treasury due to increase returns from more cash on hand. At 9 months revenue is above 75% of the full year budget.

Expenditure

After February's early close we delayed closure this month to ensure that all the costs for the 9 months were captured. It is important that prompt processing of purchase orders occurs as we make sure that our suppliers are paid by the 20th. Overall Expenditure is tracking behind budget except for Roothing, Environment and Regulatory, Investment (with lower borrowings) and Community Well-Being - see detailed commentary later in this report. At 9 months total expenditure is 71.3% of the full year budget.

Statement of Financial Position as at End of March 2015.

Overall, the Council retains a strong balance sheet and Treasury position, but with the draft LTP signalling borrowing for projects we are forecasting the need for a debt facility either with a bank or the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) by September 2015. It is intended to come back to Council with the options and cost but the likely scenario would be to borrow from our existing banks until we get to around \$5M of debt, after which the LGFA looks to have better rates and also borrowing terms which better match Council requirements. Detailed activity variances are reported after the following financials.

Rangitikei District Council

Statement of Financial Performance

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

	YTD Actual 2014/15	Ytd Budget 2014/15	FYR Budget 2014/15	FY Actual 2013/14
Income				
Community Leadership	440	0	0	48,494
Community Wellbeing	186,831	149,389	169,605	175,573
Environmental and Regulatory	738,563	667,157	819,052	934,028
Community & Leisure Assets	419,782	359,962	480,718	418,656
Investment	241,550	161,228	194,669	14,996,186
Public Refuse Collection - Litter C	283,153	305,388	406,509	407,810
Water and Wastewater	208,406	128,430	1,071,241	913,151
Subsidised Rooding	5,766,274	5,437,548	7,250,051	7,993,692
Business Units	31,619	14,535	19,381	40,289
Total Revenue	7,876,617	7,223,637	10,411,226	25,927,879
Rates				
Community Leadership	40,559	39,687	52,915	52,115
Community & Leisure Assets	535,968	536,469	715,293	765,245
Investment	4,676,306	4,613,714	6,064,951	5,810,974
Public Refuse Collection - Litter C	326,496	326,471	435,294	338,597
Water and Wastewater	5,006,233	4,787,602	6,623,685	7,093,833
Subsidised Rooding	4,753,899	4,706,115	6,274,816	6,171,247
Total Rates	15,339,462	15,010,058	20,166,954	20,232,010
Total Apportioned Rates	0	-3,644	-101,573	-230,190
Total Internal Charges	5,105,547	5,523,732	7,364,926	6,761,336
Total Internal Recoveries	5,105,547	5,523,696	7,364,926	6,761,336
Expenditure				
Community Leadership	482,445	521,058	664,488	640,437
Community Wellbeing	712,642	706,724	905,695	738,724
Environmental and Regulatory	247,143	190,870	251,344	283,065
Community & Leisure Assets	2,036,689	2,318,133	2,907,726	2,841,375
Investment	440,827	785,881	1,187,044	684,493
Public Refuse Collection - Litter C	691,726	720,164	956,493	869,305
Water and Wastewater	3,148,659	4,040,702	5,335,258.00	5,453,545
Subsidised Rooding	9,210,578	8,757,972	11,677,256	33,876,032
Business Units	3,904,334	4,062,186	5,373,611	4,920,824
Total Expenditure	20,875,042	22,103,690	29,258,915	50,307,800
Net Surplus	2,341,037	126,325	1,217,692	-4,378,100

Rangitikei District Council
Statement of Financial Position
For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

	YTD Actual 2014/15	FY Actual 2013/14
Equity		
Reserves	31,744,204	31,744,204
Equity	447,487,215	451,857,165
Net Surplus	2,341,037	-4,378,100
Total Equity	481,572,456	479,223,269
Current Assets		
Total Current Assets	3,447,042	4,106,036
Current Liabilities		
Provisions	469,952	469,952
Current Liabilities	3,135,334	3,391,702
Agency Liabilities	549,502	379,143
Total Current Liabilities	4,154,788	4,240,797
Working Capital	-707,746	-134,762
Non Current Assets		
Other Financial Assets	7,163,600	6,653,674
Forestry	204,814	204,814
Fixed Assets	14,289,016	21,466,672
Infrastructural Assets	451,441,956	451,241,146
Net Projects	9,389,091	
Total Non Current Assets	482,488,478	479,566,306
Non Current Liabilities		
Loans External	208,276	208,276
Provisions		
Total Non Current Liabili	208,276	208,276
Net Assets	481,572,456	479,223,269

Strategic Perspective

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Strategic Activities - Operating Results

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Variance YTD	Full Year Budget
Community Leadership				
Council	30,677	(21,966)	52,643	-
Council Committees	5,421	(7,554)	12,975	(10,074)
Taihape Community Board	4,521	(753)	5,274	(4)
Ratana Community Board	744	(1,014)	1,758	(1,345)
Elections	(1,074)	2,625	(3,699)	3,504
Net Surplus (Deficit) of activities	40,290	(28,662)	68,952	(7,919)
Community Wellbeing				
Community Awards	18,353	11,621	6,732	(2,982)
Information Centres	25,212	16,371	8,841	21,855
District Promotions & Dev	(95,387)	(83,547)	(11,840)	(86,167)
Civil Defence	21,940	(5,334)	27,274	(7,454)
Rural Fire	17,125	(1,520)	18,645	(7,088)
Net Surplus (Deficit) of activities	(12,756)	(62,409)	49,653	(81,836)
Environment & Regulatory				
Building	58,371	51,068	7,303	56,294
District Planning	90,899	93,981	(3,082)	99,506
Dog Control	45,357	(4,934)	50,291	(63,128)
Health	38,922	6,262	32,660	-
Resource Consents	(88,874)	(5,128)	(83,746)	-
Stock Control	14,820	(797)	15,617	(1,057)
Net Surplus (Deficit) of activities	159,494	140,452	19,042	91,615
Community & Leisure Assets				
Libraries	66,885	6,536	60,349	(2)
Domains	104,187	(67,943)	172,130	59,739
Cemeteries	61,778	24,650	37,128	30,912
Real Estate	52,349	48,046	4,303	29,866
Swim Centres	16,550	(17,839)	34,389	(19,609)
Community Housing	(228,520)	(244,089)	15,569	(279,137)
Public Toilets	44,231	(4,360)	48,591	(23,575)
Halls	(32,076)	(71,343)	39,267	(82,732)
Forestry Investments	(12,139)	(395)	(11,744)	(2,170)
Net Surplus (Deficit) of activities	73,245	(326,737)	399,982	(286,708)
Investment	(255,505)	(743,473)	487,968	(100,001)
Rubbish & Recycling				
Public Refuse and Bin Collection	795	(6,039)	6,834	-
Landfills and Waste Transfer Stns	(134,210)	(117,504)	(16,706)	(102,688)
Waste Minimisation	31,398	507	30,891	-
Net Surplus (Deficit) of activities	(102,018)	(123,036)	21,018	(102,688)
Waters				
Stormwater	198,576	(5,614)	204,190	(1)
Water	1,151,814	388,531	763,283	832,738
Wastewater	485,021	192,677	292,344	2
Rural Water	(146,041)	(126,009)	(20,032)	18,685
Net Surplus (Deficit) of activities	1,689,370	449,585	1,239,785	851,424
Roading				
Roading	598,132	732,147	(134,015)	783,937
Non Subsidised Roading	150,806	65,790	85,016	1
Net Surplus (Deficit) of activities	748,938	797,937	(48,999)	783,938
Business Units	(20)	22,668	(22,688)	72,868
TOTAL OPERATING SURPLUS (DEFICIT) ACTIVITIES	2,341,037	126,325	2,214,712	1,220,693
Tsf to Flood Reserves	-	-	-	-
Variance	-	-	-	-
Per Balance Sheet	2,341,037	-	-	-
Strategic Activities - Capital Expenditure				
Community Wellbeing	-	20,000	20,000	-
Community & Leisure Assets	169,502	752,727	583,225	-
Environment & Reg Services	-	-	-	-
Rubbish & Recycling	87,858	222,506	134,648	-
Waters	3,451,228	12,294,222	8,842,994	-
Roading	5,564,143	7,608,757	2,044,614	-
TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE & RENEWALS	9,272,731	20,898,212	11,625,481	-

Community Leadership

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	440		440	
Rates Revenue	844,332	843,459	873	1,124,612
Internal Charges	322,037	351,063	29,026	468,043
Expenditure	482,445	521,058	38,613	664,488
Net Surplus	40,290	-28,662	68,952	-7,919

Council

Revenue	313		313	
Rates Revenue	753,703	753,702	1	1,004,936
Internal Charges	298,823	324,414	25,591	432,535
Expenditure	424,516	451,254	26,738	572,401
Net Surplus	30,677	-21,966	52,643	

Council Committees

Rates Revenue	45,770	45,771	-1	61,028
Internal Charges	11,736	13,383	1,647	17,848
Expenditure	28,614	39,942	11,328	53,254
Net Surplus	5,421	-7,554	12,974	-10,074

Taihape Community Board

Revenue	326		326	
Rates Revenue	28,439	27,624	815	36,832
Internal Charges	6,404	7,263	859	9,669
Expenditure	17,839	21,114	3,275	27,167
Net Surplus	4,521	-753	5,275	-4

Ratana Community Board

Rates Revenue	12,121	12,063	58	16,083
Internal Charges	3,671	4,329	658	5,762
Expenditure	7,705	8,748	1,043	11,666
Net Surplus	744	-1,014	1,759	-1,345

Elections

Revenue	-200		-200	
Rates Revenue	4,300	4,299	1	5,733
Internal Charges	1,403	1,674	271	2,229
Expenditure	3,771		-3,771	
Net Surplus	-1,074	2,625	-3,699	3,504

Community Wellbeing

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	186,831	149,389	37,442	169,605
Rates Revenue	786,040	786,040		1,042,403
Internal Charges	272,985	291,114	18,129	388,149
Expenditure	712,642	706,724	-5,918	905,695
Net Surplus	-12,756	-62,409	49,653	-81,836

Community Awards

Revenue	25,861	23,561	2,300	23,561
Rates Revenue	880	882	-2	1,173
Internal Charges	1,725	2,322	597	3,098
Expenditure	6,663	10,500	3,837	24,618
Net Surplus	18,353	11,621	6,732	-2,982

Information Centres

Revenue	17,921	18,369	-448	24,495
Rates Revenue	257,725	257,724	1	343,633
Internal Charges	184,802	188,433	3,631	251,233
Expenditure	65,631	71,289	5,658	95,040
Net Surplus	25,212	16,371	8,842	21,855

District Promotions & Dev

Revenue	128,104	102,662	25,442	115,159
Rates Revenue	322,363	322,362	1	429,817
Internal Charges	40,768	47,502	6,734	63,346
Expenditure	505,085	461,069	-44,016	567,797
Net Surplus	-95,387	-83,547	-11,839	-86,167

Civil Defence

Rates Revenue	76,221	76,221		100,313
Internal Charges	10,162	11,979	1,817	15,972
Expenditure	44,119	69,576	25,457	91,795
Net Surplus	21,940	-5,334	27,274	-7,454

Rural Fire

Revenue	14,945	4,797	10,148	6,390
Rates Revenue	128,852	128,851	1	167,467
Internal Charges	35,528	40,878	5,350	54,500
Expenditure	91,144	94,290	3,146	126,445
Net Surplus	17,125	-1,520	18,645	-7,088

Environment & Regulatory Services

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	738,563	667,157	71,406	819,052
Rates Revenue	647,273	648,117	-845	835,825
Internal Charges	979,198	983,952	4,754	1,311,918
Expenditure	247,143	190,870	-56,273	251,344
Net Surplus	159,494	140,452	19,042	91,615

Building

Revenue	188,388	184,527	3,861	246,032
Rates Revenue	278,927	278,927		357,266
Internal Charges	341,468	340,452	-1,016	453,930
Expenditure	67,477	71,934	4,457	93,074
Net Surplus	58,371	51,068	7,302	56,294

District Planning

Revenue				
Rates Revenue	159,726	159,726		187,165
Internal Charges	23,471	25,524	2,053	34,025
Expenditure	45,356	40,221	-5,135	53,634
Net Surplus	90,899	93,981	-3,082	99,506

Dog Control

Revenue	431,347	392,614	38,733	461,354
Rates Revenue	110,547	110,547		152,997
Internal Charges	483,097	481,662	-1,435	642,213
Expenditure	13,440	26,433	12,993	35,266
Net Surplus	45,357	-4,934	50,291	-63,128

Health

Revenue	74,637	48,967	25,670	56,951
Rates Revenue	17,505	17,937	-432	23,907
Internal Charges	50,411	52,128	1,717	69,503
Expenditure	2,810	8,514	5,704	11,355
Net Surplus	38,922	6,262	32,659	

Resource Consents

Revenue	27,445	40,248	-12,803	53,650
Rates Revenue	44,608	44,607	1	65,988
Internal Charges	42,866	46,215	3,349	61,623
Expenditure	118,061	43,768	-74,293	58,015
Net Surplus	-88,874 -	5,128	-83,746	

Stock Control

Revenue	16,744	801	15,943	1,065
Rates Revenue	35,960	36,373	-414	48,502
Internal Charges	37,884	37,971	87	50,624
Expenditure				
Net Surplus	14,820	-797	15,616	-1,057

Community & Leisure Assets

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	419,782	359,962	59,820	480,718
Rates Revenue	2,388,239	2,388,739	-500	3,150,034
Internal Charges	698,087	757,305	59,218	1,009,734
Expenditure	2,036,689	2,318,133	281,444	2,907,726
Net Surplus	73,245	-326,737	399,982	-286,708

Libraries

Revenue	39,481	35,571	3,910	37,433
Rates Revenue	535,968	536,469	-501	715,137
Internal Charges	354,401	358,848	4,447	478,459
Expenditure	154,164	206,656	52,492	274,113
Net Surplus	66,885	6,536	60,348	-2

Domains

Revenue	121,679	20,826	100,853	27,770
Rates Revenue	475,798	475,797	1	763,334
Internal Charges	101,729	120,627	18,898	160,835
Expenditure	391,561	443,939	52,378	570,530
Net Surplus	104,187	-67,943	172,130	59,739

Cemeteries

Revenue	49,553	39,996	9,557	52,661
Rates Revenue	126,836	126,836		167,834
Internal Charges	41,083	45,747	4,664	61,008
Expenditure	73,528	96,435	22,907	128,575
Net Surplus	61,778	24,650	37,128	30,912

Real Estate

Revenue	24,300	19,692	4,608	26,253
Rates Revenue	98,186	98,187	-1	88,706
Internal Charges	25,921	28,107	2,186	37,466
Expenditure	44,215	41,726	-2,489	47,627
Net Surplus	52,349	48,046	4,304	29,866

Community & Leisure Assets Cont ...

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
--	---------------	---------------	---------	-----------

Swim Centres

Revenue	854	33,876	-33,022	61,181
Rates Revenue	703,564	703,563	1	835,603
Internal Charges	56,340	64,980	8,640	86,622
Expenditure	631,528	690,298	58,770	829,771
Net Surplus	16,550	-17,839	34,389	-19,609

Community Housing

Revenue	172,881	182,259	-9,378	243,017
Internal Charges	43,679	49,158	5,479	65,533
Expenditure	357,722	377,190	19,468	456,621
Net Surplus	-228,520	-244,089	15,569	-279,137

Public Toilets

Rates Revenue	211,946	211,946		264,832
Internal Charges	30,557	35,676	5,119	47,577
Expenditure	137,159	180,630	43,471	240,830
Net Surplus	44,231	-4,360	48,590	-23,575

Halls

Revenue	11,034	13,977	-2,943	18,638
Rates Revenue	235,941	235,941		314,588
Internal Charges	42,473	51,822	9,349	69,113
Expenditure	236,578	269,439	32,861	346,845
Net Surplus	-32,076	-71,343	39,267	-82,732

Forestry Investments

Revenue		13,765	-13,765	13,765
Internal Charges	1,903	2,340	437	3,121
Expenditure	10,236	11,820	1,584	12,814
Net Surplus	-12,139	-395	-11,744	-2,170

Treasury

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	241,550	161,228	80,322	194,669
Rates Revenue	4,676,306	4,613,714	62,592	6,064,951
Apportioned Rates	-4,732,534	-4,732,534		-5,172,577
Expenditure	440,827	785,881	345,054	1,187,044
Net Surplus	-255,505	-743,473	487,968	-100,001

Rubbish & Recycling

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	283,153	305,388	-22,235	406,509
Rates Revenue	407,811	407,786	25	602,059
Internal Charges	101,255	116,046	14,791	154,763
Expenditure	691,726	720,164	28,438	956,493
Net Surplus	-102,018	-123,036	21,019	-102,688

Public Refuse and Bin Collection

Rates Revenue	81,315	81,315		116,480
Internal Charges	14,837	17,649	2,812	23,542
Expenditure	65,683	69,705	4,022	92,938
Net Surplus	795	-6,039	6,834	

Landfills and Waste Transfer Stns

Revenue	242,437	268,137	-25,700	357,518
Rates Revenue	289,522	289,496	26	436,280
Internal Charges	66,038	76,842	10,804	102,482
Expenditure	600,131	598,295	-1,836	794,004
Net Surplus	-134,210	-117,504	-16,706	-102,688

Waste Minimisation

Revenue	40,716	37,251	3,465	48,991
Rates Revenue	36,974	36,975	-1	49,299
Internal Charges	20,381	21,555	1,174	28,739
Expenditure	25,911	52,164	26,253	69,551
Net Surplus	31,398	507	30,891	

Waters

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	208,406	128,430	79,976	1,071,241
Rates Revenue	5,513,443	5,294,815	218,628	6,356,385
Internal Charges	883,821	932,958	49,137	1,243,944
Expenditure	3,148,659	4,040,702	892,043	5,332,258
Net Surplus	1,689,370	449,585	1,239,784	851,424

Stormwater

Revenue	12,177	1,611	10,566	2,151
Rates	551,174	551,204	-30	728,333
Internal Charges	110,494	118,503	8,009	158,015
Expenditure	254,282	439,926	185,644	572,470
Net Surplus	198,576	-5,614	204,189	-1

Water

Revenue	31,098		31,098	900,000
Rates	2,889,922	2,799,043	90,879	3,146,114
Internal Charges	437,457	455,292	17,835	607,044
Expenditure	1,331,749	1,955,220	623,471	2,606,332
Net Surplus	1,151,814	388,531	763,283	832,738

Wastewater

Revenue	165,131	126,819	38,312	169,090
Rates	1,706,822	1,561,055	145,767	1,791,461
Internal Charges	253,444	271,035	17,591	361,372
Expenditure	1,133,487	1,224,162	90,675	1,599,177
Net Surplus	485,021	192,677	292,345	2

Rural Water

Revenue				
Rates	365,526	383,513	-17,987	690,477
Internal Charges	82,426	88,128	5,702	117,513
Expenditure	429,140	421,394	-7,746	554,279
Net Surplus	-146,041	-126,009	-20,031	18,685

Roading & Footpaths

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	5,766,274	5,437,548	328,726	7,250,051
Rates Revenue	4,753,899	4,706,115	47,784	5,994,810
Internal Charges	560,659	587,754	27,095	783,667
Expenditure	9,210,578	8,757,972	-452,606	11,677,256
Tsf to Flood Reserves				
Net Surplus	748,938	797,937	-49,001	783,938

Roading

Revenue	5,752,386	5,437,548	314,838	7,250,051
Rates Revenue	3,979,540	3,928,551	50,989	5,045,800
Internal Charges	485,545	503,604	18,059	671,472
Expenditure	8,648,250	8,130,348	-517,902	10,840,442
Net Surplus	598,132	732,147	-134,016	783,937

Non Subsidised Roothing

Revenue	13,888		13,888	
Rates Revenue	774,359	777,564	-3,205	949,010
Internal Charges	75,114	84,150	9,036	112,195
Expenditure	562,328	627,624	65,296	836,814
Net Surplus	150,806	65,790	85,015	1

Business Units

For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015

Consolidated

	Actual YTD	Budget YTD	Var +/-	FY Budget
Revenue	31,619	14,535	17,084	19,381
Rates Revenue	54,653	50,163	4,490	66,879
Internal Charges	1,287,505	1,503,540	216,035	2,004,708
Internal Recoveries	5,105,547	5,523,696	-418,149	7,364,927
Expenditure	3,904,334	4,062,186	157,852	5,373,611
Net Surplus	-20	22,668	-22,688	72,868

CEO Business Unit

Revenue	14,087		14,087	
Internal Charges	65,650	76,761	11,111	102,347
Internal Recoveries	342,303	364,599	-22,296	486,136
Expenditure	290,736	293,151	2,415	383,789
Net Surplus	3	-5,313	5,317	

Human Resources Business Unit

Revenue	2,400		2,400	
Internal Recoveries	61,988	114,606	-52,618	152,811
Expenditure	64,388	114,710	50,322	152,811
Net Surplus	1	-104	104	

Policy & Governance Business Unit

Internal Charges	68,864	84,015	15,151	112,031
Internal Recoveries	367,323	390,375	-23,052	520,501
Expenditure	298,459	307,055	8,596	408,470
Net Surplus	0	-695	695	

Finance Business Unit

Revenue	321	10,683	-10,362	14,245
Internal Charges	142,302	173,619	31,317	231,493
Internal Recoveries	775,958	802,539	-26,581	1,070,051
Expenditure	633,993	642,672	8,679	852,803
Net Surplus	-16	-3,069	3,053	

Statutory Planning & Reporting Business Unit

Internal Charges	207,900	217,152	9,252	289,534
Internal Recoveries	317,974	496,422	-178,448	661,898
Expenditure	110,081	283,530	173,449	372,364
Net Surplus	-6	-4,260	4,253	

Information Services Business Unit

Revenue	1,207		1,207	
Rates Revenue	27,326	27,327	-1	36,435
Internal Charges	30,466	37,098	6,632	49,459
Internal Recoveries	667,408	780,651	-113,243	1,040,865
Expenditure	665,476	743,847	78,371	991,406
Net Surplus		27,033	-27,034	36,435

Customer & Community Services Business Unit

Revenue	1,031		1,031	
Internal Charges	134,886	170,217	35,331	226,956
Internal Recoveries	556,058	552,564	3,494	736,749
Expenditure	422,197	383,002	-39,195	509,793
Net Surplus	6	-655	661	

Assets Business Unit

Revenue	7,163		7,163	
Internal Charges	444,216	512,991	68,775	683,986
Internal Recoveries	892,461	863,325	29,136	1,151,095
Expenditure	455,408	356,115	-99,293	467,110
Net Surplus	0	-5,781	5,781	-1

Property Management Business Unit

Revenue	5,098	3,852	1,246	5,136
Rates Revenue		-135	135	-182
Internal Recoveries	131,450	147,924	-16,474	197,236
Expenditure	136,548	155,620	19,072	202,191
Net Surplus		-3,979	3,979	-1

Fleet Management Business Unit

Revenue				
Rates Revenue	27,326	22,971	4,355	30,626
Internal Recoveries	220,910	252,459	-31,549	336,614
Expenditure	248,237	250,999	2,762	330,805
Net Surplus	0	24,431	-24,432	36,435

Regulatory Business Unit

Revenue	312		312	
Internal Charges	193,222	231,687	38,465	308,902
Internal Recoveries	771,714	758,232	13,482	1,010,971
Expenditure	578,811	531,485	-47,326	702,069
Net Surplus	-8	-4,940	4,933	

Statement of Capital Works 2014/15 For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015	Full Year Budget 2014/15	Budget Carried Forward from 2014	Actual YTD 2014/15	Variance
---	---	---	-------------------------------	-----------------

Community & Leisure Assets

Libraries				
Library Books	100,000		64,437	35,563
Computer Equipment	6,000		3,650	2,350
Furniture and Fittings	26,000		0	26,000
Swimming Pools				
Renewals				
Marton - Pump	1,694		8,981	-7,287
Taihape Pump	3,238		0	3,238
Marton	10,588		4,479	6,109
Taihape Pool Resurface	20,878		0	20,878
Taihape Fans	28,812		0	28,812
Taihape & H/Ville Blgs	15,883		0	15,883
Marton Changing Rooms	5,294		0	5,294
Marton Fencing & Impr	70,000		1,442	68,558
Taihape Carpark	31,765		0	31,765
DE Filter Bags Marton	5,294		0	5,294
DE Filter Bags Taihape	5,294		0	5,294
Community Housing				
District	25,310		4,885	20,425
Parks & Reserves				
District - Renewals	153,767		30,229	123,538
Bulls Court House	30,000		0	30,000
Public Toilets				
Renewals				
Campground Toilet & WW T/Ment	100,000		3,943	96,057
Halls				
Renewals				
District	81,261		33,356	47,905
Cemeteries				
Renewals				
District	15,453		2,298	13,155
New Capital				
District	16,196		11,803	4,393
Total Community & Leisure Assets	752,727	0	169,502	583,225

Community Wellbeing

Info Centres				
District Promotions		20,000		20,000
Rural Fire				
Total Community Wellbeing	0	20,000	0	20,000

Statement of Capital Works 2014/15	Full Year	Budget	Actual YTD	
For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015	Budget	Carried Forward	2014/15	

Rubbish and Recycling

Renewals

Marton

New Capital

Marton

2,506		0	2,506
2,506	0	0	2,506

Total Rubbish and Recycling

Waste Transfer Stations

Renewals

Marton - Ground Mtc & Fencing

New Capital

Marton - Pit Access

220,000		87,858	132,142
220,000	0	87,858	132,142

Total Waste Transfer Stations

Statement of Capital Works 2014/15 For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015	Full Year Budget 2014/15	Budget Carried Forward from 2014	Actual YTD 2014/15	Variance
---	---	---	-------------------------------	-----------------

Stormwater

Renewals				
Renewals District Wide	386,999	227,000	151,680	462,319
New Capital				
New Capital District Wide	173,101	0	21,727	151,374
Total Stormwater	560,100	227,000	173,407	613,693

Water

Renewals District Wide	2,455,468	621,000	1,946,882	1,129,586
Hunternville	43,131		13,113	30,018
Erewhon Rural Water	112,510		76,800	35,710
Hunternville Rural Water	120,614		10,601	110,013
Omatane Rural Water			0	0
Putorino RWS				
New Capital				
New Capital District Wide	2,011,998	333,500	471,784	1,873,714
Hunternville	36,424		2,179	34,245
Hunternville Rural Water			320	-320
Erewhon Rural Water			1,360	
Total Water	4,780,145	954,500	2,523,040	3,211,605

Wastewater

Renewals				
Renewals District Wide	695,708	5,000	95,772	604,936
New Capital				
New Capital District Wide	4,590,904	480,865	659,010	4,412,759
Total Waste Water	5,286,612	485,865	754,782	5,017,695

Roads and Transportation

Renewals-Subsidised				
Structures Component Replacement	200,000		165,608	34,392
Pavement Rehabilitation	2,743,515		1,349,220	1,394,295
Unsealed Road	333,502		193,034	140,468
Drainage Renewals	296,193		399,769	-103,576
Planning	0		300	-300
Sub.Rdg.Pavement Rehab. Prf.Sr	180,000		88,587	91,413
Sub.Rdg.Drainage Prof.Serv.	20,000		0	20,000
Sub.Rdg.Struct.Comp.P/S	46,079		6,718	39,361
Sub.Rdg.Traffic Ser Rnw P/S	10,000		2,160	7,840
Sub.Rdg.Sealed Rd Surfacc.P/S	120,000		10,080	109,920
Reseals	1,837,711		2,502,114	-664,403
Traffic Services	100,000		103,433	-3,433
Associated Improvements	106,000		99,059	6,941
Renewals-Non Subsidised				
Renewals Prof Services	18,140		0	18,140
Footpath Renewals	85,367		111,590	-26,223
New Capital - Subsidised				
Taihape Napier Road			0	0
Minor safety Projects - Principal ContrProf	531,290		423,616	107,674
Prof Services - Minor Safety	0		975	-975
Major Bridge Refurb	909,999		39,000	870,999
New Capital - Non Subsidised				
Footpath Construction	64,025		68,880	-4,855
Ratana Speed Humps	6,936		0	6,936
Total Roads and Transportation	7,608,757	0	5,564,143	2,044,614

Statement of Capital Works 2014/15 For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015		Full Year Budget 2014/15	Budget Carried Forward from 2014	Actual YTD 2014/15	Variance
Miscellaneous					
Vehicles		175,000		58,574	116,426
Total Vehicles		175,000		58,574	116,426
PC Replacements				0	0
Hardware Servers & Core Network		69,227		3,063	66,164
PC Replacements		35,146		21,040	14,106
Hardware - Other		26,626		13,044	13,582
SAN		21,300		0	21,300
Furniture & Fittings				787	
Aerial Photography		31,951		0	31,951
Plant & Machinery				2,170	-2,170
Computer Additions		5,325		0	5,325
Office Furniture Purchases		25,000		12,817	12,183
Software Purchases		0		4,865	-4,865
Total Miscellaneous		389,575	0	116,360	273,215
Grand Total		19,600,422	1,687,365	9,389,091	11,898,696

Finance/Performance Committee 30 April 2015

**Significant Variances in the Financial Highlights and Commentary to 31 March 2015
10% and greater than \$2,500.**

Community Leadership			
Council	Council Committees	Elections	
Expenditure is down \$26,736; internal charges are down \$25,591	Expenditure is down \$11,328	Expenditure is up \$3,771	
Main reason for lower year-to-date expenditure is that LGNZ annual subscription has yet to be invoiced. Also lower expenditure in mileage, conferences and catering, but higher expenditure in advertising and telephone/communications. There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting (so a lower internal charge).	Lower than expected expenditure in payments to Members of Te Roopu Ahi Kaa (annual allowances, meeting fees, conference attendance)	This is due to costs for the Taihape Community Board by-election	

Community Wellbeing			
Community Awards	District Promotion	Civil Defence	Rural Fire
Expenditure is down \$3,837	Revenue up by \$25,442; expenditure is up by \$44,016	Expenditure is down \$25,457	Revenue is up by \$10,148; internal costs down by \$5,350
This activity includes the Creative Communities Scheme which has its second allocation meeting on 27 May 2015.	The additional revenue represents external grants being more than budgeted. Higher expenditure comes from the town centre plan projects and the Bulls Community Centre (for which additional provision has been made). The excess expenditure is less than reported in March because two grants were coded as offsets to expenditure whereas they should be treated as revenue, This has been adjusted for April.	This is due to late invoicing from Horizons for the Civil Defence contract;	Increased revenue is due to reimbursement for fire-fighting costs; decreased internal charges due to lower allocated costs for property

Environment & Regulatory Services			
District Planning	Dog Control	Resource Consents	Stock Control
Expenditure is up \$5,135	Revenue is up \$38,733; expenditure is down \$12,993	Revenue is down by \$12,803; expenditure is up \$74,293	Revenue is up \$15,943
This is due to incorrect coding (noise control callouts) and advice for reviewing the District Plan <i>Note:</i> resource consent service arrangement with Wanganui District Council is budgeted and expensed here.	Increased revenue is due to on-call work done for Wanganui District Council; reduced expenditure is due to the lower than budgeted legal costs.	These two are inter-related; there has not yet been recovery of costs related to the Bonny Glen resource consent. There are also unbudgeted costs for legal advice on Meridian's application to extend lapse date for Project Central Wind.	This is due to recovery of costs (from NZTA) associated with retrieving stock from State Highways.
Health			
Revenue is up \$25,670 and expenditure is down \$5,704			
Higher than budgeted revenue from liquor licences (higher fees set by statute) and from food premises registration (100% coverage); lower than budgeted expenditure because of mis-coded noise control (under District Plan)			

Community & Leisure Assets			
Libraries	Domains	Cemeteries	Real estate
Revenue is up \$3,910; expenditure is down \$52,492; internal charges are down \$4,447	Revenue is up \$100,853; expenditure is down \$52,378; internal charges are down \$18,898	Expenditure is down \$22,907; internal charges down \$4,664	Revenue is up \$4,608
Year-to-date revenue is slightly lower than the same period last year: the budget is conservative as it is dependent on demand for sale books, printing and photocopying. Higher expenditure is due to lower ongoing fee for Overdrive (e-book service) and later invoicing for EPIC databases (\$15,000), reduced spending on magazines (\$5,000), delayed invoicing of books (\$10,000), different format for publishing annual local writing competition (\$5,000); seasonal lower use of electricity (\$5,000); less use than expected of external contractors (\$5,000). There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting, hence the lower internal charge.	The higher revenue is due to the Lotteries Facilities grant for refurbishing the Shelton Pavilion. The decreased expenditure is due to over provision for the external contractor (pro rata by \$15,000); lower costs from the principal contractor - primarily through less day works than last year (\$20,000), less extraordinary repairs (\$10,000), less rates (\$7,000). There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting, hence the lower internal charge.	Lower expenditure reflects the reduced number of repairs required (\$10,000) and fewer new berms being needed than expected (\$10,000). There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting, hence the lower internal charge.	Increased revenue is the result of reviewing leases and licences.

Swim Centres			Community housing			Public Toilets			Halls		
Revenue is down \$33,022; internal charges are down by \$8,640; expenditure is down by \$58,770.			Revenue is down by \$9,378; internal charges are down by \$5,479 and expenditure is down by \$19,468			Internal charges are down by \$5,119; expenditure is down \$43,471			Internal charges are down by \$9,349; expenditure is down \$32,861		
The lower revenue is due to the terms of the contract for the management of the Marton Swim Centre; revenue is issued as a credit note and deducted from the invoice. There has been less cost related to statutory planning (so lower than expected internal charges); the budget for operating grants is now too high (having regard for the treatment of revenue at the Marton Swim Centre).			Reduced revenue is the result of a slightly higher vacancy rate; there has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting (so lower than expected internal charges); the amount of renewals work done has been less than projected.			There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting. The lower expenditure is primarily the result of too high a budget provision (pro rata by \$35,000). Overall, expenditure is similar to last year's but slightly lower due to a decreased use of the Wallace Development toilets in Bulls, compared with the now closed High Street toilets, and a decreased spend on 'reinstatement after vandalism'			There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting. The lower than budgeted expenditure is because of over provision for grants (pro rata by \$10,000) and for external contractor (pro rata by \$30,000) where the expenditure pattern has been similar to last year. However, electricity costs are higher than projected (\$10,000)		
Forestry investments											
Revenue is down by \$13,765											
No logging has been done this year											

Rubbish and recycling					
Public Refuse and Bin Collection	Landfills and Waste Transfer Stations	Waste Minimisation			
Internal charges are down by \$2,812	Revenue is down by \$25,706; internal charges are down by \$10,804	Revenue is up \$3,465 because of income from recycling being greater than forecast; expenditure is down by \$26,253			
There has been less than expected cost from statutory planning and reporting.	The lower revenue reflects the reducing quantity of waste going to landfill (greenwaste is charged at a lower rate). There has been less cost than expected from statutory planning and reporting.	Higher revenue Lower expenditure is the result of the lower uptake of the Zero Waste programme within Schools.			

Waters			
Stormwater	Water	Wastewater	Rural water
Revenue is up \$10,566 and expenditure is down \$185,644	Revenue is down \$675,000 and expenditure is down \$623,471	Revenue is up \$38,312; internal charges are down by \$17,591; expenditure is down by \$90,675.	Internal charges are down \$5,702; expenditure is up by \$7,746.
The increased revenue is due to a correction of invoices for connections. The lower than budget expenditure is due to (i) the \$100,000 set aside for the investigations associated with Council's Water-Related Services Bylaw and (ii) the over-provision for repairs to the network	The lower revenue is related to the slower progress with the Ratana water upgrade (and only \$25,000 of the total \$900,000 subsidy from the Ministry of Health has been paid to date. High rates reflects the greater use of metered (extraordinary water) over the dry summer. Lower expenditure is the result of operational efficiencies (lower costs for chemicals and electricity), different deployment of Shared Services staff and contractors/consultants, and reallocation of costs to capital/renewal projects.	The revenue earned from user charges is similar to the same period last year; the budget was set too low. There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting (hence lower internal charges). Although electricity costs are higher than for the same period last year, they are \$25,000 less than budget. There have been lower year-to-date costs for chemicals and materials (\$25,000) and Manawatu shared services staff (\$115,000) but higher year-to-date costs for contractors/consultants (\$25,000) resource consents (\$20,000), insurance (\$10,000) and rates (\$15,000).	The main reason for increased expenditure is been the extent of work done on the Erewhon scheme. Less cost from statutory planning and reporting has meant a lower internal charge.

Roading	Non-Subsidised Roading						
Revenue is up \$314,838; internal charges are down \$18,059; expenditure is up \$517,902	Revenue is up \$13,800 ; internal charges are down by \$9,036; expenditure is down \$65,296						
This is due to the earlier than usual start to the sealing and pavement rehabilitation programme. There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting (hence lower internal charges)	The increased revenue is due to a contribution from St John for a vehicle crossing in Linnet Street, Taihape, and the decreased expenditure is due to lower than expected expenditure in various areas (including: survey costs and legalisation, roadside tree maintenance and berm mowing). There has been less cost than expected related to statutory planning and reporting (hence lower internal charges)						

Business Units			
Human Resources	Finance	Statutory Planning & Reporting	Information Services
Expenditure is down \$50,322	Revenue is down \$10,362	Expenditure is down \$173,449	Expenditure is down \$78,371
This is due to a decrease in HR staffing and less expenditure on corporate training than projected. <i>Note</i> : the revenue shown in the CEO business unit is Work & Income subsidy for short-term placements.	This is a timing issue - payment of the share by Horizons in the QV valuation.	This is due to timing. Invoices have yet to come from the Council's auditors and the designers of "What's the Plan Rangitikei...?"	Although spending on external contractors and consultants aligns with the same period last year, it is \$25,000 under budget. The other elements of the year-to-date under-expenditure are: postage (\$15,000), hardware maintenance (\$10,000), and staff training (\$10,000).
Customer & Community Services	Assets	Property Management	Regulatory
Expenditure is up \$39,293	Expenditure is up \$99,293	Expenditure is down \$19,072	Expenditure is up \$47,326
Wages and salaries aligns with the same period last year, this is \$50,000 over budget. There is under-expenditure on training of \$10,000.	This is due to increased charges associated with software, contractors and small tools.	This is due to a decreased spend on furniture and external contractors (apart from the cleaning contractor).	This is caused by the additional animal control staffing related to the shared services arrangement with Manawatu. The budget does not reflect that.

Variances other Capital

- Capital – computing servers \$90,527 was budgeted to buy new servers and other hardware Storage area network or SAN. This did not include approximately \$20,000 which was charged to Council the last time this was done to transfer the application and data between servers. Council requested proposals for a number of suppliers to look to replace these and suppliers are increasingly offering leasing as a good option. Basically for the cost of the depreciation approximately 2000 per month we have been able to secure new servers which are leased and this cost includes the upfront transfer between old and new machines and also some of the monthly support costs are included in the price by the supplier saving nearly \$4K per month. This is a model that the MWLASS is likely to move to with perhaps the servers being accommodated in other locations now that we have a fibre connection just about operational.
- Capital Computing – desktops approximately \$14K is left in this year budget for Desktop Computer replacements although some of this will be needed for replacements before year end. It is requested that the balance of these funds are carried forward and used as part of a refresh of desktops likely in Oct 2015 with the arrival of Windows 10. Moving to later versions of the ubiquitous Windows operating system will reduce maintenance costs and simplify support while providing staff with fit for purpose machines. Exactly which type of machines has not yet been fully determined but with the positive experience with Surface tablets which are compatible with the full Microsoft Office suite it is likely that increasing numbers of staff who are mobile will be provided with Surface tablets.
- Capital Vehicles – This is now fully spent with the renewal of a number of vehicles which were due for replacement.

**Rangitikei District Council
Treasury Report
For the 9 Months ended 31st March 2015**

Investments

Bank Deposits	Maturity Date	Int Rate	Term	% of Portfolio	Amount	Comment
Westpac Current Account	Call	3.30%	Call	1.65%	137,528.37	Immediate Needs
Westpac Call Account	Call	3.25%	Call	10.92%	910,431.03	Immediate Needs
BNZ-3023	01/05/15	3.88%	60	12.27%	1,022,688.86	Immediate Needs reinvested 60 days
BNZ-3024	23/04/15	3.88%	30	12.13%	1,011,095.89	Immediate Needs
Westpac 0013	27/04/15	4.34%	91	12.00%	1,000,000.00	Immediate Needs
ASB 0073	17/05/15	4.29%	80	12.00%	1,000,000.00	Immediate Needs 1000000 80 days from 26/02

5,081,744.15

60.97% Of total pool Investment
policy allows up to 100%

The Investment Policy requires that maximum any one bank of \$5m

And maturity mix as follows

Actual Policy

0-3 months	60.64%	15%-40%
3-6 months	39.36%	10%-60%
6 month to 2 years	0.00%	10%-60%

Equity Investments

Number

Cost

Value 2013

@

Local Government Insurance Corporation

23,338

23,338

36,939

\$1

23,338

36,939

0.44% Of total pool Investment
policy allows up to 10%

Corporate Bonds						S & P Rating	
Date of Purchase							
Purchased 16/02/06				Effective Coupon	Face value	Fair Value 2014	
Fonterra Perpetual Cap Note	none	5.73%	8.74%	191,963.00	201,735.76		
Purchased 21/02/06							
Fonterra Perpetual Cap Note	none	5.73%	8.74%	280,000.00	294,072.88		
Notes Redeemed 10/07/06				-443,645.00	-465,086.38		
loss on Redemption					-981.01		
Balance as at 30 June 2014		5.44%		28,318.00	29,741.25	28,035	A
Purchased 24/03/06							
Telecom 10 Year Bonds	24/03/2016	7.04%	7.04%		500,000.00	528,900	A-
Purchased 20/09/07							
RABOBANK Bonds Perpetual		3.708%	3.708%	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	935,000	A+
Purchased 11/03/09							
Fonterra Bonds 2015	10/03/2015	7.60%	7.75%	500,000.00	0.00	515,050	AA
							MATURED
Purchased 22/09/10							
Manukau City Council Bonds	29/09/2017	6.52%	6.52%	1,500,000.00	1,500,000.00	1,608,750.00	AA
Total					3,029,741.25	3,615,734.82	36.35%
							Of total pool Investment policy allows up to 50%
Forestry					185,799.00		2.23%
							Of total pool Investment policy allows up to 20%
Total Investments and Cash					8,334,223.40		

Attachment 3

Rangitikei District Council

Statement of Service Performance

1 July 2014 – 31 March 2015

To Finance/Performance Committee, 30 April 2015

The measures and targets are those presented in the 2012/22 Long Term Plan.

Progress with the mandatory performance measures for roading, water, wastewater and stormwater (which must be included in the 2015/25 Long Term Plan) are also noted. For the completely new measures, no performance targets apply for 2014/15. Targets will be set in April 2015 for 2015/16, having regard for year-to-date results available by then

The full-year Statement of Service Performance will form part of the 2014/15 Annual Report, and is subject to scrutiny by the Council's auditors.

Performance Reporting

In the Activities that follow, performance reporting against the **Target (or Intended Level of Service)** will be detailed as follows:

Achieved	<p>Required actions have been completed and the intended level of service has been achieved</p> <p>Or where a long-term level of service is targeted, the results for the year are in keeping with the required trend to achieve the intended level of service</p>
Partly achieved	<p>Some outputs contributing to the intended level of service have been achieved (e.g. 3 workshops held of the 4 initially proposed)</p> <p>Or the result for the year is between 50% and 75% of the intended level of service</p>
Achieved/ongoing	<p>A particular level of service has been achieved. But it is multi-faceted and not totally time related in that there are constant actions continuously adding to it</p>
In progress	<p>No actual output has been achieved but pre-requisite processes have commenced</p>
Not commenced	<p>No actions to achieve the stated level of service have begun</p>
Not achieved	<p>None of the required actions have been undertaken</p> <p>Or the result for the year is less than half of the intended level of service</p> <p>Or where a long-term level of service is targeted, the results for the year are contrary to the required trend to achieve the intended level of service</p>
Not yet available	<p>Timing of the relevant data set occurs later in the year.</p>

Community Leadership

Level of Service		
Make decisions that are robust, fair, timely, legally compliant and address critical issues, and that are communicated to the community and followed through		
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
Completion of annual plan actions on time	<p>92% of Annual Plan actions substantially undertaken or completed. All groups of activities achieved at least 80% of identified actions.</p> <p><i>This is an increased target from 2013/14 – 90% and 77% respectively.</i></p>	<p>In progress:</p> <p>Of 60 actions identified in the Annual Plan, 34 are being actively progressed. 18 are fully complete, of which 17 are fully achieved.</p> <p>The planned carpark extension at the Taihape Pool was due for completion before the pool opened for the 2014/15 season. Remedial work has been undertaken but the project was deferred for later consideration, after the Taihape Town Centre Plan is completed, because of the possibility of the Pool complex being an integral part of a recreation hub. This is considered to be complete but not achieved.</p> <p>Two projects are started (on track) but are likely to be delivered late (and therefore unlikely to be achieved by year-end). These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the Ratana water upgrade which is now due for completion in December 2015 To review the District Plan and propose a necessary plan change. The final delivery of this is now not expected until late 2015. <p>Those actions not yet started are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the traffic calmers and stage 1 upgrade to access road to Ratana water tanks and urupa review stormwater system design parameters. Implement education programme on responsibilities for stormwater drainage maintenance implement agreed earthquake-strengthening and undertake further evaluations in response to government requirements (not yet announced) review Council's earthquake-prone buildings policy give effect to provisions of Food Act (awaiting schedule from MPI).
Completion of capital	88% of planned capital programme	In progress:

programme	<p>expended; all network utilities groups of activities to achieve at least 77% of planned capital expenditure.</p> <p><i>This is an increased target from 2012/13 – 85% and 75% respectively.</i></p>	<p>Total capital expenditure for the first nine months was \$9.39 million from a total budget of \$19.60 million (including carry-forwards of \$1.69 million) i.e. 48%.</p> <p><i>Roading</i> Total capital expenditure for the first six months was \$5.56 million from a budget of \$7.61 million (i.e. 73%)</p> <p><i>Utilities (water, wastewater and stormwater)</i> Total capital expenditure for the first six months was \$3.45 million from a budget of \$10.63 million¹ (i.e. 32%)</p> <p><i>Community and Leisure Assets (cemeteries, halls, housing, libraries, parks and reserves, public toilets and swimming pools)</i> Total capital expenditure for the first six months was \$169,502 from a budget of \$752,727 (i.e. 23%)</p>
-----------	--	--

There are no mandatory performance measures for this group of activities.

¹ This includes approved carry-forwards of \$1,667,365.

Roading and footpaths

Level of Service		
Provide a safe roading network which allows people to travel from A to B, free of loose gravel or potholes and maintaining the level of sealed roads currently available		
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
Smooth travel exposure rating (i.e. NAASRA roughness counts)	96.5% <i>This target is unchanged from 2013/14.</i>	Achieved: The most recent measurement was in June 2014. The mean rating for the sampled District's roads was 98%. This is the percentage of the road distance travelled in the sample which met the specified service level. Primary collector roads such as Wanganui Road have a roughness level of 150 NAASRA counts whereas for road with a daily count of less than 50 per day a NAASRA count between 200 and 250 would be acceptable. The results of the sampling are used to review renewal priorities. The next measurement is expected in 2016.
The number of callouts to the contractor, both within working hours and after-hours, with the response and resolution times (with the percentage resolved within a specified time). Specific note to be made of (i) time to respond/ resolve callouts relating to potholes; and (ii) incidents of crashes on Council's roading network and whether the road condition was a cause of each crash.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% after-hours callouts responded to within 12 hours 100% callouts during working hours, responded to within 6 hours 80% of all callouts resolved (i.e. completed) within one month of the request. Specific reference to callouts relating to potholes No fatal crashes attributable to the condition of the roading network <i>This target is unchanged from 2013/14.</i>	Partly achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 94% after-hours callouts responded to within 12 hours (16 requests). 84 callouts during working hours responded to within 6 hours (100 requests). 85% of all callouts resolved (i.e. completed) within one month of the request. During the reporting period 24 pothole requests were lodged – all during working hours (18 were responded to in time). There were two fatal crashes on the Council's roads during the reporting period: one was caused by excessive speed, the other by one driver cutting the corner, so neither fatality is attributable to the condition of the network.

Level of Service
Increase asset length and footpath renewal programme

Adequacy of provision and maintenance of footpaths, street-lighting and local roads (annual survey) ² .	<p>A greater proportion (than in the previous year) of the sample believe that Council's service is getting better</p> <p><i>This sets an increased target from 2013/14.</i></p>	<p>Achieved: The survey conducted in March 2015 showed (in aggregate) that 13% (8% last year) rated the roading network better than last year, 65% (70% last year) rated it about the same and 21% (20% last year) thought it worse.</p> <p>Specific questions in the survey sometimes revealed levels of satisfaction which differed from the overall result. For example, 16% thought there were fewer potholes and loose gravel on sealed roads (11% last year).</p> <p>Comments showed a range of views about the state of maintenance of roads and footpaths; there was a clearer (and more positive) view on the standard of street lighting and signage.</p>
--	--	--

Mandatory performance measures for the 2015/25 Long Term Plan

Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
<p>Road safety The change from the previous financial year in the number of fatalities and serious injury crashes on the local road network, expressed as a number</p>	In 2013/14 there were four fatal crashes and 11 serious injury crashes on the network but none of these was attributable to the condition of the roading network.	<p>In progress/Not yet available There were two fatal crashes and nine serious injury crashes during the reporting period.³ The number of serious injury accidents in 2013/14 has not yet been researched</p>
<p>Road condition The average quality of ride on a sealed local road network, measured by smooth travel exposure</p>	See above	See above
<p>Road maintenance The percentage of the sealed road network that is resurfaced.</p>	8% (i.e. 55km of resealing and 8.8 km of road rehabilitation). The network has 796 km of sealed road.	<p>Achieved: 61.84 km of road resealing and 5.81 km of road rehabilitation has been completed during the reporting period. This is 8.3% of the sealed network.</p>

² Groups which are targeted for consultation:

- Residents where programmed renewal has taken place,
- Community Boards/ Committees,
- Community group database
- Business sector database

³ 'Serious injury' is not defined in the Rules or associated guidance from the Department of Internal Affairs. At a minimum it is likely to cover all injuries requiring admission to hospital for treatment.

<p><i>Footpaths</i></p> <p>The percentage of footpaths within the District that fall within the level of service or service standard for the condition of footpaths that is set out in the Council's relevant document (such as its annual plan, activity management plan, asset management plan, annual works programme or long term plan)</p>		<p><i>Not yet available</i></p> <p>A methodology is being proposed based on the One Network Roading Classification model.</p> <p>While there are high-level standards specified in the asset management plan (pp.37-38), they require more specificity to be used for this measure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate maintenance and reliability • Smooth footpaths which enable residents with all types of mobility to travel on them. • Provision of street lighting which ensures residents feel safe when travelling around the District (walking, cycling, driving, etc.). • Implementation, use and monitoring of surveillance cameras to deter anti-social behaviour. • Implementation of urban design principles to improve the aesthetics of footpaths (e.g. planting).
<p><i>Responses to service requests</i></p> <p>The percentage of customer service requests relating to roads and footpaths to which the territorial authority responds within the time frame specified in the long term plan</p>	<p>See above</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 88% of footpath and road requests were responded to within time (147requests). • 87% of footpath and road requests were resolved in time.

Water supply

Level of Service		
Provide a reliable, accessible and safe water supply to properties on the urban reticulation systems		
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
Compliance with resource consents ⁴	<p>No incidents of non-compliance with resource consents</p> <p><i>This target is unchanged from 2013/14.</i></p>	<p>Not achieved:</p> <p>Water Outlook identified exceedances at Mangaweka over 34 days. This (and the rectifying measures) has been discussed with Horizons. Non-compliance for abstraction at Omatane during 3-11 December 2014 due to leak (now repaired).</p> <p>No other non-compliances detected in monitoring by Horizons. However, at Taihape the pipeline hydraulics are such that more water must be taken from the river than is allowed in the consent, otherwise air will be introduced into the line and it could fail as well as cause major operational difficulties. Horizons has accepted the proposed remedy, which is to discharge excess water back into the river downstream.</p>
Compliance with the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards ⁵	<p>No incidents of E-coli detection requiring information to be passed to Ministry of Health's Drinking Water Assessor</p> <p>Operational compliance with legislation confirmed by Drinking-water Assessor grading in Ratana, Hunterville and Mangaweka water schemes (Marton, Taihape and Bulls continue to be assessed as compliant)</p> <p><i>The second of these targets is higher than in 2013/14.</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>There was one incident of <i>E coli</i> detected at Hunterville in March 2015. This required notification and three consecutive daily samples to be taken and the chlorine residual tested. However, all samples were clear and the chlorine tests were passed.</p> <p>In progress:</p> <p>Compliance with legislation measured by status of Water Safety Plans (WSPs). The revised Hunterville WSP has been approved. Update of Bulls WSP to reflect treatment plant process changes. This WSP (and those for Marton and Taihape) must be signed off by Drinking Water Assessor by 30 June 2015.</p>
Number of unplanned water supply disruptions affecting multiple properties	<p>No unplanned water supply disruptions affecting multiple properties</p> <p><i>This target is unchanged from</i></p>	<p>Partly achieved</p> <p>There was one unplanned water interruption during the reporting period. The number of properties affected was not recorded.</p>

⁴ Council has previously regarded this compliance as a measure of delivering a sustainable water supply

⁵ There are three distinct measures: (a) weekly sampling and testing on a weekly basis at Environmental Laboratory Services in Gracefield, Lower Hutt of all Council's urban reticulated supplies; (b) random tests conducted by MidCentral Health, and (c) annual inspections and grading by the Drinking-water Assessor (MidCentral Health, on behalf of the Ministry of Health)

	2013/14.	
Level of Service		
Provide a reliable water pressure and flow, which complies with the NZ Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice		
Random flow checks at the different supplies ⁶	100% of fire hydrant installations are in compliance <i>This is an increased target from 2013/14– 95%.</i>	Not achieved: Two maintenance issues relating to fire hydrants evident during the reporting period. The last full test of hydrants was in 2012 Council's reticulation team is developing a programme to re-test hydrants according to New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. It is planned before July to upsize the main alongside Rangatahi Street, Ratana, and install three hydrants.

Mandatory performance measures for the 2015/25 Long Term Plan

Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
<p><i>Safety of drinking water</i> The extent to which the Council's drinking water supply complies with</p> <p>(a) part 4 of the drinking water standards (bacteria compliance criteria)</p> <p>(b) part 5 of the drinking water standards (protozoa compliance criteria)</p>	<p>No incidents of non-compliance</p> <p>Establish monitoring programme so reports are available from January 2015.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Not yet available: When implemented, Water Outlook will assist with compliance monitoring. Secure bore status being investigated for Ratana and Calico Line (Marton). Upgrades planned for Taihape, Hunterville and Bulls. All plants should be compliant by 30 June 2015.</p>
<p><i>Maintenance of the reticulation network</i> The percentage of real water loss from the Council's networked reticulation system⁷</p>	<p>Establish monitoring programme so that reports are available from January 2015 for <i>each of Council's network systems</i>.</p>	<p>Not yet available: The guidance for this measure anticipates a sampling approach. When implemented, Water Outlook will enable SCADA⁸ information to be interrogated in-house. A figure for each scheme will be determined before 30 June 2015</p>
<p><i>Fault response time</i> Where the Council attends a call-out in response to a fault or unplanned</p>	<p>Establish monitoring programme so reports are available from January</p>	<p>Not yet available <i>The request for service system records time of notification, attendance/</i></p>

⁶ This measure tests whether the Council is providing a reliable water pressure and flow, which complies with the NZ Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice

⁷ A description of the methodology used to calculate this must be included as part of the report.

⁸ Supervisory control and data acquisition – i.e. automated remote monitoring,

<p>interruption to its networked reticulation system, the following <i>median times</i> are measured</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) attendance for urgent call-outs: from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel reach the site, and (b) resolution of urgent call-outs from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel confirm resolution of the fault of interruption (c) attendance for non-urgent call-outs: from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel reach the site, and (d) resolution of non-urgent call-outs from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel confirm resolution of the fault of interruption 	<p>2015.</p>	<p><i>response and resolution/completion for each notification, and whether the times are within the prescribed service standard but does not calculate the actual times taken. In addition, the times are recorded only as figures. Ways of getting this calculation are being investigated.</i></p> <p>There were 273 notifications of urgent callouts. Of these, 252 were responded to in time and 235 were resolved in time.</p> <p>There were 10 notifications for non-urgent callouts. Of these, 9 were responded to and resolved in time.</p>
<p><i>Customer satisfaction</i> The total number of complaints (expressed per 1000 connections to the reticulated networks) received by the Council about</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) drinking water clarity (b) drinking water taste (c) drinking water pressure or flow (d) continuity of supply, and (e) The Council's response to any of these issues 		<p><i>In progress</i> <i>The request for service system does not show all complaints for any one incident, so there is potential under-reporting. With that qualification, the year-to-date results are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) 25/1000 (b) 2/1000 (c) 8/1000 (d) 10/1000 (e) 45/1000
<p><i>Demand management</i> The average consumption of drinking water per day per resident within the District</p>	<p>Establish monitoring programme so reports are available from January 2015.</p>	<p><i>Not yet available</i> Implementation of Water Outlook has enabled this information to be collected automatically. However, Marton is not yet included.</p>

		<p>The average daily consumption of drinking water per day per resident in Ratana, Bulls, Hunterville (town), Mangaweka and Taihape was 524 litres.</p>
--	--	---

Sewerage and the treatment and disposal of sewage

Level of Service		
Provide a reliable reticulated disposal system that does not cause harm or create pollution within the existing urban areas.		
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
Compliance with resource consents	<p>100% compliance at Marton WWTP (Bulls Mangaweka, Hunterville and Taihape WWTP continue 100% compliant)</p> <p><i>This is an increased target from 2013/14 – Bulls added that year.</i></p>	<p>Not achieved</p> <p>Significant non-compliance found during the Inspection of the Marton WWTP in February 2015 of Marton WWTP. Ammoniacal nitrogen limits have been exceeded with consequent impact on aquatic life the Tutaenui Stream. Horizons also expressed concern of insufficient monitoring of the particular impacts from accepting leachate from the Bonny Glen landfill.</p> <p>Horizons has also expressed concern about the environmental effects from using the emergency bypasses at the Hunterville and Taihape WWTPs. Priority is being given to checking the extent of infiltration from stormwater in both systems.</p> <p>In June 2014 the Koiatiata WWTP was assessed as presenting significant non-compliance primarily because the required waste disposal field had not been constructed (resulting in overflow from the oxidation pond soaking into the neighbouring ground). Steps are being taken to address this.</p> <p>The consent at Bulls has expired and negotiations continue to renew this.</p>
Number of overflows from each network (response/resolution time)	<p>No single network to experience more than 2 overflows during a 12 month period. Response/resolution time monitored and compared with benchmark].</p> <p><i>This is an increased target from 2013/14 – no more than 3 overflows.</i></p>	<p>Partly achieved:</p> <p>2 overflows in Marton during the reporting period. Both were responded to and resolved within the prescribed time.</p>
Number of reported blockages in Council's reticulation system per km ⁹ The total reticulation length is 109 km.	<p>Less than 1 blockage per 13.625Km in Council's reticulated system</p> <p><i>This target is unchanged from 2013/14.</i></p>	<p>Partly achieved:</p> <p>13 requests for wastewater blockages during the reporting period.</p> <p><i>Pro rata this is one blockage per 8.38 km of the Council's reticulated systems.</i></p>

⁹ Council relies on reported faults to check whether there is a blockage in its system. Flow metres are not installed throughout the network to provide alerts on such blockages.

Mandatory performance measures for the 2015/25 Long Term Plan

Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
<p><i>System and adequacy</i> The number of dry weather sewerage overflows from the Council's sewerage system, expressed per 1000 sewerage connections to that sewerage system.</p>	<p>Not more than one per 1,000 connections There are 4,226 sewerage connections in the District.</p>	<p>Achieved 3/1000 overflows reported. However, 2 requests relate to the same issue. The other request relates to a blocked toilet. This results in there only being one overflow issue.</p>
<p><i>Discharge compliance</i> Compliance with the Council's resource consents for discharge from its sewerage system measured by the number of (a) abatement notices (b) infringement notices (c) enforcement orders, and (d) convictions received by the Council in relation to those resource consents</p>	<p>No abatement or infringement notices, no enforcement orders and no convictions</p>	<p>Achieved No abatement or infringement notices, no enforcement orders and no convictions received during the reporting period.</p>
<p><i>Fault response time</i> Where the Council attends to sewerage overflows resulting from a blockage or other fault in the Council's sewerage system, the following <i>median times</i> are measured (a) attendance time: from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel reach the site, and (b) resolution time: from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel confirm resolution of the fault of interruption</p>	<p>Establish monitoring programme so reports are available from January 2015.</p>	<p>Not yet available <i>The request for service system records time of notification, attendance/ response and resolution/completion for each notification, and whether the times are within the prescribed service standard but does not calculate the actual times taken. In addition, the times are recorded only as figures. Ways of getting this calculation are being investigated.</i></p> <p>There were 22 faults reported during first nine months of the year. Of these, 21 were responded to in time and 20 were resolved in time.</p>
<p><i>Customer satisfaction</i> The total number of complaints received by the Council about any of the following: (a) sewage odour (b) sewerage system faults</p>		<p>In progress <i>The request for service system does not show all complaints for any one incident, so there is potential under-reporting. With that qualification, the year-to-date results are:</i></p>

(c) sewerage system blockages, and (d) the Council's response to issues with its sewerage systems expressed per 1,000 connections to the Councils sewerage system.		(a) 4/1000 (b) 3/1000 (c) 11/1000 (d) 18/1000
---	--	--

Stormwater drainage

Level of Service		
Provide a reliable collection and disposal system to each property during normal rainfall		
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
Number of habitable dwellings which remain uninhabitable for over 24 hours in a heavy rain event (1 in 20-year storm).	In each event of 1 in 20 year storm, no more than 20 dwellings affected for more than 24 hours. <i>This target is unchanged from 2013/14.</i>	In progress: No such event occurred in the reporting period.
Callouts for blocked drains and faults: Specific note to be made of time to respond and resolve callouts relating to manhole covers and inlets.	60% responded within time and 60% resolved within time 100% resolved The targeted <i>response</i> times are 30 minutes for urgent callouts and 24 hours for other callouts. Targeted <i>resolution</i> times are 24 hours for urgent faults and 96 hours for other faults. <i>This is an increased target from 2013/14 – 55%, 55% and 100% respectively.</i>	In progress: We received 11 callout requests in the reporting period. Of these, 4 callouts were urgent and 7 were non urgent. Of the 4 urgent callouts, 3 were responded to within 30 minutes. All were resolved in time. Of the 7 non-urgent callouts, all were responded to within 24 hours and all were resolved in time.

Mandatory performance measures for the 2015/25 Long Term Plan

Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
System adequacy (a) The number of flooding events ¹⁰ that occurred in the District (b) For each flooding event, the number of habitable floors affected (expressed per 1,000 properties connected to the Council's stormwater system)		In progress No such event occurred during the reporting period.
Discharge compliance Compliance with the Council's resource consents for discharge from its stormwater system measured by the number of (a) abatement notices (b) infringement notices		Not applicable The Council has not yet been required to have resource consents for any of its stormwater discharges.

¹⁰ The rules for the mandatory measures define a 'flooding event' as an overflow from a territorial authority's stormwater system that enters a habitable floor

(c) enforcement orders, and (d) convictions received by the Council in relation to those resource consents		
<p><i>Response time</i></p> <p>The median response time to attend a flooding event, measured from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel reach the site.</p>	<p>Establish monitoring programme so reports are available from January 2015.</p>	<p>Not yet available/Not applicable</p> <p><i>The request for service system records time of notification, attendance/response and resolution/completion for each notification, and whether the times are within the prescribed service standard but does not calculate the actual times taken. In addition, the times are recorded only as figures. Ways of getting this calculation are being investigated.</i></p> <p>There were no flooding events in the time period.</p>
<p><i>Customer satisfaction</i></p> <p>The number of complaints received by the Council about the performance of its stormwater system, expressed per 1,000 properties connected to the Council's stormwater system.</p>		<p>In progress</p> <p><i>The request for service system does not show all complaints for any one incident, so there is potential under-reporting.</i></p> <p>11/1000</p>

Community and leisure assets

Level of Service		
Provide a "good enough" range of community and leisure assets at an appropriate proximity to centres of population		
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
"Report card" produced during April/May 2012 of perceptions of the provision and maintenance of Council's: community and leisure assets	A greater proportion (than in the previous year) of the sample believes that Council's service is getting better.	<p>Partly achieved: This annual survey was carried out in March – the headline results are provided here. The headline results indicate that most of Council's community facilities are perceived as performing on a par with last year. The positive exceptions to this are Sports fields and parks and Public toilets. The only Council facility that appears to have decreasing perceptions of improvements is the Swimming pools.</p> <p>Further analysis will be undertaken prior to reporting in the Annual Report.</p> <p>Ratings for the public libraries have remained on a par with results from 2014. Customer service (17%) and other services (16%) continue to be the aspects of the libraries residents think are better than last year.</p> <p>All swimming pool measures have decreased this year, with customer service (19%), cleanliness and maintenance (15%) and opening hours (12%) are perceived as better than last year. A significant decrease can be seen in residents rating programme activities as better than last year (10% cf. 2014, 19%).</p> <p>The additional facilities at the fields, parks and reserves are considered better than last year by 9% of residents, although not statistically significant, this is a 3% increase from last year. On a par with last years results, 8% mention the maintenance and upkeep is better then last year, and 3% think the location and accessibility of sports fields, parks and reserves is better than last year.</p>
	<i>This sets an increased target from 2013/14.</i>	
	Public libraries ¹¹	
	Swimming pools ¹²	
	Sports fields and parks ¹³	

¹¹ In 2013/14, 15% believed it was better than the previous year, 63% about the same, 1% worse (and 21% didn't know)

¹² In 2013/14, 22% believed the service was better than the previous year, 29% about the same, 2% worse (and 47% didn't know).

¹³ In 2013/14, 5% believed the service was better than the previous year, 69% about the same, 9% worse (and 16% didn't know).

	Public toilets ¹⁴	Ratings for measures pertaining to public toilets this year have increased, with significantly more residents indicating the maintenance and upkeep (22% cf. 2014, 6%) and location and accessibility (16% cf. 2014, 4%) is better than last year.
	Community buildings ¹⁵	Ratings associated with community building remain largely on a par with last years results. Customer service (7%), maintenance and upkeep (6%) and additional facilities (6%) continue to be perceived as better than last year.
	Community housing ¹⁶	Although most ratings associated with community housing remain on a par with last year, the majority of residents were not able to rate these measures.

There are no mandatory performance measures for this group of activities.

¹⁴ In 2013/14, 5% believed the service was better than the previous year, 66% about the same, 10% worse (and 18% didn't know).

¹⁵ In 2013/14, 5% believed the service was better than the previous year, 72% about the same, 5% worse (and 18% didn't know).

¹⁶ In 2013/14, 3% believed the service was better than the previous year, 29% about the same, 5% worse (and 63% didn't know).

Rubbish and recycling

Level of Service																							
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.																							
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015																					
Waste to landfill (tonnage) ¹⁷	<p>[No more than] 4,900 tonnes to landfill</p> <p><i>This is an increased target from 2013/14 – 5,200 tonnes.</i></p>	<p>Achieved: For the reporting period 3,541 tonnes went to the landfill. Compared to projected annual total; 72% of projected total has been sent to landfill.</p> <p>While Budget Waste transports its kerbside collections from Marton and Bulls direct to the landfill – more economic since they own the landfill – it is still included in the total to landfill.</p> <p>For the period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014, the transfer station tonnage to landfill (including Budget Waste kerbside tonnage) was 4,693 tonnes to landfill</p>																					
Waste diverted from landfill (tonnage and (percentage of total waste) ¹⁸	<p>Percentage of waste diverted from landfill 13%</p> <p><i>This is an increased target from 2013/14 – 11% diversion.</i></p>	<p>Achieved: 13.3% of waste was diverted during the reporting period.</p> <p>The specific recycling was:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Glass.....</td><td>212.6 tonnes.....</td><td>39.4%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Greenwaste.....</td><td>179.4 tonnes.....</td><td>33.2%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Paper.....</td><td>84.2 tonnes.....</td><td>15.6%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Metals.....</td><td>38.4 tonnes.....</td><td>7.1%</td></tr> <tr> <td>E-waste.....</td><td>8.6 tonnes.....</td><td>1.6%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Plastics.....</td><td>15.3 tonnes</td><td>2.8%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Commingle.....</td><td>1.5 tonnes.....</td><td>0.2%</td></tr> </table>	Glass.....	212.6 tonnes.....	39.4%	Greenwaste.....	179.4 tonnes.....	33.2%	Paper.....	84.2 tonnes.....	15.6%	Metals.....	38.4 tonnes.....	7.1%	E-waste.....	8.6 tonnes.....	1.6%	Plastics.....	15.3 tonnes	2.8%	Commingle.....	1.5 tonnes.....	0.2%
Glass.....	212.6 tonnes.....	39.4%																					
Greenwaste.....	179.4 tonnes.....	33.2%																					
Paper.....	84.2 tonnes.....	15.6%																					
Metals.....	38.4 tonnes.....	7.1%																					
E-waste.....	8.6 tonnes.....	1.6%																					
Plastics.....	15.3 tonnes	2.8%																					
Commingle.....	1.5 tonnes.....	0.2%																					

There are no mandatory performance measures for this group of activities.

¹⁷ Calibrated records maintained at Bonny Glen landfill.

¹⁸ Records maintained at waste transfer stations

Environmental and regulatory services

Level of Service		
Provide a legally compliant service		
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
Timeliness of processing the paperwork (building control, consent processes, licence applications) ¹⁹	<p>At least 92% of the processing of documentation for each of Council's regulatory and enforcement services is completed within the prescribed times</p> <p><i>This is an increased target from 2013/14 – 91%.</i></p>	<p>Achieved: 158 building consents were issued during the reporting period, all within the prescribed time.</p> <p>Category 1 -75, Category 2 38, Category 3 -7, Category 4 – 3, Category 5- 3, Category 6 – 4</p> <p>Since 9 March 2015, aligned to MBIE category system:</p> <p>Commercial 1 – 4; Residential 1` - 10; Residential 2 - 6.</p> <p>29 resource consents were issued, 94% within the prescribed time</p> <p>13 land-use consents, 13 subdivisions, 3 outline plans plus 11 Section 223 Certificates, 11 Section 224 Certificates and one Section 221 Certificate.</p>
Possession of relevant authorisations from central government ²⁰	<p>Accreditation as a building consent authority maintained</p> <p><i>This target is unchanged from 2013/14.</i></p>	<p>In progress: Accreditation confirmed from October 2014, but is subject to a technical review in February 2015. Clearance of the four Corrective Action Requests (CARs) from that review is expected by 30 April 2015.</p>
Level of Service		
Provide regulatory compliance officers		
Timeliness of response to RFS for enforcement call-outs (animal control and environmental health); within prescribed response and resolution times	<p>Improvement in timeliness reported in 2013/14.</p> <p><i>This sets an increased target from 2013/14.</i></p>	<p>Achieved: For Animal Control and Environmental Health there were 1,081 requests, of which 867 were responded to in time (i.e. 80%) and resolve in time. There are 17 current requests in the system that may well be responded to in time. The lowest timeliness was for wandering stock, caused by travelling distances.</p> <p>The full-year result for last year's responding to requests was 84%.</p> <p><i>Timeliness of completion has yet to be calculated.</i></p>

There are no mandatory performance measures for this group of activities.

¹⁹ This includes any prescribed monitoring, such as of resource consents

²⁰ Excluding general authorisation through legislation where no further formal accreditation is specified

Community well-being

Level of Service		
Provide opportunities to be actively involved in partnerships that provide community and ratepayer wins		
Measure	Target for 2014/15	Actual July 2014-March 2015
<p>Partners' view of how useful Council's initiatives and support has been (annual survey)²¹</p> <p>The focus for the survey is those community groups within the District with whom the Council has worked. So, this excludes shared services or other contractual arrangements with other councils. It also excludes direct collaboration with central government agencies although, where these are also involved with community organisations and groups within the Rangitikei, they are invited to participate in the annual survey.</p>	<p>A greater proportion (than in the previous year) of the sample believes that Council's service is getting better.</p> <p><i>This sets an increased target from 2013/14.</i></p>	<p>Achieved:</p> <p>This annual survey was carried out in March – the headline results are provided here.</p> <p>From the 96 (cf 86 in 2014 and 108 in 2014) responses to the survey, 17% (cf 16% in 2014 and 30% in 2013) thought Council's service was getting better, 45% (cf 37% in 2014 and 42% in 2013) thought it about the same, 3% (cf 8% in each of the last two years) and 35% (cf 43% in 2014 and 21% in 2013) did not know.</p> <p>Further analysis will be undertaken prior to reporting in the Annual Report.</p>

There are no mandatory performance measures for this group of activities.

²¹ Groups which are targeted for consultation:

- Participants in Path to Well-being Theme Groups
- Community group database
- Public sector agency database
- Business sector database

Attachment 4



REPORT

SUBJECT: **Review of Criteria for Funding Events through Council's Contestable Funding Scheme**

TO: Finance/Performance Committee

FROM: Denise Servante, Strategy and Community Planning Manager

DATE: 16 April 2015

FILE: 3-GF-8

1 Background

- 1.1 Through the 2015-25 Long Term Plan, Council is reviewing the support that it provides for events in the District. It has provisionally allocated \$25,000 for events as part of the extended economic development strategy.
- 1.2 In the past, events were eligible to be funded through the contestable Community Initiatives Fund and, generally, about \$15,000 per annum has been awarded to events through that scheme. In addition, Council part funds work programmes with key stakeholder agencies and these work programmes include the provision of specified high profile events in Bulls, Marton and Taihape and a number of other events that contribute to community life in these towns.
- 1.3 The Committee previously requested a review of the criteria, application form and marking sheets for the Community Initiatives Fund prior to the next funding round. At a Committee discussion on 26 February 2015, there was consensus that the criteria for the Community Initiatives Fund worked well for the Community service and support, Leisure promotion and Heritage and environment categories.
- 1.4 There was no consensus over the efficacy of the criteria for high profile and new events. There were varying views amongst Councillors about whether there should be a separate funding pot for events and about whether Council should fund high-profile events. Similarly, there were differing views whether new events should bid into the same contestable pot as high profile events.
- 1.5 However, given the current situation that about 50% of the funding available through a contestable process for events was the norm (and thus could be "top-sliced"), it was agreed that further consideration be given to funding recurring high profile events in the District which could/should be capable of developing to the point where Council support is no longer needed.

1.6 A report, Review of Criteria for the Community Initiatives Fund, was considered by the Committee on 26 March 2015. That report contained:

- examples of practice in neighbouring territorial authorities,
- issues to be considered when recurring funding for high profile events is sought, and
- examples of evaluating the economic impact of an event.

1.7 The Committee requested a further report to the Finance/Performance Committee's meeting in April 2015 with proposals for criteria to fund events (new and recurring) in line with the comments in the report "Review of Criteria for the Community Initiatives Fund"¹.

2 Rationale for ratepayer investment in events

2.1 During discussion on the development of a draft economic development strategy for the District, Councillors suggested a role for high profile events in attracting visitors to the District and providing the opportunity to promote/showcase the District as a great place to live. This rationale is echoed by other local territorial authorities.

2.2 Therefore, high profile events can be categorised as events which:

- provide a regional/national profile and attract a significant number of visitors to the District; and
- provide an opportunity to showcase the District.

2.3 In addition, Council also recognises that there are community events, such as the Christmas Parades, that are important to Rangitikei's community life and well-being but where there would not be a large influx of visitors from outside the District. There may also be an economic impact in that local people stay in their home towns and spend money locally.

2.4 Therefore, community events can be categorised as events which:

- are locally significant and/or of special interest to local people; and
- enhance community well-being.

2.5 There is a category of events that meet both the "high profile" and "community" criteria above. They tend to be free (for local people and visitors alike) and regular (annual) events². Examples include:

- Gumboot Day
- Marton Market Day
- Marton Harvest Party

¹ 15/FPE/010

² Council aims to support at least one such event in each of the main towns as part of the MOU arrangement with key stakeholder agencies.

- Hunterville Shemozzle
- Turakina Highland Games

- 2.6 The outcomes that Council is seeking can be measured either through attendance³ (for community events) or economic impact⁴ (for high profile events) and sometimes a mix of both (for high profile, community events).
- 2.7 It is suggested that the Committee considers using the contribution from events to these outcomes as one of the criteria for its decision-making around the use of ratepayer funds for events.
- 2.8 Council financial support will not always be in the form of a cash grant. It may also include waiving fees for use of facilities or fees charged for consents or licences. It may also include facilitating or providing ancillary services or facilities such as toilets and rubbish removal.

3 New versus recurring events

- 3.1 A further distinction within the events categories is to balance new and recurring events. There are some long-standing events which remain highlights on the District's calendar. However, Council would not want to be associated with events that have become stale or deliver diminishing returns. Equally, Council wants to encourage new events which inject new life and bring vibrancy to local communities. The criteria within the categories should aim to support Council to strike the right balance.
- 3.2 A new event needs to be able to demonstrate the *potential* to deliver good attendance or positive economic impact. A recurring event needs to demonstrate a *track record* in delivering good (or increasing) attendance and good (or increasing) economic impact.
- 3.3 So, a recurring community event, such as the Christmas Parades, would need to demonstrate community support through maintaining or growing attendance, whereas a recurring high profile event would (also) need to demonstrate good or increasing economic impact. In both instances, a long-term view is needed, since there are factors which can diminish support in a particular year – weather, other attractions (either within the District or in neighbouring areas) etc.
- 3.4 In addition, it is feasible to use the annual residents' survey to test community views on any event. Such surveys are normally conducted in February-March. In all cases, results from the annual residents' survey would provide a comparative perspective

³ Although usually this will only be an estimate since such events normally do not have an entry fee.

⁴ Measured through, for example, the Event Report supplied through Market View. The Event Report for Marton Market Day was circulated with the report, Review of Criteria for the Community Initiatives Fund, to the Committee on 26 March 2015. The limitations and context for the report were discussed at that meeting but Councillors felt that such reports had a place in evaluating the success of high profile events.

across the spectrum of events which Council has supported in the previous twelve months.

4 Potential to generate income and/or become self-supporting

- 4.1 All events organisers should be encouraged to investigate the opportunities for the event to raise or generate income. This can include for example, admission charges, stall fees, donations, fundraising activities and sponsorship. Council funding, when awarded, should be seen as sponsorship and appropriately acknowledged in publicity and branding.
- 4.2 For events to receive Council funding, Council needs to be satisfied that all avenues for generating income or fundraising have been pursued and that the event is not capable of self-funding.
- 4.3 Council may be prepared to fund recurring, non-self-funding community events that continue to be popular for residents (and possibly visitors) but it has questioned whether it should continue to fund recurring, non-self-funding high profile events and if not, at what point Council should withdraw further support. Part of the difficulty in formulating an approach is that high-profile events which gain increasing interest also typically incur higher costs – not just in the facilities needed but also through compliance matters. In addition, Council may wish to continue to be associated as a sponsor with successful events.
- 4.4 There are two key alternative approaches. The first is to put an absolute limit on how many years a high-profile event can receive Council funding (say 5 years). This ensures that Council and the event organisers will review the value of the event and its future potential.
- 4.5 The second would be to fund an event that was increasing its economic impact year on year and to cease funding once this has been maximised. Council would need to make this assessment, taking the long-term view as outlined in section 3.3. This is likely to be seen as a more confrontational approach, and thus potentially more controversial.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 Council financial support for events should be seen in terms of sponsorship. The application form is for sponsorship of an event. The requirements for acknowledging Council sponsorship should be outlined in the application form. Council's financial support will typically be a cash grant but may extend to waiver of fees or facilitation or provision of ancillary services.
- 5.2 Events will need to identify whether they are a high profile event or a community event. This could be done by asking how many people are likely to attend/participate

in the event, distinguishing between how many will be resident in Rangitikei and how many will be visitors⁵.

- 5.3 Events with less than 30% local attendees will be seen as high profile events, events with more than 70% local attendees will be seen as community events and those with between 30% and 70% local attendees will be seen as high profile, community events.
- 5.4 Post-event reporting/evaluation of the sponsorship needs to include attendance and financial records as well as questions⁶ such as:
- What are your 3 growth objectives for the next year?
 - Compared to your expectations, what other things may have influenced your event and the numbers attending?
 - Please list your cash sponsors' names below.
 - How are you building greater financial sustainability into your event?
 - If you feel your event has reached maximum capacity for growth in Rangitikei, please explain why below.
- 5.5 In addition, it is proposed that Council will undertake an Event Report through MarketView for all high profile and high profile, community events that it sponsors. The funding for this will not be included in the sponsorship amount but it will be a condition of sponsorship. Council will then be in a position to evaluate its annual sponsorship for high profile events⁷.
- 5.6 The same process for monitoring and reporting (Post-Event reporting/feedback and MarketView Event Reports) should also apply to high profile, community events organised through the MOU agencies. This enables Council to review these events in the same way as it would review high profile events that it sponsors outside of the MOU arrangement. In addition, using the annual residents' survey allows a comparative analysis of events which Council has funded during the previous twelve months.
- 5.7 Council would expect to reduce its sponsorship of high profile events that are growing to the point where the event has reached its maximum growth. It will need to make an assessment of the amount of sponsorship it will provide based upon (i) the participation numbers, (ii) income generating potential (iii) the MarketView Event Report (bearing in mind circumstances outlined in the Post-event reporting) and (iv) the annual residents' survey.

⁵ Questions would also address sources of other income and income generation etc.

⁶ This list of questions is used by Wanganui District Council in their event reporting

⁷ Wanganui District Council asks all event organisers to estimate the number of local, day and overnight visitors to each event and perform a simple calculation to assess economic impact. The MarketView Event Reports will come at a cost - if Council sponsors 10 high profile events each year, then the cost of this will be \$4,000 - but the information has high communicative value.

- 5.8 Council will also need to consider the extent to which it wishes to be associated with any successful high-profile event that continues to deliver good outcomes and that is popular with residents and ratepayers. This may mean sponsorship arrangements which extend beyond the period outlined above. The importance of flexibility within an evidence-based framework is paramount.

6 Next steps

- 6.1 Feedback is sought from the Committee on the conclusions and suggestions contained in section 5 of this report.
- 6.2 This will enable a draft Event Sponsorship Application Form and Post Event Report Form to be prepared for discussion at the Committee's meeting in May 2015.

7 Recommendations

- 7.1 That the report "Review of Criteria for Funding Events through Council's Contestable Funding Scheme" be received.
- 7.2 That a further report is brought to the Finance/Performance Committee's meeting in May 2015 with a draft Event Sponsorship Application Form prepared in line with the conclusions in the report "Review of Criteria for Funding Events through Council's Contestable Funding Scheme" [without amendment/as amended], viz:
- Council will consider developing sponsorship arrangements with any organisation seeking financial support for an event in the District;
 - Council will consider recurring sponsorship arrangements where an event has the potential to gain considerable community interest and/or achieve a high profile outside the District;
 - The normal maximum term of any sponsorship arrangement (reviewed annually) will be 5 years, at which time Council and the event organisers will jointly review the value of the event and its future potential (after which Council may develop a further sponsorship arrangement);
 - Events will be classified as community, community/high profile or high profile based on actual and/or estimated numbers and locations of participants/attendees;
 - Applicants will be required to outline their strategies for maximising interest in attending the event and for income generation strategies (including the potential for the event to be self-funding);
 - Successful applicants will be required to complete a Post-Event report form which includes financial and attendance data;
 - Council will commission an independent economic impact report for all high profile and high profile, community events
 - Evaluation of events will be incorporated into the annual residents' survey.

Denise Servante
Strategy and Community Planning Manager