

Chairs report, September 2020

Finance & Performance Committee

Welcome to the Finance and Performance Committee meeting for September 2020.

I would like to start off with a warm welcome to our new Group Manager of Finance & Business Support, Mr Dave Tombs. Dave comes to the Rangitikei District Council with a wealth of knowledge and experience within the local government sector. I know the district will be well served by Dave and we as a committee of Council look forward to his expertise and input into advice provided to us.

This coming year has a huge workload ahead with not just the annual requirements of financial reporting, audit, etc. but also LTP budgeting and determining the financial impacts of decisions made by Council around wish lists and final outcomes. This certainly puts a lot of pressure on staff and we, as a committee and our elected member roles should be thinking of those demands if we are requesting extra information or further work.

The draft financial statement provided in today's agenda shows the financial performance of Council over the past financial year. Whilst the overall figures show an operating deficit, these figures are still to be finalised and confirmed. I expect that our revaluation of assets and the depreciation that comes attached with that has had a significant impact on the final result.

Nigel Belsham

Finance & Performance Committee Chair

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Finance Performance
on 24 September 2020

Rangitīkei District Council

Statement of Service Performance

1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

The measures and targets are those presented in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. Mandatory performance measures – in roading and footpaths, water supply, sewerage and the treatment and disposal of sewage, and stormwater drainage – are denoted by an asterisk.

The full-year Statement of Service Performance will form part of the 2019/20 Annual Report, and is subject to scrutiny by the Council's auditors.

Considered at Finance/Performance Committee, 24 September 2020

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Finance Performance
on 24 September 2020

Performance Reporting

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

Achieved

Required actions have been completed and the intended level of service has been achieved

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

Partly achieved

Some outputs contributing to the intended level of service have been achieved (e.g. 3 workshops held of the 4 initially proposed)

Or the result for the year is between 60% and 75% of the intended level of service

Achieved/ongoing

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

In progress

No actual output has been achieved but pre-requisite processes have commenced

Not commenced

No actions to achieve the stated level of service have begun

Not achieved

None of the required actions have been undertaken

Or the result for the year is less than half of the intended level of service

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

Not yet available

Timing of the relevant data set occurs later in the year.

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 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
On-time completion of, or substantially undertaken annual plan actions	<p>92% of Annual Plan actions substantially undertaken or completed. All groups of activities to achieve at least 85% of identified actions.</p> <p><i>In 2018/19, 47% of actions identified in the Annual Plan were either substantially or fully completed.</i></p>	<p>Partly achieved</p> <p>68% of Annual Plan actions were substantially undertaken or completed by 30 June 2020. This includes progress made with projects spanning more than one year, such as the water strategies for Marton and Bulls and the new Bulls Community Centre</p> <p>A number of projects (especially in the 3 waters and Community & leisure assets) were delayed by the four-week alert level 4 lockdown. In addition, the subsequent alert level 3 also had an impact on work-sites because of the social distancing requirements.</p> <p>Overall, the extent of disruption to projects could be around 10-15%.</p>
Completion of capital programme	<p>85% of planned capital programme expended; all network utilities groups of activities to achieve at least 70% of planned capital expenditure.</p> <p>Note: This analysis <u>excludes</u> approved expenditure on emergency repairs to the roading network.</p> <p><i>In 2018/19, 42% of the planned capital programme was expended. Roding achieved 85%; water achieved 25%, sewerage and the treatment and disposal of sewage achieved 14% and stormwater assets achieved 13%.</i></p>	<p>Not achieved</p> <p>For the twelve months ending 30 June 2020, \$9.787 million was spent on the capital programme from a full-year budget of \$22.260 million.</p> <p>However, as noted in reviewing progress with annual plan actions, a number of projects span more than one year. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4.85 million was provided in 2019/20 for the construction of the Mangaweka Bridge but the necessary investigation has delayed this until 2020/21. \$4.6 million has been carried forward to 2020/21 for this. • \$2.76 million was provided for purchase of land for wastewater treatment from Bulls and Marton. \$2.7 million has been carried forward for that. • \$1.6 million was budgeted for Bulls Reservoir and Scotts Ferry stormwater works. Both projects were suspended subject to potential covid "shovel ready" stimulus funding from central government. This

		<p>funding did not materialise and so contracts have now commenced.</p> <p>Total Capital expenditure, plus those items carried forward that would have been expected to have been spent had it not been for the circumstances outlined above, equates to \$18,687,000, or 84% of budget</p> <p>This result is also affected by the disruption from the Covid-19 alert levels 3 and 4.</p>
--	--	---

Satisfaction (new)	<p>Increase in percentage of 'Very satisfied' and decrease in percentage of 'neutral' compared with the benchmark.</p> <p><i>2018/19 results:</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Very satisfied and satisfied</th> <th>Neutral</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Roading</td> <td>n.a</td> <td>n.a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water</td> <td>24%</td> <td>n.a.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wastewater</td> <td>26%</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parks/sports fields</td> <td>25%</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community buildings</td> <td>18.9%</td> <td>35.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Halls</td> <td>19%</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pools</td> <td>27%</td> <td>n.a.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Libraries</td> <td>34%</td> <td>n.a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Very satisfied and satisfied	Neutral	Roading	n.a	n.a	Water	24%	n.a.	Wastewater	26%	23%	Parks/sports fields	25%	14%	Community buildings	18.9%	35.5%	Halls	19%	36%	Pools	27%	n.a.	Libraries	34%	n.a	<p>Achieved</p> <p>The number of respondents to each of the activities is noted in the table below. Because of the different methodology for the 2019/20 survey, it is feasible to distinguish accurately between 'satisfied' and "very satisfied" whereas that was not possible for the 2018/19 survey results.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Very satisfied</th> <th>Satisfied</th> <th>Neutral</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Roading = 368</td> <td>2%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water = 370</td> <td>6%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wastewater = 369</td> <td>4%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parks/sports fields = 371</td> <td>1%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community buildings = 368</td> <td>1%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Halls</td> <td>n.a</td> <td>n.a</td> <td>n.a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pools = 228</td> <td>11%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Libraries = 253</td> <td>30%</td> <td>42%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Roading = 368	2%	39%	36%	Water = 370	6%	25%	9%	Wastewater = 369	4%	34%	18%	Parks/sports fields = 371	1%	30%	24%	Community buildings = 368	1%	30%	35%	Halls	n.a	n.a	n.a	Pools = 228	11%	36%	20%	Libraries = 253	30%	42%	15%
	Very satisfied and satisfied	Neutral																																																															
Roading	n.a	n.a																																																															
Water	24%	n.a.																																																															
Wastewater	26%	23%																																																															
Parks/sports fields	25%	14%																																																															
Community buildings	18.9%	35.5%																																																															
Halls	19%	36%																																																															
Pools	27%	n.a.																																																															
Libraries	34%	n.a																																																															
	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral																																																														
Roading = 368	2%	39%	36%																																																														
Water = 370	6%	25%	9%																																																														
Wastewater = 369	4%	34%	18%																																																														
Parks/sports fields = 371	1%	30%	24%																																																														
Community buildings = 368	1%	30%	35%																																																														
Halls	n.a	n.a	n.a																																																														
Pools = 228	11%	36%	20%																																																														
Libraries = 253	30%	42%	15%																																																														

Value for money – residents' perceptions in annual survey (new)	<p>Higher rating than previous year.</p> <p><i>2018/19 results:</i></p> <p>7.4% of respondents considered that Council 'definitely does deliver value for money', 42.4% considered it was 'at a satisfactory level', 27.2% were unsure or neutral 18.7% considered 'not really' and 4.3% stated 'definitely not'</p>	<p>Not achieved</p> <p>4% of respondents considered that Council 'definitely does deliver value for money', 18% considered it was 'at a satisfactory level', 33% were unsure or neutral 34% considered 'not really' and 12% stated 'definitely not'</p> <p>369 people responded to this question. This result is a considerable contrast to the overall satisfaction noted above. While the survey did not provide an opportunity for comment on this question, general comment shows a</p>
---	--	--

		concern about rates increases – during the period the survey was open (21 May to 13 July), there was considerable media discussion about having zero rates increases in 2020/21 as a response to the COVID-19 disruptions to livelihoods. Council considered that option but settled on 3.63% (instead of the 6.27% increase projected in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan).																								
Effectiveness of communication (new)	<p>Increase in percentage of ‘very satisfied’ and decrease in percentage of ‘neutral’ compared with previous year.</p> <p><i>2018/19 results:</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>Very satisfied</i></th> <th><i>Neutral</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Phone</i></td> <td>20%</td> <td>34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Council website</i></td> <td>15%</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Social media</i></td> <td>13%</td> <td>45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Library/ info centre</i></td> <td>23%</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Rangitikei Line</i></td> <td>12%</td> <td>49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Local newspapers</i></td> <td>17%</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>In person</i></td> <td>22%</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Phone</i>	20%	34%	<i>Council website</i>	15%	33%	<i>Social media</i>	13%	45%	<i>Library/ info centre</i>	23%	36%	<i>Rangitikei Line</i>	12%	49%	<i>Local newspapers</i>	17%	22%	<i>In person</i>	22%	30%	<p>Not commenced</p> <p>Not asked in the 2020 residents’ survey.</p>
	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Neutral</i>																								
<i>Phone</i>	20%	34%																								
<i>Council website</i>	15%	33%																								
<i>Social media</i>	13%	45%																								
<i>Library/ info centre</i>	23%	36%																								
<i>Rangitikei Line</i>	12%	49%																								
<i>Local newspapers</i>	17%	22%																								
<i>In person</i>	22%	30%																								
Māori responsiveness framework (new)	<p>Improved satisfaction from the previous year.</p> <p><i>2019/20 will be the first year of measuring satisfaction.</i></p>	<p>Not commenced</p> <p>While the responsiveness framework has been developed (and discussed with both Te Rōpu Ahi Kā and the Council) a survey was not undertaken during the year.</p>																								
Engagement with sector excellence programmes (new)	<p>Improved survey ratings.</p> <p>Percentage of suggested improvements completed under action.</p> <p><i>2019/20 will be the first year of measuring satisfaction.</i></p>	<p>Not commenced</p> <p>Council has asked to defer participation in the independent assessment CouncilMARK process until 2021. It is not participating in the <i>Australasian Local Government Performance Excellence Programme</i></p>																								

Roading and footpaths

Level of Service		
Provide a sustainable network which is maintained in accordance with each road's significance for local communications and the local economy, taking into account the One Roding Network Classification and funding subsidies.		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
<p><i>*Road condition</i></p> <p>The average quality of ride on a sealed local road network, measured by smooth travel exposure</p>	<p>97%</p> <p><i>96% achieved last year</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>94%</p> <p>This reduction reflects changes requested by the New Zealand Transport Agency.</p>
<p><i>*Road maintenance</i></p> <p>The percentage of the sealed road network that is resurfaced</p>	<p>8% (i.e. 55km of resealing and 8.8 km of road rehabilitation). The network was assessed in the Long Term Plan as being 796 km of sealed road.</p> <p><i>In 2018/19, 52.6 km of road resealing completed; this is 6.6% of the sealed network.</i></p> <p>Note: a review of the RAMM database during 2018/19 has shown that the total extent of the local road network is 1,243.0 km, of which 809.7 km is sealed and 433.3 km is unsealed.</p>	<p>Partly achieved</p> <p>6.2%. 46.85 km sealed, in addition, 2.86 km of pavement rehabilitation was completed. The reduction reflects budgetary constraints.</p>
<p>The percentage if the unsealed road network which is remetalled during the year</p>	<p>At least 75% of [the unsealed] network remetalled each year – 12,000m³.</p> <p><i>In 2018/19, 6.783m³ was placed on the network.</i></p> <p>Note: <i>The percentage figure is incorrect. It should have been stated as between 25% and 30%. In addition, a review of the results has shown that the figure reported previously over-stated the amount of metal placed on unsealed roads.</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>10,557m³ metal placed on the network</p> <p>This increase compared with last year reflects the dry summer: road metal dries out easily and tends to be lost to the side so more metal is needed.</p>
<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>At least 80% of footpath lengths in CBD areas in Bulls, Marton, Hunterville and Taihape are at grade 3 or higher</p> <p>At least 75% of sampled footpaths lengths outside CBD areas are at grade 3 or higher</p> <p>At least 90% of sampled footpaths assessed at grade 5 are included in upgrade programme during the following two years.</p> <p>Note:</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>100% of the areas within the CBD have achieved the required standard which means grade 3 or LOWER. A grade 4 & 5 are worse.</p> <p>95% of the areas outside of the CBD are grade 3 or lower. See above re the grading.</p> <p>The sections identified as a grade 5 are programmed to be addressed in 2020/21.</p>

	<p>A five point grading system to rate footpath condition based on visual inspections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Excellent 2 Good 3 Fair 4 Poor 5 Very Poor <p>Footpaths will be assessed in approximately 100-metre lengths. The sample of non-CBD footpaths will include ten lengths in each of Bulls, Marton and Taihape, and four lengths in Mangaweka, Hunterville and Rātana.</p> <p>The assessments will normally be conducted in November and May.</p> <p><i>In 2018/19 –</i></p> <p><i>93% of the sampled footpaths were grade 3 or better</i></p> <p><i>92% of the footpath length assessed as grade 5 are included in the upgrade programme over the next two years</i></p>	
<p>*Road safety</p> <p>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>	<p>No change or a reduction from the previous year.</p> <p><i>In 2018/19 there were –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 fatal crashes • 10 serious injury accidents: in one instance only was the road a contributing factor (because of loose material on the road, 	<p>Achieved</p> <p>There were 21 serious accidents in the Rangitikei District during the 2019/2020 year – 17 on the State Highway and 4 on the RDC network which were serious. There were no fatal crashes on the Council's network.</p>

Level of Service

Be responsive to community expectations over the roading network and requests for service

Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
<p>Adequacy of provision and maintenance of footpaths, street-lighting and local roads (annual survey).</p> <p>Report card" qualitative statements.</p> <p>Groups targeted for consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents where programmed renewal has taken place, • Community Boards/ Committees, • Community group database, • Business sector database. 	<p>A greater proportion (than in the benchmark) or more than 10% of the sample believe that Council's service is getting better</p> <p><i>In 2014/15 (the benchmark), 13% believed it was better than last year, 65% about the same, 21% worse than last year (2% didn't know).</i></p> <p><i>2018/19 results: 5.7% believed Council's service was better than last year, 61.3% about the same, 28.3% worse than last year (4,7% didn't know)</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>9% believed Council's service was better than last year, 59% about the same, 22% worse than last year (5% didn't know, 6% other)</p>

<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><i>Note: Council measures resolution as well as initial attendance in response to such requests.</i></p>	<p>(a) 95% callouts during working hours responded to within 6 hours and</p> <p>(b) 95% callouts during after-hours responded to within 12 hours.</p> <p>(c) 85% of all callouts resolved (i.e. completed) within one month of the request.¹</p> <p>(d) Specific reference to callouts relating to potholes</p> <p>In 2018/19 –</p> <p>(a) There were 410 footpath and road requests during working hours of which 340 (or 83%) were responded to within time</p> <p>(b) There were 91 footpath and road requests outside working hours, of which 75 (or 82%) were responded to within time.</p> <p>(c) Of the total 501 footpath and road requests, 373 (or 74%) were resolved within one month.</p> <p>(d) 35 requests concerned potholes: 100% of these were responded to in time and 95% were resolved within one month</p>	<p>Partly achieved</p> <p>(a) There were 352 footpath and road requests during working hours of which 214 (or 61%) were responded to within time</p> <p>(b) There were 102 footpath and road requests outside working hours, of which 86 (or 84%) were responded to within time.</p> <p>(c) Of the total 454 footpath and road requests, 300 were completed on time (66%)</p> <p>(d) 26 requests concerned potholes 22 responded to in time (or 85%)</p> <p>COVID-19 alert level 4 caused some delay in both responding to requests and resolving (completing) them, not only during the actual lockdown period but after that ended because of catching up with the backlog of requests.</p>
---	--	--

¹ There is a wide range of requests meaning resolution times will range from hours to several weeks or months, depending on urgency and work programming.

Water supply

Level of Service		
Provide a safe and compliant supply of drinking water		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019- June 2020
<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)²</p> <p>(b) part 5 of the drinking water standards (protozoa compliance criteria)³</p>	<p>No incidents of non-compliance</p> <p><i>2018/19 results: There were no incidents of E.coli.</i></p> <p>No incidents of non-compliance</p>	<p>Achieved No E.coli has been detected in any of the supplies.</p> <p>Not achieved Protozoa compliance achieved at Mangaweka, Hunterville Urban, Marton and Ratana.</p> <p>The Bulls water treatment plant did not achieve protozoa compliance in October 2019 due to a three minute spike in UV transmittance. Due to spikes in turbidity at the Taihape water treatment plant totalling 7 minutes protozoa compliance was not achieved. If the proposed log credit reductions are accepted, this non compliance will become compliant. Taihape and Bulls were compliant for all other months.</p>
Compliance with resource consents	<p>No incidents of non-compliance with resource consents</p> <p><i>In 2018/19 this was not achieved. Water abstraction consents were applied with at all locations (except Mangaweka and Ratana).</i></p>	<p>Partly achieved All plants were compliant except Ratana was non-compliant on 2 occasions.</p>

² Currently measured by weekly sampling and testing through Environmental Laboratory Services in Gracefield.

³ Measured through Water Outlook.

Level of Service		
Provide reliable and efficient urban water supplies		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Number of unplanned water supply disruptions affecting multiple properties	Fewer unplanned water supply disruptions affecting multiple properties than the previous year. <i>In 2018/19 there were no unplanned water supply interruptions.</i>	Achieved There were no unplanned water interruptions during the reporting period.

<p><i>*Maintenance of the reticulation network</i></p> <p>The percentage of real water loss from the Council's networked reticulation system⁴</p>	Less than 40%.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Average is 32.2%</p> <p>The guidance for this measure anticipates a sampling approach. Water Outlook enables SCADA^[2] information to be interrogated in-house.</p> <p>Last year's figures are included in brackets</p> <p>Bulls.....21.5%(35.4%)</p> <p>Huntermville Urban.....54.7%(16.1%)</p> <p>Mangaweka.....36.3%(29.0%)</p> <p>Marton..... 26.8%(35.0%)</p> <p>Rātana..... 10.1%(33.3%)</p> <p>Taihape..... 43.7%(38.3%)</p> <p>All supplies were within the target of 40%.</p> <p>Variances between schemes could be expected because each scheme is different. The reticulation within each town is of varying ages, and of varying pipe materials. Most of these towns were managed by separate local authorities in the past, and so there are legacy issues around such things as installation methods and materials.</p> <p>In addition to this, ground conditions can vary. In the case of asbestos cement pipes in particular, soil pH is a strong determinant of expected useful life. Varying water quality can also be an issue, as aggressive water can cause certain pipe materials to fail sooner. Land form is also an issue, most prominently in Taihape, where slips can generate partial failures which contribute to leakage.</p> <p>Taihape has had a large leak located and repaired during the trunk main upgrade.</p> <p>Leakage was also identified in Mangaweka during the financial year.</p>
--	----------------	--

⁴ A description of the methodology used to calculate this must be included as part of the annual report document.

^[2] Supervisory control and data acquisition – i.e. automated remote monitoring.

		The high value for Hunterville is caused by the ground water well driller using unmetered town water supply																								
<p>*Demand management</p> <p>The average consumption of drinking water per day per resident within the District</p> <p>Note: This includes all water released from the urban treatment plants, <u>irrespective of whether it is used for residential, agricultural, commercial or industrial purposes.</u></p>	<p>600 litres per person per day</p> <p><i>In 2018/19, the average daily consumption of drinking water per day per resident was 357L.</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Using the method specified by the Department of Internal Affairs, consumption across urban schemes averaged 539 Litres /person / day. This is higher than last year but lower than 2017/18.</p> <p>The guidance for this measure anticipates a sampling approach. Water Outlook enables SCADA information to be interrogated in-house</p> <p>Note that this includes all agricultural and commercial users connected to the Council's urban schemes. Because these such extraordinary users are metered, it is feasible to estimate the consumption of other users (i.e. domestic users). This is detailed in the table below. As all of Hunterville urban is metered (both residential and non-residential), this has been used to calculate the average consumption, although this will be distorted by a few commercial users in the town. Higher consumption at Taihape is the result of an identified leakage issue and high commercial use.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Supply</th> <th>Population</th> <th>Consumption Litres/person/per day</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bulls</td> <td>1,935</td> <td>548</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hunterville Urban</td> <td>420</td> <td>593</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mangaweka</td> <td>180</td> <td>489</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marton</td> <td>5,270</td> <td>462</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rātana</td> <td>345</td> <td>512</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Taihape</td> <td>1,720</td> <td>628</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All urban</td> <td>9,870</td> <td>539</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*except Hunterville</p>	Supply	Population	Consumption Litres/person/per day	Bulls	1,935	548	Hunterville Urban	420	593	Mangaweka	180	489	Marton	5,270	462	Rātana	345	512	Taihape	1,720	628	All urban	9,870	539
Supply	Population	Consumption Litres/person/per day																								
Bulls	1,935	548																								
Hunterville Urban	420	593																								
Mangaweka	180	489																								
Marton	5,270	462																								
Rātana	345	512																								
Taihape	1,720	628																								
All urban	9,870	539																								

Level of Service		
Be responsive to reported faults and complaints		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
<p>*Fault response time</p> <p>Where the Council attends a call-out in response to a fault or unplanned interruption to its networked reticulation system, the following <i>median times</i> are measured</p>	<p>Improved timeliness compared with the previous year.</p> <p><i>2018/19:</i></p> <p>(a) 15 minutes (b) 48 minutes (c) 10 minutes (d) 10 minutes (when recalculated as median times)</p>	<p>Not achieved</p> <p>The median times for the reporting period are:</p> <p>(a) 26 minutes (b) 1 hour 25 minutes (c) 50 minutes (d) 1 hour 52 minutes</p>

<p>(a) attendance time: from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel reach the site, and</p> <p>(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>(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</p> <p>(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>	<p>Request for service system specified standard:</p> <p>(a) 0.5 hour (attendance – urgent)</p> <p>(b) 24 hours (resolution – urgent)</p> <p>(c) 24 hours (attendance –non-urgent)</p> <p>(d) 96 hours (resolution – non-urgent)</p>	<p>The comparison with last year is distorted by the large number of callout requests in Marton for dirty water – these were assigned an arbitrary 10 minutes for attendance and resolution (non-urgent).</p> <p>A comparison with 2017/18 would have shown a result of ‘partly achieved’ two results in 2019/20 being better and two worse than in 2017/18.</p>
---	--	--

<p><i>*Customer satisfaction</i></p> <p>The total number of complaints (expressed per 1000 connections to the reticulated networks) received by the Council about</p> <p>(a) drinking water clarity</p> <p>(b) drinking water taste</p> <p>(c) drinking water pressure or flow</p> <p>(d) continuity of supply, and</p> <p>(e) The Council’s response to any of these issues</p> <p>There are 4,268 connections</p>	<p>Total number of complaints is less than the previous year or no more than 13 complaints per 1,000 connections</p> <p><i>In 2018/19 total complaints were 58.21 per 1,000 connections.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, there were 63 complaints about water leaks throughout the network, 55 about water leaks at the meter or toby, 47 requests to replace a toby or meter, and 16 requests to locate a meter, toby or other utility.</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>10.9 complaints per 1000 connections</p> <p>(a) 1.17/1000</p> <p>(b) 3.7/1000</p> <p>(c) 2.3/1000</p> <p>(d) 3.7/1000</p> <p>(e) nil⁵</p> <p>This improved result reflects the lack of complaints about dirty water in Marton which was a major cause of complaints in 2018/19.</p>
---	---	--

⁵ This is intended to refer to complaints about Council’s response or resolution of any of the four issues specified. They are not distinguishable within the Council’s request for service system but are included in (a) to (d).

Level of Service		
Maintain compliant, reliable and efficient rural water supplies		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Compliance with resource consents	<p>No incidents of non-compliance with resource consents.</p> <p><i>In 2018/19, there were no incidents of non-compliance. Omatane, typically under consented volume was over the limit on 3 July 2018 due to a break in the water main</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Operations at Erewhon, Omatane and Hunterville all complied with conditions of consent</p>
<p>Fault response time Where the Council attends a call-out in response to a fault or unplanned interruption to its networked reticulation system, the following median times are measured</p> <p>(a) attendance for urgent call-outs: from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel reach the site, and</p> <p>(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</p>	<p>Fewer requests (per 1000 connections) than previous year</p> <p>(when recalculated as median times)</p> <p>2018/19 results: (a) 1 hour 1 minute (b) 4 hours 45 minutes</p> <p>Specified standard: (a) 24 hours (b) 96 hours</p> <p>2018/19 results: (a) 15 minutes (b) 48 minutes</p>	<p>Partly achieved</p> <p>Information from Hunterville scheme only as this is the only scheme where servicing is directly managed by Council.</p> <p>(a) 1 hour 24 minutes (b) 4 hours 10 minutes</p>

Level of Service		
Ensure fire-fighting capacity in urban areas		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Random flow checks at the different supplies	99% of checked fire hydrant installations are in compliance	<p>Achieved</p> <p>No issues recorded in the request for service system.</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 existing urban areas.		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
<p><i>*Discharge compliance</i></p> <p>Compliance with the Council's resource consents for discharge from its sewerage system measured by the number of</p> <p>(a) abatement notices</p> <p>(b) infringement notices</p> <p>(c) enforcement orders, and</p> <p>(d) convictions</p> <p>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><i>In 2018/19, no infringement or abatement notices were received. No enforcement orders and no convictions were received.</i></p>	<p>Not achieved</p> <p>Horizons Regional Council made a successful prosecution for wastewater discharge into the Hautapu River, Taihape. A fine of \$60,000 was imposed.</p> <p>Council has programmed the upgrade of the Taihape Pump Station infrastructure in the 2020/21 financial year, which will provide a higher level of service and significantly reduce any environmental risk. The work will be done in conjunction with an upgrade of the Wastewater Treatment Plant for Taihape</p> <p>No other abatement or infringement notices, no enforcement orders and no convictions were received during the year</p>
<p>Routine compliance monitoring of discharge consents</p>	<p>6 out of 7 systems comply</p> <p><i>In 2018/19 only 2/7 plants complied.</i></p>	<p>Partly achieved</p> <p>The excessive volume of the discharge, is typically caused by stormwater infiltration during heavy rainfall which reduces its environmental impact. Ongoing consultation with Horizons continues to occur.</p> <p>Horizons has yet to undertake and report its annual assessments.</p>
<p><i>*System and adequacy</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Fewer overflows than 0.4/100</p> <p><i>2018/19 results: 1.49/1000</i></p> <p>There are 4,226 sewerage connections in the District.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>There were no reported dry weather overflows in the twelve months ending 30 June 2020.</p> <p>0.0/1000</p>

Level of Service

Be responsive to reported faults and complaints.

Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
<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</p> <p>(a) attendance time: from the time that the Council receives notification to the time that service personnel reach the site, and</p> <p>(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>Improved timeliness compared with the previous year.</p> <p>Specified standard: Attendance: (a) 0.5 hour urgent (b) 24 hours non-urgent</p> <p>Resolution: (a) 24 hours urgent (b) 96 hours non-urgent</p> <p><i>2018/19 results (a) 37 minutes (b) 6 hours 54 minutes</i></p> <p><i>Urgent callouts are where sewage is evident</i> Note: this mandatory measure does not distinguish between urgent and non-urgent callouts.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>(a) 23 minutes (b) 3 hours 30 minutes</p>
<p><i>*Customer satisfaction</i> The total number of complaints received by the Council about any of the following:</p> <p>(a) sewage odour (b) sewerage system faults (c) sewerage system blockages, and (d) the Council's response to issues with its sewerage systems⁶</p> <p>Expressed per 1,000 connections to the Council's sewerage system. There are 4,226 sewerage connections in the District.</p>	<p>Fewer requests (per 1000 connections) than previous year or no more than 5 requests per 1000 connections.</p> <p><i>2018/19 results: 5.73/1000</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>The request for service system may not show all complaints for any one incident, so there is potential under-reporting. With that qualification, the results are:</p> <p>(a) 0.24/1000 (b) 0.24/1000 (c) 2.8/1000 (d) 0.47/1000</p> <p>i.e. a total of 3.75/1000.</p>

⁶ These are matters relating to the Council's wastewater systems recorded in the request for service system *other than* in (a), (b) or (c) such as complaints about wastewater overflows.

Stormwater drainage

Level of Service		
Provide a reliable collection and disposal system to each property during normal rainfall		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
<p><i>*System adequacy</i></p> <p>(a) The number of flooding events⁷ that occurred in the District</p> <p>(b) For each flooding event, the number of habitable floors affected (expressed per 1,000 properties connected to the Council's stormwater system)</p>	<p>Fewer requests (per 1000 properties) than previous year.</p> <p><i>2018/19 results: No flooding events</i></p> <p>There are 4,122 properties in the District that pay the stormwater rate.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>No reports of any flooding affecting properties.</p>
<p><i>*Discharge compliance</i></p> <p>Compliance with the Council's resource consents for discharge from its stormwater system measured by the number of</p> <p>(a) abatement notices</p> <p>(b) infringement notices</p> <p>(c) enforcement orders, and</p> <p>(d) convictions</p> <p>received by the Council in relation to those resource consents</p>	<p>Not yet applicable.</p> <p><i>Council currently has no resource consents for stormwater.</i></p>	<p>Not applicable</p> <p>The Council has not been required to have resource consents for any of its stormwater discharges.</p>

Level of Service		
Be responsive to reported faults and complaints		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
<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>Timeliness noting the severity of the incident(s)</p> <p><i>2018/19 results: there were no flooding events that met the conditions of this measure</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>There were no flooding events for the 12 month 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</p>	<p>Fewer requests (per 1000 connections) than previous year or no more than in 2016/17. The 2016/17 results were 4.12/1000.</p> <p><i>2018/19 results: 3.6/1000</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>There was one call-out during this period, which was resolved in time.</p> <p>0.24/1000</p>

⁷ 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

Council's stormwater system. 4,122 connections		
---	--	--

Community and Leisure Assets

Level of Service		
Provide a fit for purpose range of community and leisure assets		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Progressive improvement based on the Annual Resident Survey. ⁸	<p>(a)Libraries - more than 10% of the sample believes that Council's service is 'better than last year'.</p> <p>(b)Public swimming pools – a greater proportion (than the benchmark) or more than 10% of the sample believe that Councils service is getting better.</p> <p>(c)Sports fields and parks - a greater proportion (than the benchmark) or more than 10% of the sample believe that Councils service is getting better.</p> <p>(d)Public toilets - a greater proportion (than the benchmark) or more than 10% of the sample believe that Councils service is getting better.</p> <p>(e)Community buildings - a greater proportion (than the benchmark) or more than 10% of the sample believe that Councils service is getting better.</p> <p>(f)#Camping grounds - a greater proportion (than the benchmark) or more than 10% of the sample believe that Councils service is getting better.</p>	<p>Partly achieved</p> <p>(a) Libraries 15% better than last year (35.68% in 2018/19)</p> <p>(b) Pools 17% Pools better than last year (31% in 2018/19)</p> <p>(c) Sports fields and parks 5% better than last year (19.05% in 2018/19)</p> <p>(d) Public toilets 19% better than last year (9.4% in 2018/19)</p> <p>(e) Community buildings 4% better than last year (18.87% in 2018/19)</p> <p>(f) Campgrounds 2% better than last year (7.3% in 2018/19)</p> <p>All activities within this group show improvement compared with last year. Noteworthy is the continuing high performance of libraries and pools and also the assessment of public toilets, which will be attributable to a higher standard of work encouraged by the team supervisor.</p>

⁸ It is intended to take the sample from the electoral roll for residents. During the previous three years the sample was taken from Council's ratepayer database.

Level of Service		
#compliance with relevant standards		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Swim Centres All swimming pools have PoolSafe accreditation	Benchmark maintained. <i>All swim centres to have Poolsafe accreditation.</i>	Achieved Formal notification of PoolSafe Accreditation was received on 6 March 2020.
Community housing Council records compliance with the 59 criteria in the rental warrant of fitness programme	Maintaining or improving compliance. <i>Compliance – 95%</i>	Partly achieved 62 of the 72 units achieved 95% or more compliance. A further eight units achieved 94% (not achieving 95% due to low scoring in the 'General' condition. These flats were all at Cuba Street, Marton). The remaining two units scored 81% and 89% primarily due to tenants not using ventilation, causing surface mould.
Occupancy of community housing	95%-100% occupant of whom 70% are superannuitants. <i>30 June 2019, occupancy was 97% (two units being refurbished) of whom 74% were superannuitants</i>	Achieved 97.2% occupancy of which 75% were superannuitants
Toilet buildings are well designed, safe and visible – Compliance with SNZ4241:1999 and CPTED ⁹ (safer design guidelines) for new or refurbished toilets	Meeting the benchmark. <i>Compliance is 95% or greater</i>	In progress Code Compliance Certificates achieved for all new toilet buildings (accessible standards). All locations comply with the CPTED focus areas – physical security, surveillance, movement control, management and maintenance, and defensible space Provision for accessible car parking in Mangaweka is still being addressed by roading team.
Levels of service for parks throughout the District consistent with the New Zealand Recreation Association parks Categories and Levels of	Increased % compliance with Levels of Service Guideline for all parks with previous year.	In progress Checklists and inspection sheets developed and in use. .

⁹ Crime prevention through environmental design

Service guideline		
-------------------	--	--

Secure high use of staffed facilities		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Number of users of libraries and nature of use	<p>An increase in use compared with the benchmark</p> <p><i>In 2018/19:</i> <i>Bulls: 13,406 (1 day unrecorded)</i> <i>Marton: 45,665 (17 days unrecorded)</i> <i>Taihape: 35,622 (61 days unrecorded)</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Bulls: 12,458 (84 days unrecorded) Marton: 35,398 (36 days unrecorded) Taihape: 35,680 (54 days unrecorded)</p> <p>Note: The libraries were closed for six weeks due to COVID-19 but use outside that period increased.</p>
Number of users of pools	<p>An increase in use compared with the previous year:</p> <p><i>2018/19 season totals</i> <i>Marton.....21,749</i> <i>Taihape.....10,403</i></p>	<p>Achieved (pro rata)</p> <p>Marton 19,997 (pro rata 21,856) Taihape 9,649 (pro rata 10,656)</p> <p>Note: Swim Centres closed 33 days early due to COVID-19: this is the reason for the reduced attendance.</p>

Rubbish and recycling

Level of Service		
Make recycling facilities available at waste transfer stations for glass, paper, metal, plastics, textiles and greenwaste. Special occasions for electronics (e-waste). Council intends to continue the operation (under contract) of existing urban waste transfer stations – Ratana, Bulls, Marton, Hunterville, Mangaweka and Taihape.		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Waste to landfill (tonnage) ¹⁰	Less tonnage to landfill than previous year <i>In 2018/19, 4,720 tonnes went to the landfill.</i>	Partly achieved 4,878 tonnes went to the landfill Waste collection contractors were able to access the waste transfer stations during the Covid-19 lockdown period, but public access was not permitted (other than bag drop outside) including access to the recycling area. This meant some recycling ended up going to landfill.
Waste diverted from landfill (tonnage and (percentage of total waste) ¹¹	Percentage of waste diverted from landfill 22%. <i>In 2018/19, a total of 1,419.5 tonnes (or 23.1%) of waste was diverted.</i>	Achieved? These are nine month figures 1,090 tonnes of waste diverted i.e. 23.1% diversion Greenwaste..... 512.9 tonnes Glass..... 248.3 Metals..... 162.3 Paper..... 118.7 Plastics.....45.1 Tyres..... 0 e-waste..... 1.6 Haz waste..... 1.8

¹⁰ Calibrated records maintained at Bonny Glen landfill.

¹¹ Records maintained at waste transfer stations

Environmental and regulatory services

Level of Service		
Provide a legally compliant service		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Timeliness of processing building consents and resource consents	<p>Building consents – 98%</p> <p>Recourse consents – 98%</p> <p><i>In 2018/19, 79% of building consents and 75% of resource consents were issued within the prescribed time</i></p> <p><i>There were 378 building consents and 63 resource consents.</i></p>	<p>Partly achieved</p> <p>85% of building consents and 71% of resource consents were issued within the prescribed times. Last year's results (respectively) were 79% and 75%.</p> <p>COVID-19 was a disrupter. No building consents were processed during the alert level 4 period, resulting in 43 consents waiting to be processed when the building team came back into the office at level 3. For resource consents, processing continue so long as all agency reports and information had been supplied and received. Where this was not the case, the consent went on 'hold' for the reports to be provided: the working days continued to be counted.</p> <p>There have been 301 building consents and 89 resource consents (28 land use, 12 permitted boundary and 45 subdivisions. Last year there were 373 building consents and 63 resource consents.</p> <p>4 Certificate of Compliance) processed 282 Code Compliance Certificates were issued, 96% on time No abatement or infringement was issued, but there were 8 Notices to Fix.</p> <p>100 inspections of potentially earthquake-prone buildings were done</p>
Possession of relevant authorisations from central government ¹²	<p>Accreditation as a building consent authority maintained</p> <p>Functions of a registration authority and role of a recognised agency under the Food Act not subject to Ministerial Review.¹³</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Council's accreditation was confirmed for two years from February 2019.</p> <p>Functions undertaken by Whanganui District Council on behalf of Rangitikei District Council.</p>

¹² Excluding general authorisation through legislation where no further formal accreditation is specified

¹³ Food Act 2014, s. 185. This added since the measure is an annual review of relevant documents.

Level of Service

Provide regulatory compliance officers

Timeliness of response to requests for service for enforcement call-outs - animal control and environmental health

% timeliness of response – this will be the benchmark for subsequent years.

Responded in time: 92%

Completed in time: 83%

In 2018/19, 89% were responded to in time and 80% were completed in time.

For animal control, priority 1 (urgent) callouts (dog attack, threatening dog or stock on road) require response within 30 minutes and resolution within 24 hours; priority 2 (i.e. non-urgent) callouts require response within 24 hours and resolution within 96 hours.

For environmental health, there are varying times – for noise complaints, a response is required within one hour, for food issues, it is within 24 hours.

Achieved

83.8% of callouts responded to in time; 74.4% were resolved in time.

There are two activities which contribute to this measure. Animal control (which has exceeded both targets) is managed directly by Council; environmental health (primarily noise control) is contracted out. There is a lag in reporting times for the latter for weekend work, which is the major explanation for the different results.

There were 357 urgent call-outs for animal control of which 344 were responded to in time (96.4%)

There were 581 non-urgent call-outs for animal control of which 542 were responded to in time (93.2%)

There were 286 urgent call-outs for environmental health of which 140 were responded to in time (49.0%)

There were 3 non-urgent call-outs for environmental health of which 3 were responded to in time (100%)

Of the 938 callouts for animal control, 770 were resolved in time (82.0%)

Of the 249 callouts for environmental health, 143 were resolved in time (49.5%)

Community well-being

Level of Service		
Provide opportunities to be actively involved in partnerships that provide community and ratepayer wins		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
<p>Partners' view of how useful Council's initiatives and support has been (annual survey)¹⁴</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 benchmark) or more than 10% of the sample believes that Councils service is getting better.</p> <p>Increased % satisfaction compared with previous year.</p> <p><i>In 2018/19, 40% thought Council's service is getting better, 60% thought it about the same, no one thought it was worse or did not know how to rate this</i></p>	<p>Not commenced</p> <p>A survey was not undertaken this year</p>

Level of Service		
Identify and promote opportunities for economic growth in the District		
Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Rangitikei Districts GDP growth compared to the average of similar district economies. (Ruapehu, Tararua, Manawatu and Otorohanga)	<p>Greater than 1% against last financial year compared to the mean of similar district economies.</p> <p><i>2018/19 results: 1.145% growth for similar districts vs 1.6% in Rangitikei</i></p> <p><i>2019/2020 Results: 2.55% growth for similar districts vs 3.3% in Rangitikei</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>The 'similar district' mean growth was 2.55%, GDP growth in Rangitikei was 3.3%</p> <p>Nationally, there was 1.7% growth in GDP</p>
Rangitikei District's earnings data growth compared to the average of similar districts (Ruapehu, Tararua, Manawatu and Otorohanga)	<p>Greater than or equal to 1% range from the last financial year compared to the mean of similar district economies.</p> <p><i>2016/17 results: Rangitikei- 3.38% vs mean of 4.02% for similar districts</i></p> <p><i>2018/2019 results Rangitikei - 4.7% vs mean of 3.75% for similar districts</i></p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Rangitikei's earnings data growth was 4.7% compared with the 3.75% mean for similar districts.</p>
The number of visits and unique visits to rangitikei.com	An increase in the number of visits and unique visits to rangitikei.com compared to the benchmark.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>The benchmark is inflated because of work undertaken by Council staff when</p>

¹⁴ Groups which are targeted for consultation:

- Participants in Path to Well-being Theme Groups
- Public sector agency database
- Participants in other partnership programmes that involve Council

	<p><i>Benchmark 2016/17 results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visits to Rangitikei.com - 83,831 • Unique visits to Rangitikei.com - 25,401 <p><i>2018/19 results: visits – 104,666; unique visits – 68,033</i></p>	<p>assuming management of the site:</p> <p>For the period of this report Visits: 82,631 Unique visits: 46,873</p>
<p>A greater proportion of young people living in the district are attending local schools.</p>	<p>An increase in the number of enrolments compared with the benchmark.</p> <p><i>Benchmark 2016/17 results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Enrolments – Years 9 – 13 = 653 • Total number of High School Youth = 1054 <p><i>2018/19 results: year 9-13 = 606</i> <i>2019/2020 results: year 9-13 – 581</i></p> <p><i>Information obtained from www.educationcounts.govt.nz</i></p>	<p>Not achieved</p> <p>2019/20 result for year 9-13 is 581 students, i.e. 96% of the numbers last year.</p> <p>This is taken from the Ministry of Education’s enrolment data for 1 July 2019.</p> <p>While a measure of considerable importance to Council (because local schools are a strong local community focus), Council’s ability to influence where local students are enrolled is limited to its general promotion of the District and the facilities (including quality schools) it offers. There is no specific measure of the impact on this on decisions taken by caregivers for schooling.</p>

Level of Service

Provide a safe and relevant community space, acting as a gateway for skills and social development, improving educational, training or employment access, and improving access for youth related social services

Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Partners view of how useful Councils activity in youth space facilitation and advocacy has been	Very satisfied – 70%	<p>Not commenced</p> <p>Youth spaces have been developed in both Marton and Taihape, and use monitored. However, a survey of partners’ view on the youth spaces was not undertaken this year.</p> <p>Rangitikei Youth Council (a Committee of Council), meets monthly during the school year but partners’ views on its advocacy role (or that undertaken by Council on youth matters) has not been undertaken.</p>

Level of Service

Ensure competency in discharging Civil Defense responsibilities

Measure	Target for 2019/20	Actual July 2019 – June 2020
Timing of self-assessment when the emergency Operations Centre is activated and of continued civil defense training	(a)Self-assessment undertaken and responded to within four months of Emergency Operations Centre Activation.	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Introductory sessions held for all staff, with request to undertake online</p>

exercises.	At least one exercise undertaken each year involving at least half of Council staff.	assessment. Some staff were able to use these skills during the welfare response to COVID-19.
------------	--	--