

Symbols used to identify each measure contributing to community outcomes

PS Public Safety EM Environment SC Services that support Communities

Council Initiative		Measure		EM SC
Day to day service provision		Percentage of request for service responded to in set time and to the appropriate standard		
Result 2009/10: 100%	Target 2010/11: 90%	Result 2010/11: 99.33%	Achieved - Comments: Result achieved through the monitoring of the RFS response times, keeping the customer informed, undertaking works in an appropriate manner and to an acceptable standard within budget allocations.	
In 2009/10 Council advised: Continue to respond to RFS's in set time and to the appropriate standards while meeting the public's expectations to the required levels of service and within the current budget allocations. Target for 2010/11 remains at above 90%. Challenges going forward: Continuing to respond to RFS's within the set timeframes and to the appropriate standards while meeting the public's expectations to the required levels of service and within the current budget allocations. Target for 2011/12 remains at above 90%.			Challenges going forward: Developing new renewal programs based on the condition assessment reports undertaken in 2010/11.	

Council Initiative		Measure		PS EM
Stormwater improvements		Percentage of respondents indicating they are very/fairly satisfied as measured by the Communitrak Survey ¹ (Measure above was segregated under the sub-categories for stormwater as shown in the result column for 2009/10)		
Result 2009/10: River Drainage-66% Roadside Drainage-65% Rural stormwater drainage-67% Urban Stormwater collection-64%	Target 2010/11: 53%	Result 2010/11: 46%	Not Achieved - Comments: Due to the generic type question asked within the survey this year the public were unable to distinguish the area of responsibility for certain types of situations. For example - in the situation where a cesspit or a road culvert blocks and causes flooding it is automatically assumed by the public as being a stormwater issue to address where in fact it is actually a roading issue to address utilising roading funds to rectify. This same principle applies to the other areas noted above when flooding occurs. Therefore from the survey results it is impossible to determine what the specific flooding issues relate to and who is responsible to address the situation.	
In 2009/10 Council advised: Continue to fulfil the public's expectations to the required levels of service and within the current budget allocations.			Challenges going forward: Maintain stormwater maintenance and improvements within the current budget allocations.	

¹ There are several areas where flooding type situations occur and different parties have jurisdictional responsibility for investigating and addressing those specific issues:

- Rivers and Land Drainage issues are the responsibility of the Northland Regional Council to address.
- Rooding Drainage is the responsibility of the FNDC to administer. This utilises roading budgets and is eligible for a NZTA subsidy. Within urban areas this basically consists of open drains within the road corridor, kerb and channel and cesspits and the lead to the first manhole. In rural areas it consists of all drainage structures within the road corridor.
- Stormwater drainage is the responsibility of the FNDC to administer within defined urban areas. This consists of the network from the first manhole onwards and includes the main pipelines within the road corridor and private property, open drains within private properties etc. This does not include any rural drainage and any required works are funded from a stormwater budgets.
- Land Drainage Districts are the responsibility of the FNDC and are defined catchments within the Northern area. Those properties within those catchments pay specific drainage rates that funds drainage related issues within those areas.
- State Highway drainage issues are the responsibility of NZTA to address.

