

# BEST VALUE QUALITY AND COST STANDARDS REPORT TARGET AND ACTUAL PERFORMANCE 2009-2010



## Achievements Summary

Service Group	Number of Quality and Cost Standards				Total
	Exceeded	Achieved	Not Achieved	Not Applicable for 2009/2010	
Transport Services (Pg2)	10	3	5	4	22
Family and Children's Services (Pg 5)	2	4	2	1	9
Economic Prosperity (Pg 7)	3	4	1	2	10
Aged & Disability (Pg 9)	7	7	1	1	16
Community Wellbeing (Pg 11)	8	6	6	1	21
Waste Management (Pg15)	5	10	1	2	18
Community Amenity (Pg 17)	9	4	2	5	20
Recreation, Culture & Leisure Services (Pg 21)	12	9	22	2	45
Organisational Support (Pg 26)	20	26	6	8	60
Leadership & Governance (Pg 34)	4	4	3	1	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>233</b>
<b>Achieved in 2009/10</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Exceeded:** The actual quality and/or cost standard surpassed the target  
**Achieved:** The actual quality and/or cost standard was met  
**Not Achieved:** The actual quality and/or cost standard was below the target  
**Not Applicable:** The target is unable to be calculated as the measurement no longer exists.

## Transport Services

(Report adopted by council December 2002)

*Programs included within this service group*

Footpaths and Bicycle Paths  
Sealed Roads (includes program Roads to Recovery)  
Unsealed Roads  
Road Furniture, Line Marking and Car parks  
Aerodromes

Footpaths	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Grinding meters/year.	1,430 <sup>(1)</sup>	900	✓
Replacement square meters/year.	1,320	1,200	✓
Average response time to address service requests (weeks).	4	4	✓
Average Community Satisfaction Rating on footpaths. (July 2009)	N/a <sup>(2)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
Number of Service Requests received that address issues on footpaths.	66 <sup>(3)</sup>	40	✓
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Average maintenance expenditure per square metre of footpath.	\$1.63	\$1.70	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The program hired a mini loader and grinder attachment for a period of 1 month. This increased the amount of footpath grinds the program could complete in one day.
- (2) Actual figures are sourced from the results of the Community satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of survey questions varied from previous years therefore statistics do not reflect the current standard. While no percentage rating was assigned, it was revealed that footpaths rated as an area of importance as well as an area for improvement amongst the community.
- (3) There was an increased level of footpath maintenance carried out over 2009/10 financial year, to ensure Council met its Road Management Plan standards.

Roads	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Number of Complaints of residents unable to access their home.	0	2	✓
Completion of asset inspection as per the Road Management Plan.	100%	100%	✓
Average response time to address safety standards (days)	5 <sup>(1)</sup>	2	X
Average response time to address service requests (weeks)	7 <sup>(1)</sup>	4	X
Average community satisfaction rating: (July 2009)			
Sealed Roads	N/a <sup>(2)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	N/a
Unsealed Roads	N/a <sup>(2)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	N/a
Road name and warning signs	N/a <sup>(2)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	N/a
Number of Service Requests received that address issues on roads:			
Sealed Roads	71	80	✓
Unsealed Roads	102 <sup>(1)</sup>	90	X
Percentage of sealed road network renewed per annum.	0.92% <sup>(3)</sup>	1.05%	X
Percentage of unsealed road network renewed per annum.	3.2%	2.9%	✓
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Average expenditure per square meter of Sealed Road.	\$0.35	0.38	✓
Average cost per square meter of Sealed Road.	\$28.10	\$28.50	✓
Average cost per square meter of Unsealed Road.	\$3.98 <sup>(4)</sup>	\$4.20	✓

Variations from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The service request target that were originally set for this indicator is based on 80% of the roads (which have an intervention of 365 days or greater) being a lower priority, however over the last 12 months a number of higher priority road requests were received increasing the average response time to address other service requests.
- (2) Actual figures are sourced from the results of the Community satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of survey questions varied from previous years therefore statistics do not reflect the current standard. While no percentage rating was assigned, it was revealed that sealed and unsealed roads rated as an area of importance as well as an area for improvement amongst the community.
- (3) The added cost of crushing limestone impacted on the number of sealed roads that were able to be renewed.
- (4) The Average cost per square metre of unsealed road costs have decreased this year due to the shorter carting of material. Also the purchasing of an accugrade cross slope system for the construction grader has increased productivity and reduces site costs.

Aerodromes	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b>			
Meet the requirements for operating a registered aerodrome as set out by Civil Aviation Safety Regulation 139.	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost to operate the aerodromes	115,655 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$86,880	X

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The cost to operate the aerodromes during 2009/2010 increased due to the requirement of urgent maintenance works of \$30,000 (unplanned).

**Family and Children's Services**

(Report adopted by council September 2002)

*Programs within this service*

Out Of School Hours Child Care consisting of:

- Before and After School Child Care
- Vacation Child Care
- Mobile Vacation Child Care

Preschools

Family Day Care

Maternal &amp; Child Health

Out of School Hours Child Care	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b>			
Meet the outcomes of the funding and service agreements (this includes regular client satisfaction surveys and quality assurance certification).	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net cost per hour of care delivered	\$8.20 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$8.00	X

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The target set in 2007/2008 for 2008/2009 did not include costs associated with a work cover claim which remains ongoing.

Family Day Care	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b>			
Meet the outcomes of the funding and service agreements (this includes regular client satisfaction surveys and quality assurance certification).	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net cost to Council per hour of care delivered.	\$1.02	\$1.10	✓

Maternal and Child Health	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Percentage of children enrolled from birth notifications received.	98%	98%	✓
Meet and exceed DHS targets for Maternal & Child Health Services (includes Enhanced Home Visits, additional family support, parent education and screening processes).	Yes	Yes	✓
Community Satisfaction Rating (July 2009)	N/a (1)	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
Percentage of children attending for 3.5 - 4 yr old developmental assessment.	100%	60%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net cost to Council per consultation.	\$40.29	\$40.00	<b>X</b>

Variations from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Actual figures are sourced from the results of the Community Satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of survey questions varied from previous years therefore statistics do not reflect the current standard and therefore no percentage rating was assigned as there was no specific question relating to Maternal Child Health.

**Economic Prosperity Services**

(Report adopted by council February 2003)

*Programs within this service*

Economic Development Unit  
 Stock Selling Complex  
 Lake Boga Caravan Park  
 Robinvale Caravan Park  
 Swan Hill Caravan Park  
 Commercial and Industrial Estates  
 Tower Hill Estate Development  
 Marketing and Information Services

Key Municipal Objectives	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Achieve Population growth for the municipality.	Yes	Yes	✓
Achieve employment growth greater than the average for Rural and Regional Victoria.	Yes <sup>(1)</sup>	Yes	<b>N/a</b>
Achieve an unemployment rate lower than the average for Rural and Regional Victoria.	No <sup>(1)</sup>	No	<b>N/a</b>

## Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The small area labour market statistics have not been released since December 2008 to provide information regarding employment growth and unemployment rates.

Economic Development Unit	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b>			
Maintain national accreditation for Visitor Information Services.	Yes	Yes	✓
Increase in assistance provided to visitors/potential visitors.	5%	5%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Average net cost of responding to inquiries/fulfilling requests for information per inquiry/request.	\$5.21	\$5.37	✓

## Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Visitor numbers have increased largely due in part to the relocation of the Information Centre.

Stock Selling Complex	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b>			
Maintain National Saleyards Quality Assurance (NSQA) accreditation	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost of operating the complex as a % of total sale value	1.23%	1.3%	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Expenditure includes all operational plus capital less depreciation (\$327,269.00) divided by gross livestock sales (\$26,755,900.00).

Caravan Parks	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b>			
Number of substantiated complaints received on quality of service provided by caravan park lessee.	0	<3	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
All caravan parks operate at a net return to Council	No <sup>(1)</sup>	Yes	<b>X</b>

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The ongoing drought conditions associated with the Lake Boga Caravan Park continue to impact on the achievement of this cost standard.



**Aged & Disability Services**

(Report adopted by council February 2003)

*Programs within this service*

General Home Care  
 Home and Property Maintenance  
 Personal Care  
 Respite Care  
 Food Services  
 Aged Accommodation  
 Home Care - Specific Target Areas  
 Aged & Disability Service Management  
 Brokered Works  
 Social Support- Volunteer Coordination  
 Senior Citizens Centres  
 Social Support – Planned Activities  
 Commonwealth Respite  
 Community Aged Care Packages- Internal  
 Community Aged Care Packages- External

Aged & Disability Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
<b>Client Needs</b>			
Review of existing clients to assess appropriateness of service levels, whether service standards are being achieved and to reassess the needs of the client:			
High needs clients	100%	100%	✓
Medium needs clients	80%	80%	✓
Low needs clients	80%	80%	✓
<b>Physical Safety</b>			
Undertake a physical safety assessment of the home environment, and ensure that it is at the required level:			
Initial for new clients	100%	100%	✓
Review of existing clients	at each visit	at each visit	✓
<b>Government Requirements</b>			
Compliance with grant conditions and service requirements.	100%	100%	✓
<b>Community Perception of Services</b>			
Community Satisfaction Rating per Council's regular Community Survey (July 2009)	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
<b>Brokered Works</b>			
Services delivered in accordance with brokerage agreement.	100%	100%	✓

Aged & Disability Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
<b>Average cost per service hour</b>			
General Home Care	\$41.75	\$50.21	✓
Home and Property maintenance	\$45.25	\$52.18	✓
Personal Care	\$43.93	\$44.77	✓
Respite Care	\$37.54	\$40.14	✓
<b>Average Cost per Meal</b>			
This is measured as the total cost of the Food Services program divided by the number of meals delivered to clients.	\$9.19 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$9.84	✓
<b>Average Cost to Maintain Aged Accommodation.</b>			
This is measured as the total cost to maintain Aged Accommodation facilities divided by the number of properties maintained.*	\$2,833 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$2,197.50	X
<b>Senior Citizen Centres</b>			
Total cost to operate Senior Citizen Centres and related activities.	\$12,840 <sup>(4)</sup>	\$32,770	✓
<b>Brokered Works</b>			
Services delivered at nil cost to Council.	(\$171) <sup>(5)</sup>	(\$55,105)	✓

\*These figures exclude additional structural works deemed necessary by Council's building department.

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Actual figures are sourced from the results of the Community satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of survey questions varied from previous years therefore statistics do not reflect the current standard and therefore no percentage rating was assigned as there was no specific question related to Aged and Disability Service.
- (2) Income and expenditure for meals for external clients are now separated. Brokered works figures now included meals. Above figures relate to HACC clients.
- (3) Income under budget as one unit empty for extended period.
- (4) Building and Maintenance costs under budget.
- (5) Includes \$29,682 for provision of doubtful debts.

## Community Wellbeing Services

(Report adopted by Council June 2003)

### Programs within this service

Development Group (Building & Planning)  
Arbovirus Disease Control Program  
Emergency Management Services  
Regulatory Services  
Parking Control & School Crossings  
Public Health

Development Group	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Average number of days* required to issue Planning Permits.	56 <sup>(1)</sup>	60	✓
Average number of days* required to issue Building Permits.	16.3	18	✓
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Net cost to Council per Planning Permit	\$975 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$600	X
Net cost to Council per Building Permit (Profit)	\$115.68	\$261	✓

\* Days include: weekends, Public Holidays, and all clock stopped' periods, e.g. awaiting further information, notifications etc.

### Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Due to process improvements there was an 8% improvement in the average number of days required to issue Planning Permits within the statutory time limits.
- (2) Planning permit numbers remain static and below the number of applications estimated to be received during 2009/2010. Permit numbers remain below the long term average and this may be attributable to the economic slowdown, and ongoing drought conditions.
  - Operational costs increased by 16% (4.75% EBA increase, and unforeseen legal and procedural costs) Income down by \$18,100 costs up by \$63,000 = net difference \$44,900 (\$343 cost increase per permit above estimate 09/10)
  - Fees set by State Government; the next review is due August 2010.

Arbovirus Disease Control Program	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b> Meets the outcomes of the funding and service agreement with the Department of Human Services.	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b> Cost per annum to Council to conduct the program.	39,560 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$21,540	X

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) 2009-2010 target should have been \$25,850. The estimated subsidy was \$6,132 higher than the final claim. \$7,949 was expected to be received in 2009-2010 and will now be received in 2010-2011. Had the \$7,949 been received in 2009-2010 the actual cost to Council in 2009-2010 would have been \$31,611.

Emergency Management Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b> Response to emergencies as required.	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b> Net cost to Council for emergency management.	\$4.43	\$4.63	✓

Regulatory Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b> Community satisfaction rating on the control of domestic animals as per Council's community satisfaction survey July 2009	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	N/a
Community satisfaction rating for Council's enforcement of by laws.	64% <sup>(2)</sup>	65%	X
<b>Cost Standard</b> Average cost to Council to enforce Local Laws per registered animal.	\$13.04	\$24.00	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Actual figures sourced from the results of the Community Satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of the survey questions varied from previous years and reflect a different standard as no specific question to Council's performance in regard to control of domestic animal was asked in the Community Satisfaction Survey 2009.
- (2) The Community Satisfaction rating for Council's enforcement of by laws fell short by 1%. This is the first time this target has been reported within the Quality and Cost Standards and it should be noted that Swan Hill Rural City Council performed on par with the median range across the state for this category.

Parking Control and School Crossings	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Community satisfaction rating of car parking control i.e. policing of meters/parking signs, as per Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey 2009.	60%	60%	✓
Community satisfaction rating of traffic management and parking facilities.	60%	58%	✓
School days the crossing is supervised.	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Net cost to Council per 'restricted' car park space per annum.	\$31.30 <sup>(1)</sup>	(76.81)	✓
Cost to Council per school crossing per annum*.	\$3,915 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$3,248	X

\* Excludes the costs of new uniforms and 'stop' signs.

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Car parks in McCrae Street between Campbell and Beveridge have not been metered for 12 months whilst Council determined the best metering system for the area. It is estimated that Council has lost approximately \$20,000 in parking revenue.

Provision for bad and doubtful debts was not budgeted, and this amounted to \$10,422.

.25 Administration Officer shared with the health department was employed to help with the implementation of the new Civica corporate software system at a cost of \$12,000. This position has not been filled and no longer exists. There was also the need to seek temporary agency staff to help with the transition costing \$1,849.00.

- (2) A subsidy of \$9,118 expected in 2009/2010 for school crossings will be received in 2010/2011. Had this have been received, this would have decreased our net cost to Council to \$2,613.

Public Health	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Meet the legislative and inspection requirements for registrable premises.	100%	100%	✓
Maintain the compliance of food premises with their food safety program.	60% <sup>(1)</sup>	75%	X
Maintain compliance of food samples with the Food Standards Code.	80% <sup>(1)</sup>	90%	X
Maintain the rate of vaccinations above the national average.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Average cost per head of population to safeguard public health.	\$11.50	\$12.00	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The department was unable to meet the required targets due to 2 of the 3 qualified Environmental Health Officers being on maternity leave and the lack of ability to recruit suitably qualified staff. The department has been functioning short staffed and there was difficulty in conducting follow-up inspections to ensure premises complied. Council has commenced succession planning to suitably recruit qualified staff by assigning two scholarship students to help alleviate pressures on Council services and existing Council staff.

## Waste Management Services

(Report adopted by Council June 2003)

### Programs within this service

Garbage Service  
Swan Hill Landfill  
Landfill – Other  
Recycling Service

Domestic Garbage and Recyclable Collection Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Collection bins within 4 hours of the scheduled collection day and time.	Yes	Yes	✓
Empty all bins put out for collection. (Less than 1 in 1,000 bins missed.)	Yes	Yes	✓
Delivery of new bins and replacement of damaged bin within 2 working days of request being received.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost per bin collection per household (from Contract).	\$0.99	\$1.02	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Based on budgeted cost and anticipated services.
- (2) Based on 90% of actual cost (Biz) and number of services at December (Monthly contract payment).

Landfill	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
All landfill sites to be open and manned as per advertised hours.	Yes	Yes	✓
All waste to be retained within the landfill site (number of complaints of litter near landfill site).	Nil	Nil	✓
All landfill sites operated in accordance with EPA requirements (number of EPA infringement notices).	Nil	Nil	✓
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Net cost per capita of waste deposited at Swan Hill landfill sites.	\$30.50	\$33.10	✓
Net cost per capita of waste deposited at Robinvale landfill sites.	\$21.33	\$24.10	✓
Net cost per capita to maintain rural landfill sites.	\$11.55	\$14.20	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Net cost per capita = budgeted contract cost OR actual contract cost/ Population served.
- (2) Based on 2006 data census and population distribution across the Municipality.

Litter and Special Events Collection Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
All bins to be emptied once a week, or immediately after a special event.	Yes	Yes	✓
All litter within 3 meters of the bin to be picked up upon collection of the bin.	Yes	Yes	✓
Replace all bins into position (on stand or within enclosure) and covers/locks secured post collection.	99%	99%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Average annual cost to collect each litterbin (from Contract).	\$163.00	\$168.90	✓

Recycling Centre	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Participation of households in recycling (proportion of households in declared districts that have recycling bins allocated).	99%	99%	✓
Maximise the rates of recycling of materials collected from households (proportional increment of household waste recycled in Swan Hill).	49% <sup>(1)</sup>	50%	X
Proportion of recycling bins that are contaminated with non-recyclable materials.	N/a <sup>(2)</sup>	6%	N/a
The contamination rate in weight of total recycle collection. (in Swan Hill)	N/a <sup>(2)</sup>	6%	N/a

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The contamination rate for the Robinvale Kerbside recycle collection is increasing significantly (24% - 42% according to Robinvale recycling audit 08-09). Council needs to implement a correction to ensure that this is reflected in the Quality and Cost Standards. This is affecting the overall municipal contamination rate of 9% (Swan Hill recycling Audit 07-08). The recycling facility practices have changed since the last audit, which have affected the contamination rate. Council no longer appeals a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), it is now a transfer station. Practices are in place to identify contamination before the material reaches the transfer station.
- (2) Contamination Rate figures are not available for this financial year (the last Recycling Audit for Swan Hill was conducted in 2007/2008)



**Community Amenity**

(Report adopted by Council June 2004)

*Programs within this service*

Drainage  
Environmental Services  
Urban Streetscapes  
Street Beautification  
Public Conveniences and Rest Centres  
Street Cleaning  
Public Lighting

Drainage	2009/2010		
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
No. of drainage system events (flooding of private property in urban areas by stormwater).	Nil	Nil	✓
Average tonnes of gross pollutants removed from gross pollutant traps (per pollutant trap).	6.2T	3.0T	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost to clean and maintain drainage pits each year per drainage pit.	\$57.40	\$65.00	✓

Environmental Standards	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Community satisfaction rating on Council's performance in Conservation and Natural Resources as per Council's community satisfaction survey July 2009.	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	N/a
Number of community consultations held to implement environment programs.	6 a year	5 a year	✓
Number of water sensitive urban design plantations installed in the municipality.	7 a year	5 a year	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net value to Council of external support gained (including in-kind) to support environment projects and initiatives.	\$50,000	\$50,000	✓

## Variances to quality and cost standards:

- (1) Actual figures sourced from the results of the Community Satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of the survey questions varied from previous years and reflects a different standard as no specific question to Council's performance in regard to conservation and natural resources was asked in the Community Satisfaction Survey July 2009.
- (2) Additional support gained for funding projects from Catchment Management Authorities, DSE and DPI via grant applications.

Urban Streetscapes	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Compliance with powerline clearance requirements on street trees.	100%	100%	✓
Community satisfaction rating on maintenance of trees on roadsides and parks as per Council's community satisfaction survey July 2009.	Na <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost to Council for power line clearance of street trees per street tree cleared from powerlines.	\$50.74	\$52.00	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Actual figures sourced from the results of the Community Satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of the survey questions varied from previous years and reflects a different standard as no question specific to Council's performance in regard to maintenance of trees on roadsides and parks was asked in the Community Satisfaction Survey July 2009.

Street Beautification	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Community satisfaction rating on maintenance of Public Open Spaces as per Council's community satisfaction survey July 2009.	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
Community satisfaction rating on appearance of public areas.	67% <sup>(2)</sup>	68%	<b>X</b>
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost to Council to maintain garden beds and grass in public areas per hectare of grass maintained.	\$34,600 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$40,100	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Actual figures sourced from the results of the Community Satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of the survey questions varied from previous years and reflects a different standard as no specific question to Council's performance in regard to public open spaces was asked in the Community Satisfaction Survey 2009.
- (2) The Community Satisfaction rating for Council's appearance of public areas fell short by 1%. This is the first time this target has been reported within the Quality and Cost Standards.
- (3) With stage 3 and 4 water restrictions, Council's medians, road side grass areas and garden beds have not been maintained to usual standard, which may have impacted on the above standard relating to community satisfaction.

Public Conveniences and Rest Centres	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
SHRCC Community Satisfaction Survey question, "How well does Council keep public toilets clean?" (July 2009).	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost to Council to clean public toilets and rest centres per toilet block.	\$6,363.49	\$7,335	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Actual figures sourced from the results of the Community Satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of the survey questions varied from previous years and reflects a different standard as no specific question to Council's performance in regard to how clean Council keeps public toilets was asked in the Community Satisfaction Survey 2009.

Street Cleaning	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
SHRCC Community Satisfaction Survey question, "How well does Council keep Town Centres clean & tidy?"	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost to Council per hour of street swept.	\$241.00 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$230.00	<b>X</b>

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Actual figures sourced from the results of the Community Satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of the survey questions varied from previous years and reflects a different standard as no question specific to Council's performance in regard to keeping Town Centres clean and tidy was asked in the Community Satisfaction Survey July 2009.
- (2) Some minor maintenance issues with the street sweeper had an impact on the sweeping program.

Public Lighting	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
New Subdivisions to meet or exceed Council's public lighting standards.	100%	100%	✓
Net increase in number of streetlights to existing network per year (new light and pole assembly).	12 <sup>(1)</sup>	3	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost to Council for public lighting per streetlight.	\$92.00 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$110.00	✓

Variations from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Due to recent Road Management reviews between Council and Vic Roads.
- (2) More lights with constant maintenance cost reduced the average cost per street light as there were less operating hours in the day during summer.

## Recreation, Culture & Leisure Services

(Report adopted by Council June 2004)

### Programs within this service

Parks and Gardens  
Recreation Reserves and Other Sporting Facilities  
Indoor Sports Facilities & Swimming Pools  
Art Gallery  
Arts (performing)  
Regional Library  
Pioneer Settlement Museum  
Community Centres & Swan Hill Town Hall

	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Parks and Gardens</b>			
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Maintain grass height between 25 – 60 mm.	100%	100%	✓
Maintain playgrounds in accordance with national playgrounds standard.	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net operating cost per hectare.	\$8,720 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$8,500	X

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The increase in costs has been contributed to a high level of maintenance at Steggall Park.

Recreation Reserves and Other Sporting Facilities	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Maintain grass height between 25 – 60 mm.	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net operating cost per hectare.	\$10,880	\$11,150	✓

Indoor Sports Facilities & Swimming Pools	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Number of visitors/users of the indoor sports facilities/ swimming pools.			
Swan Hill Leisure Centre & Indoor Swimming Pool.	78,836 <sup>(1)</sup>	82,000	X
Swan Hill Indoor Sport & Recreation Centre.	39,758 <sup>(1)</sup>	51,000	X
Robinvale Leisure Centre & Swimming Pool.	24,002 <sup>(1)</sup>	32,000	X
<i>Outdoor Pools</i>			
Swan Hill	22,616	21,000	✓
Nyah	8,399 <sup>(2)</sup>	12,000	X
Manangatang	7,571	7,000	✓
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Net cost to Council per visitor to operate the:			
Swan Hill Leisure Centre & Indoor Swimming Pool.	\$5.00 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$4.36	X
Swan Hill Indoor Sport & Recreation Centre.	\$0.50 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$0.40	X
Robinvale Leisure Centre & Swimming Pool.	\$8.70 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$6.76	X
<i>Outdoor Pools</i>			
Swan Hill	\$8.54	\$9.02	✓
Nyah	\$4.30 <sup>(4)</sup>	\$3.29	X
Manangatang	\$5.04	\$6.57	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Visitor numbers and users of the indoor sports facilities/swimming pools fell short due to weather variances.
- (2) Nyah reported reduction in recorded patronage figures due to a refinement in the recording methods, variances in the itinerant worker population and a reduction in school swimming program activities (school has had significant reduction in student numbers). Future standards target will reflect these refinements.
- (3) Costs associated with the indoor sports facilities/swimming pools increased slightly due to the decrease in patronage.
- (4) See note 2 above.

Art Gallery	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Number of visitors to the Art Gallery (per annum).	11,906 <sup>(1)</sup>	14,000	X
Achievement of objectives as set out in the funding agreement between Arts Victoria and Swan Hill Rural City Council	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net cost to Council to operate the Gallery per visitor.	\$20.94	\$22.00	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Very low numbers in February, which may reflect the extreme heat experienced at that time of the year coinciding with the end of the summer holiday period.

Arts (performing)	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Number of people attending performing arts events during the year.	2,287 <sup>(1)</sup>	4,000	<b>X</b>
Compliance with Arts Victoria touring funding grant requirements.	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net cost to Council to operate the performing arts program per patron.	\$57.31 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$25.00	<b>X</b>

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Ticket sales for many shows were down compared to the previous year.
- (2) Ticket prices for many shows were reduced, ticket sales were below expected number and only ¼ of expected income from Guarantee Against Loss (GAL) was received.

Regional Library	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Members as % of total population served.	35%	35%	✓
Visits to service points.	98,526 <sup>(1)</sup>	102,000	<b>X</b>
Community satisfaction rating (July 2009 survey).	N/A	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net cost to Council per visit.	\$5.89 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$5.00	<b>X</b>

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Customers can now access more library services through the website and online catalogues rather than coming into the library, which has in turn affected the net cost to Council per visit.

Pioneer Settlement	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Accreditation with Museums Australia.	Discontinued Dec 09 <sup>(1)</sup>	In Progress	<b>N/a</b>
Compliance with Education program grants conditions.	100%	100%	✓
Number of visitors to the Pioneer Settlement (per year).	64,335 <sup>(2)</sup>	70,000	<b>X</b>
Camping accreditation for Lodges.	Yes	Yes	✓
Comply with Marine Safety Standards (Pyap).	100%	100%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net cost to Council to operate the Pioneer Settlement Museum per visitor.	\$16.45 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$15.40	<b>X</b>

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Accreditation deferred as the Pioneer Settlement is to operate as a Tourist Attraction and the need for Museum accreditation is not required at this point in time.
- (2) Variance in visitor numbers can be attributed to a down turn in Sound and Light visitors, low river levels and the Pyap being out of water during the month of May.
- (3) Actual cost for 2009/10 reflects a higher variance than anticipated. This can be attributed to the redevelopment of the Pioneer Settlement and increased business costs and low river levels to operate the PS Pyap. Net cost includes additional capital funding for the redevelopment of the Pioneer Settlement. Council also stopped seeking museum accreditation two years ago.



Community Centres and Swan Hill Town Hall	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Number of times the community centre/facility is used by the community each year.			
Manangatang	94 <sup>(1)</sup>	120	X
Nyah	160	110	✓
Lake Boga	19 <sup>(2)</sup>	110	X
Robinvale	342	150	✓
Swan Hill Town Hall	445	430	✓
Number of people attending events/functions/performances at the Swan Hill Town Hall.			
	27,593 <sup>(3)</sup>	28,000	X
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Net operating cost to Council per usage of the facility.			
Manangatang	\$103.52	\$235.00	✓
Nyah	\$167.47	\$600.00	✓
Lake Boga	\$1,221.52 <sup>(4)</sup>	\$158.00	X
Robinvale	\$186.81	\$509.00	✓
Swan Hill Town Hall	632.51 <sup>(5)</sup>	\$441.38	X
Net operating cost to Council per person using the Swan Hill Town Hall.			
	\$10.20 <sup>(6)</sup>	\$6.78	X

Variances

from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Main uses: Weekly Senior Citizens Bookings and Mallee Track Health and Community Service with planned local activity. Not included is the Infant Welfare space, used 4 days per week for Family Day Care operations (now no longer operating) and Pre-school used twice per week except for school holiday periods. Plus recent lease of office space to Mallee Catchment Authority Office.
- (2) Only official bookings have been listed. Several Community groups possess their own key. Unable to monitor use of the stadium by the Primary School and the Football/Netball Club who makes use of the stadium space. Council will be looking into implementing a booking system to allow for information to be captured more accurately.
- (3) Slight decrease in anticipated attendance. The costs of the halls are subsidised and their price point is very low to allow community groups and members ease of use.
- (4) See note 2.
- (5) Can be up to three bookings per day. Multiple bookings by Councillors and Council Officers. Multiple bookings by external and private function users.
- (6) Unscheduled maintenance increased net operating cost to Council during 2009-2010.

## Organisational Support

(Report adopted by Council May 2005)

*Programs within this service*

Maintenance of Council Owned Buildings  
Engineering Services (design and management of projects)  
Special Charge Schemes (works undertaken at cost to adjoining property owners)  
Municipal Offices (management and maintenance of)  
Robinvale Resource Centre and Customer Services & Revenue Control  
Acquisition & Disposal of Council Properties (as determined by Council)  
Information Technology Services (computers and systems)  
Financial Services (incorporating Financing Activities)  
Information Management (Records)  
Asset Management (infrastructure assets)  
Commercial Services & Risk Management  
Human Resource Management  
Depots  
Plant & Fleet Management

Maintenance of Council owned buildings	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b>			
Building maintenance service to be administered in accordance with the Building Maintenance Services Operations Manual.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost of providing building maintenance administration services as a percentage of Total Council Operating Expenses.	0.3% <sup>(1)</sup>	0.46%	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) With the role out of Civica, some data was input against the incorrect 'sub accounts'. There was also some project work order numbers for larger projects that were set up, which did not link back to the correct sub account. The above figure, while an achievement based on the available figures, it is not an accurate reflection of the programmed maintenance spend due to glitches in the Civica system. These problems have now been fixed and the figure which will be provided for 2010/2011 will be an accurate account of the work carried out.

Engineering Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Undertake design works in accordance with established technical standards and Council policies.	Yes	Yes	✓
Comply with statutory time frames in referral responses to other departments within Council.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost of services as a percentage of Total Council Budget.			
<u>Net Operating Result</u> Total Expenses less Depreciation and Amortisation	2.42%	2.5%	✓

Special Charge Schemes	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b> Undertake all Special Charge Schemes in accordance with legislative requirements (this covers consultation, standard of work, allocation of costs etc).	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b> Undertake and complete all Special Charge Schemes at Nil cost to Council except for the portion where Council is a participant (in which case Council portion not to exceed stated amount).	Yes	Yes	✓

Municipal Offices	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b> Provide a safe environment for work by staff and business by the public.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b> Cost of service as a percentage of total budget.	0.7%	1.04%	✓

Robinvale Resource Centre Customer Services Revenue Control	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Rate debtor collections as a percentage of Total Rate Income.	93.52% <sup>(1)</sup>	96.5%	✓
Community satisfaction with general efficiency of Council staff as per Community Satisfaction Survey July 2009.	N/a <sup>(2)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	N/a
Community satisfaction rating for Council's interaction and responsiveness in dealing with the public.	72% <sup>(3)</sup>	75%	X
Average number of non-Council services provided from the Robinvale Resource Centre.	8 <sup>(4)</sup>	15	X
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Cost of providing customer service and revenue control services.			
<u>Net Customer Services &amp; Revenue Control Program Costs</u> Total Council Operating Expenditure	2.2%	2.1%	X
Cost of providing customer services from the Robinvale Resource Centre per head of population for Robinvale and surrounding district.			
<u>Net Robinvale Resource Centre Program Costs</u> Population of Robinvale and surrounding district	\$49.70 <sup>(5)</sup>	\$54.95	✓

Variations from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Timbercorp properties placed in liquidation, Council awaiting payment on these highly valued properties. Amount outstanding totals: \$466,220.46.
- (2) Actual figures sourced from the results of the Community Satisfaction Survey conducted in July 2009. The format of the survey questions varied from previous years and reflects a different standard as no question specific to efficiency of Council staff was asked in the Community Satisfaction Survey July 2009. However, it is to be noted that Friendliness of Council staff rated as an area that Council is performing well in.
- (3) The Community Satisfaction rating for Council's responsiveness in dealing with the public fell short by 3%. This is the first time this target has been reported within the Quality and Cost Standards.
- (4) Some service providers have sought alternative accommodation in Robinvale.
- (5) The program substantially reduced associated telephone costs.

Acquisition and Disposal of Council Properties	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standard</b>			
Meet legal requirements for acquisition and disposal of Council properties.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Undertake acquisition and disposal of Council properties within Budget targets.	Yes	Yes	✓

Information Technology Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Number of working days of total unavailability of a primary computer system (Fujitsu, Novell, Info vision).	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	2	<b>N/a</b>
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Cost of providing IT services as a percentage of total operating expenses. <u>IT program (bottom line 3345)</u> Total operating expenditure	2.41%	<2.5%	✓
Cost of IT services per user. <u>IT program (bottom line 3345)</u> Number of personal computers supported	\$3,448	\$3,550	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The above measurement does not provide for an accurate measure of quality against those services. During the Scribble A virus infection in early February, access to those systems was not possible, yet the systems themselves remained active. The quality measurement does not reflect the services holistically covering all the components that make up the service. For example: desktop computers, networks, servers and software. The above quality standard does not take into account scheduled vs. unscheduled outages and therefore can not be measured as it does not represent or identify accurate service components.

Finance Services	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Meet all statutory reporting obligations:			
o Annual Report.	Yes	Yes	✓
o Business Plan and Annual Budget.	Yes	Yes	✓
o Victoria Grants Commission Return.	Yes	Yes	✓
o Local Government Sector Borrowings Survey.	Yes	Yes	✓
o Taxation (PAYG, GST and FBT).	Yes	Yes	✓
Meet Council's terms of trade:			
o Payment to staff by the 3 <sup>rd</sup> working day following pay-end date.			
o Payment to suppliers and service providers within agreed trading terms, or 30 days following receipt of invoice (invoice must be provided to Accounts Payable Officer).	Yes	Yes	✓
o Monthly Cash Balances reports for Council Agenda.	Yes	Yes	✓
o Management reports completed by 15 <sup>th</sup> working day following month end.	No <sup>(1)</sup>	Yes	X
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost of providing financial services as a percentage of Total Council Operating Expenses.			
<u>Finance Program Costs (Bottom Line P3340)</u>			
Total Operating Expenditure (excluding depreciation)	1.45%	<1.65%	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Variance in meeting Management Reports by 15<sup>th</sup> working day. Three management reports were not compiled due to difficulties experienced in the implementation of new corporate software. All other monthly reports were prepared on time for the remainder of the year.

Information Management	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Customer satisfaction with service.	78%	75%	✓
Service meets agreed timeframes for incoming correspondence registration:			
o 3:40 pm Monday			
o 2:20 pm Tuesday - Friday	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost of service as a percentage of total operating expenses.			
<u>Information Management Program</u> Total Operating Expenditure.	0.71%	<0.85%	✓

Asset Management	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
MAV STEP scorecard that allocates a score depending on the policies and processes in place:			
o Policy	85	39	✓
o Strategy	100	32	✓
o Plans	67	48	✓
o Operations	N/a	43	N/a
DVC survey sustainability index: Budget allocated to maintenance & renewal / Expenditure required for maintenance & renewal.	0.73	0.85	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost index: Full Cost of provision of the service/ Total replacement value of assets managed.	0.0007	0.0007	✓

Commercial Services and Risk Management	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
All tendering and acquisitions undertaken by Commercial Services is done in accordance with adopted Council policy.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Risk Management</b>			
• Risk mitigation assessment as assessed by Council's insurers.	92%	85%	✓
• Risk mitigation for Property Hazard Management Assessments as per Council's insurers.	67.2% <sup>(1)</sup>	75%	X
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Cost of providing commercial services as a percentage of Total Council Operating Expenses.			
<u>Total cost of Program (less Insurance Premiums)</u> Total operating cost of Council	1.1%	<1.1%	✓
<b>Risk Management</b>			
• Risk Management - Work Cover (EFT to Premiums)	\$1,232	\$1,450	✓
• Risk Management – Liability (Discount v Penalty)	N/A <sup>(2)</sup>	(\$10,000)	N/a
• Risk Management – Property (Value of Property v Premium)	\$0.0021	\$0.0025	✓
• Risk Management – Registered Motor Vehicles - Unit Cost	\$310 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$270	X

## Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) Council risk rating remained the same, due to the insurer opting to undertake biennial inspections.
- (2) Cost standard removed as insurer no longer provides discount based on ranking.
- (3) The motor vehicle insurance costs went up due to an increase in claims costs across the state. As most Victorian Council's are apart of an insurance pool and the pool has been running at a loss for the last three years – following the bushfires and hail storms - an increase in insurance costs was unavoidable. Council has taken steps to decrease our cost by increasing our excess from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per claim.

Human Resources	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Number of staff issues resolved in the Australian Industrial Relations Commission.	Nil	Nil	✓
All training courses provided as per Organisational Training Schedule.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost of providing Human Resource Services as a % of total operating expenses.	<0.05%	<0.05%	✓

Depots	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Provide secure and safe working environment for Council staff and vehicle, plant and equipment resources, as set out in OH&S requirements.	Yes	Yes	✓
Conduct 6 monthly emergency evacuation exercises.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Operate Depots within budget target.	Yes	Yes	✓



Plant and Fleet Management	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Times taken to complete scheduled preventative maintenance services within % of predetermined standards.	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
Percentage of occasions actual service times meet set standard time.	100%	90%	✓
Achieve full cost recovery on all major plant items (defined as having a capital value exceeding \$5,000) at time of disposal.	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
Achieve full cost recovery on all motor vehicles (defined as passenger sedans and station wagons) at time of disposal.	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
Percentage of occasion's actual resale values meet or exceed predetermined residual value on all motor vehicles (defined as passenger sedans and station wagons).	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	Discontinued as of 09/10	<b>N/a</b>
<b>Cost Standards</b>			
Average cost of scheduled services for passenger and light commercial vehicles (excluding parts and lubricants).	\$81.20	\$85.00	✓
Achieve annual plant replacement acquisitions program as identified in the adopted Council budget.	Yes	Yes	✓

Variance

es from quality and cost standards:

- (1) These standards have not been applicable and have not been reported on since 2006. It was discussed that a more appropriate measurement might be cost recovery on the whole fleet, defined as the level of expenditure directly on fleet versus income, annually. This current standard does not reflect current practice.

**Leadership & Governance**

(Report adopted by Council May 2005)

*Programs within this service*

Council  
Corporate Management  
Community Facilitation Unit (includes Grants & Contributions)  
Strategic Planning

Council	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Community satisfaction with Council's advocacy role per annual Statewide Survey.	64%	>60%	✓
Community satisfaction rating for overall performance generally of Council as per Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey.	63%	70%	X
Community satisfaction rating for Council's engagement is decision making on key local issues.	61%	59%	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Program cost as a percentage of operating budget.			
Program cost: Total operating expenditure calculated on a Rates determination basis.	2.5%	<2.5%	✓

Varia

nces from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The community satisfaction rating for this period was at 63%, which is below the target level of 70%. All of the areas identified as priorities for improvement have already been recognised and assigned specific actions within the Council Plan. While the lower overall satisfaction rating is disappointing it should be noted a different survey method and rating system was also in use for the first time.

Corporate Management	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Overall staff satisfaction rating per biannual survey.	69%	69%	✓
Overall community satisfaction with Council (from Council's July 2009 Community Satisfaction Survey).	N/a <sup>(1)</sup>	65%	N/a
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Program cost as a percentage of operating budget.			
Program cost: Total operating expenditure calculated on a Rates determination basis.	3.5%	<3.8%	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) This survey is conducted every two years. No survey was conducted in 2010.

Community Facilitation Unit	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Number of current user group agreements.	35	35	✓
Government and other funding attracted during the year to supplement community and Council activities.	971,000 <sup>(1)</sup>	1,000,000	X
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Net program cost as a percentage of operating budget.			
Net program cost: Total operating expenditure less income related to that expenditure calculated on a Rates determination basis.	<1%	<1.9%	✓

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The initial target of \$1,000,000 for the Community Facilitation Unit was ambitious, however it is to be noted that the actual result of \$971,000 is a remarkable achievement for this Service area.

*Please note: This figure only includes funding obtained and relevant to this particular service area, it does not include additional funding Council received throughout the year.*

Strategic Planning	2009/2010		Status
	Actual	Target	
<b>Quality Standards</b>			
Ensure currency of the Planning Scheme by undertaking public consultation every 36 months and/or as required by legislation for the review of planning schemes.	Yes	Yes	✓
<b>Cost Standard</b>			
Cost per capita to maintain currency and appropriateness of the Planning Scheme.			
<u>Gross Cost to Council</u> Population of the Municipality	\$9.82 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$9.36	X

Variances from quality and cost standards:

- (1) The cost to maintain the Planning Scheme has increased as the associated program costs have increased. Strategic Planning project costs have been increased since the planning scheme review.