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**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES**

Welcome to the report of results and recommendations for the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey.

Each year Local Government Victoria (LGV) coordinates and auspices this State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey throughout Victorian local government areas. This coordinated approach allows for far more cost effective surveying than would be possible if councils commissioned surveys individually.

Participation in the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey is optional. Participating councils have various choices as to the content of the questionnaire and the sample size to be surveyed, depending on their individual strategic, financial and other considerations.

The main objectives of the survey are to assess the performance of councils throughout Victoria across a range of measures and to seek insight into ways to provide improved or more effective service delivery. The survey also provides councils with a means to fulfil some of their statutory reporting requirements as well as acting as a feedback mechanism to LGV.

**SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLING**

This survey was conducted by Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) as a representative random probability survey of residents aged 18+ years in each participating council area.

Survey sample matched to the demographic profile of each profile as determined by the most recent ABS population estimates was purchased from an accredited supplier of publicly available phone records, including up to 10% mobile phone numbers to cater to the diversity of residents within councils, particularly younger people.

A total of n=27,907 completed interviews were achieved in State-wide. Survey fieldwork was conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March, 2017.

The 2017 results are compared with previous years, as detailed below:

* 2016, n=28,101 completed interviews, conduction in the period of 1st February-30th March
* 2015, n=28,316 completed interviews, conduction in the period of 1st February-30th March
* 2014, n=27,906 completed interviews, conduction in the period of 1st February-30th March
* 2013, n=29,501 completed interviews, conduction in the period of 1st February-30th March
* 2012, n=29,384 completed interviews, conduction in the period of 1st February-30th March

Minimum quotas of gender within age groups were applied during the fieldwork phase. Post-survey weighting was then conducted to ensure accurate representation of the age and gender profile of each council area.

Any variation of +/-1% between individual results and net scores in this report or the detailed survey tabulations is due to rounding. In reporting, ‘—’ denotes not mentioned and ‘0%’ denotes mentioned by less than 1% of respondents. ‘Net’ scores refer to two or more response categories being combined into one category for simplicity of reporting.

Within tables and index score charts throughout this report, statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level are represented by upward directing blue and downward directing red arrows. Significance when noted indicates a significantly higher or lower result for the analysis group in comparison to the ‘Total’ result for the council for that survey question for that year. Therefore in the example below:

* The result among 50-64 year olds is significantly lower than for the overall result for the councils.

Further, results shown in blue and red indicate significantly higher or lower results than in 2016. Therefore in the example below:

* The result among 35-49 year olds in the council is significantly higher than the result achieved among this group in 2016.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

Further information about the report and explanations about the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey can be found in the Appendix, including:

* Background and objectives
* Margins of error
* Analysis and reporting
* Glossary of terms

**CONTACTS**

For further queries about the conduct and reporting of the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey, please contact JWS Research on (03) 8685 8555.

**KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**OVERALL PERFORMANCE**

The average overall performance index score of 59 for councils State-wide is in line with the 2016 result, however remains lower than the peak index score of 61 in 2014.

* Councils in the Metropolitan and Interface groups perform *significantly higher* (at the 95% confidence interval) than the average for councils State-wide on the measure of overall performance (index scores of 64 and 60 respectively). Conversely, average ratings for councils in the Small Rural, Regional Centres and Large Rural groups are *significantly lower* than the State-wide average (index scores of 58, 57 and 54 respectively).
* The youngest (aged 18 to 34 years) and oldest (aged 65+ years) resident cohorts have *significantly more favourable* impressions of council performance overall than average (index scores of 62 and 60 respectively). Those aged between these two groups rate overall performance *significantly less favourable* (index score of 57 among those aged 35 to 49 years and 55 among those aged 50 to 64 years).
* There has been no significant change in performance index scores in the last year among demographic sub-groups. The exception is those aged 65+ years who rate overall performance a *significant* one index point higher than in 2016. Overall performance ratings among this cohort had been declining gradually from a high of 62 in 2014, however the 2017 result lifts the index score up from a low of 59 seen in 2016.

On average, Victorians are three times as likely to have a favourable impression (45% ‘very good’ or ‘good’) of councils’ overall performance than to have an unfavourable impression (15% ‘very poor’ or ‘poor’). A further 37% sit mid-scale providing councils an ‘average’ rating.

**OVERVIEW OF CORE PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

Review of overall State-wide ratings for core performance measures (as shown on page 22) shows that performance ratings are stable or have increased by one or two index points compared to State-wide results in 2016. Average ratings for councils State-wide only declined on one measure, sealed local roads, in the past year.

* Ratings for making community decisions (index score of 54) and customer service (index score of 69) remain unchanged from 2016 (as well as overall performance, discussed previously).
* State-wide average ratings for consultation and engagement (index score of 55, one point higher than 2016), lobbying (index score of 54, one point higher than 2016), and overall council direction (index score of 53, two points higher than 2016) increased in the past year.
* On the measure of overall council direction, the index score of 53 is equal to the peak rating seen on this measure across 2013 to 2015. This is the only core performance measure that has equaled previous peak ratings in 2017.

State-wide performance on sealed local roads (index score of 53) declined one index point in the past year.

* Ratings for the condition of sealed local roads is significantly lower than the State-wide average for councils in the Small Rural and Large Rural groups **(index scores** of 50 and 43 respectively). Ratings are significantly higher for councils in the Metropolitan and Interface groups (index scores of 66 and 59 respectively).
* In the past year, ratings declines on the measure of sealed local roads were significant among residents aged 18 to 34 and 65+ years, as well as men.

Average ratings on core measures for councils in the Metropolitan group are significantly higher than averages for councils State-wide, while ratings for councils in the Large Rural group are significantly lower. This pattern is consistent across all core measures.

In summary, results for community consultation and engagement, advocacy and overall council direction all show significant improvement over the 2016 result. Conversely, there has been a decline in the result for sealed local roads. Council overall performance, customer service and decisions made in the interest of the community are on par with the 2016 results.

**CUSTOMER CONTACT AND SERVICE**

Almost three in five (59%) residents State-wide have had recent contact with their council.

* The main method of contacting councils is by telephone and in person (32% and 28% respectively). This pattern has not changed over time, with telephone used more often than in person contact. These methods of contact remain well ahead of email (14%) which is used more frequently than contacting council in writing (11%).
* Council residents aged 35 to 49 years have the most contact with their local councils (66%) while residents aged 18 to 34 years have the least contact (52%).

The customer service index of 69 is a positive result for councils State-wide. Customer service is one of the highest performing areas.

* Almost one third (30%) of residents rate councils’ customer service as ‘very good’, with a further 36% rating customer service as ‘good’, consistent with 2016.
* Men and residents aged 35 to 49 years are significantly less favourable in their impressions of councils’ customer service (index scores of 66 and 68 respectively). Customer service ratings among both of these demographic sub-groups has been trending down from their respective peak ratings in 2014 (index scores of 70 and 71).
* Women and residents aged 65+ years are significantly more favourable of councils’ customer service (index scores of 72 and 71).

**Among those whose most recent contact with their council was via email, customer service index scores have *declined significantly* in the last 12 months** (index score of 65, down four points from 2016).

* **This is an area to pay attention to among councils who wish to migrate a greater number of service interactions to electronic communications**.
* The opposite has occurred among those who most recently contacted their council by telephone (index score of 73, up two points from 2016, a *significant increase*).

Newsletters, sent via mail (34%) or email (25%), are the preferred methods for councils to inform residents about news, information and upcoming events. The gap between these two methods of communication is reducing over time.

* **Preference for receiving information via email is steadily increasing** (from 18% in 2012).
* While **preference for receiving information sent via mail remains strong**, it has declined considerably in the last year from a steady 39% across 2013 to 2016.
* Residents aged 50 years or younger prefer to receive a council newsletter via mail (32%) to email (28%) by a small margin. Older residents (aged 50+ years) exhibit a greater preference for receiving a newsletter in the mail (37%) to email (21%).

**AREAS WHERE COUNCIL IS PERFORMING WELL**

**Art centres and libraries** is the area where councils **perform most strongly** (index score of 73). Overall performance State-wide increased in this area by one index point from 2016.

* Two-thirds of residents (66%) rate councils’ performance in this area as ‘very good’ or ‘good’.
* It is however considered one of the least important service areas (importance index score of 64).

**Another area where councils Overall are well regarded is the appearance of public areas.** With a performance index score of 71, this service area is rated second highest.

* Seven in ten residents (71%) rate councils’ performance in this area as ‘very good’ or ‘good’.
* Parks and gardens (10%) and public areas (4%) are among the frequently mentioned best things about living in Victoria’s councils.
* While not the most important council service, the appearance of public areas is still considered an important council responsibility by residents State-wide (importance index score of 74).

**Waste management** (performance index score of 71) is another area where Councils are rated more highly compared to other service areas. Overall performance State-wide increased in this area by one index point in the last year.

* Seven in ten residents (69%) rate councils’ performance in the area of waste management as ‘very good’ or ‘good’. This service area also has the second highest importance score (importance index of 79).

On each of these service areas, ratings for councils in the Metropolitan group are *significantly higher* than averages for councils State-wide, while in the Large Rural group they are *significantly lower*.

**AREAS IN NEED OF ATTENTION**

**The most significant decline** in 2017 is a three point drop on the measure of **slashing and weed control** (index score of 53). Councils’ performance in this area is at the lowest level recorded (noting that only a subset of councils measure this service).

* + Performance on this measure *declined significantly* across almost all demographic groups. Residents aged 50 to 64 years are the exception, although ratings in this area are significantly lower than average.

**Other services areas worthy of attention involve roads and parking**. **Impressions of the condition of sealed local roads** (discussed previously), **as well as parking facilities, are the two other service areas that exhibited significant declines** (one index point) **in performance index scores in the past year**.

* Counter to the geographic trends, councils in the Metropolitan and Regional Centres group accrue *significantly lower* average ratings in parking facilities than councils overall, while councils in the Small Rural, Large Rural and Interface group garner *significantly higher* ratings in this area.

Furthermore, with a performance index score of 44, **the** **maintenance of unsealed roads** **is the lowest rated service area**. Two in five residents (39%) rate Council performance in this service area as ‘very poor’ or ‘poor’.

* Councils in the Large Rural group rate on average *significantly lower* on this measure than councils State-wide, while councils in the Regional Centres group rate *significantly higher*.

Roads are a priority area for residents, with sealed local roads (importance index score of 78) and unsealed roads (importance index score of 79) rating among the most important service areas.

**FURTHER INSIGHTS**

If forced to choose, more residents prefer to see **service cuts (50%) to maintain council rates at current levels over rate rises (31%) to improve local services.**

* **Over time, preference has been shifting toward ‘service cuts’.** In 2012, 44% of residents claimed to prefer service cuts to maintain council rates at current levels. The proportion of residents preferring service cuts has been trending up over time to 50% in 2017. This contrasts with the 40% of residents who in 2012 had a preference for rate rises to improve local services (compared to 31% currently).
* Residents are almost three times as likely to ‘definitely prefer service cuts’ (27%) as they are to ‘definitely prefer rate rises’ (10%). The proportion of residents who ‘definitely prefer rate rises’ has changed little over time (from 11% in 2012). This contrasts with the proportion of residents who ‘definitely prefer service cuts’, which has steadily increased from 22% in 2012 to 27% currently.

On balance, more residents agree that the direction of councils’ overall performance has improved over the last 12 months (19%) compared to the proportion who believe it has deteriorated (13%).

* Further, residents State-wide are also more likely to agree that councils are heading in the ‘right’ direction (65%) than the ‘wrong’ direction (22%) (asked of a subset of councils).

**FOCUS AREAS FOR COMING 12 MONTHS**

**For the coming 12 months, councils State-wide should pay particular attention to the service areas where stated importance exceeds rated performance by more than 10 points**. Key priorities include the following, where the margin between importance and performance is greater than 20 points:

* + **Unsealed roads** (margin of 35 points)
  + **Making community decisions** (margin of 25 points)
  + **Sealed local roads** (margin of 25 points)
  + **Population growth** (margin of 24 points)
  + **Planning and building permits** (margin of 21 points)
  + **Slashing and weed control** (margin of 21 points).

Consideration should also be given to Large Rural councils and residents aged 50 to 64 years, who appear to be most driving negative opinion in 2017.

On the positive side, councils State-wide should **maintain the relatively strong performance in the areas of art centres and libraries, appearance of public areas and waste management, alongside other areas where performance index scores are relatively high**.

* It is also important not to ignore, and to learn from, what is working amongst other groups, especially residents aged 65+ years and Metropolitan councils, and use these lessons to build performance experience and perceptions in other areas.

**SNAPSHOT OF KEY FINDINGS**

**Higher results in 2017**

* + Overall direction
  + Art centres & libraries
  + Waste management
  + Emergency & disaster management
  + Recreational facilities
  + Family support services
  + Enforcement of local laws
  + Environmental sustainability
  + Business / community development / tourism
  + Consultation & engagement
  + Lobbying
  + Town planning policy
  + Population growth
  + Planning & building permits
  + Unsealed roads

**Lower results in 2017**

* + Sealed local roads
  + Parking facilities
  + Slashing and weed control

**Most favourably disposed towards Council**

* + Aged 65+ years
  + Metropolitan group

**Least favourably disposed towards Council**

* + Aged 50-64 years
  + Large Rural group

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**2017 Summary of Core Measures Index Score Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Overall 2012 | Overall 2013 | Overall 2014 | Overall 2015 | Overall 2016 | Overall 2017 |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | 60 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 59 | **59** |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**  (Community consultation and engagement) | 57 | 57 | 57 | 56 | 54 | **55** |
| **ADVOCACY**  (Lobbying on behalf of the community) | 55 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 53 | **54** |
| **MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS**  (Decisions made in the interest of the community) | n/a | n/a | 57 | 55 | 54 | **54** |
| **SEALED LOCAL ROADS**  (Condition of sealed local roads) | n/a | n/a | 55 | 55 | 54 | **53** |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | 71 | 71 | 72 | 70 | 69 | **69** |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | 52 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 51 | **53** |

**2017 Summary of Core Measures Detailed Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Overall 2017 | Overall 2016 | Highest score | Lowest score |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | **59** | 59 | Metropolitan | Large Rural Shires |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**  (Community consultation and engagement) | **55** | 54 | Aged 18-34 years | Aged 50-64 years, Large Rural Shires |
| **ADVOCACY**  (Lobbying on behalf of the community) | **54** | 53 | Aged 18-34 years | Aged 50-64 years, Large Rural Shires |
| **MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS**  (Decisions made in the interest of the community) | **54** | 54 | Metropolitan , Aged 18-34 years | Large Rural Shires, Aged 50-64 years |
| **SEALED LOCAL ROADS**  (Condition of sealed local roads) | **53** | 54 | Metropolitan | Large Rural Shires |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | **69** | 69 | Regional Centres, Women | Men, Large Rural Shires |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | **53** | 51 | Aged 18-34 years | Aged 50-64 years |

**2017 Summary of Key Community Satisfaction Percentage Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | 9 | 36 | 37 | 10 | 5 | 2 |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION** | 7 | 29 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 10 |
| **ADVOCACY** | 5 | 24 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 22 |
| **MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS** | 6 | 29 | 34 | 14 | 7 | 10 |
| **SEALED LOCAL ROADS** | 11 | 32 | 28 | 16 | 12 | 1 |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | 30 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key Measures Summary Results | *Improved* | *Stayed the same* | *Deteriorated* | *Can’t say* |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | 19 | 62 | 13 | 6 |

**2017 Importance Summary Index Scores Over Time**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Area | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| Community decisions | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Waste management | 79 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 78 |
| Unsealed roads | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 81 | 80 |
| Sealed local roads | 78 | 78 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a |
| Elderly support services | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 80 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 77 |
| Population growth | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Informing the community | 74 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Appearance of public areas | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 73 |
| Consultation & engagement | 74 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| Slashing & weed control | 74 | 73 | 73 | 75 | 74 | 71 |
| Family support services | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Environmental sustainability | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| Town planning policy | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 |
| Traffic management | 72 | 72 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 |
| Recreational facilities | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Planning & building permits | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 71 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 |
| Parking facilities | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 71 |
| Business & community dev. | 70 | 70 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a |
| Lobbying | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 |
| Art centres & libraries | 64 | 66 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| Tourism development | 62 | 63 | 65 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| Community & cultural | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |

**Individual Service Areas Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| Waste management | 36 | 46 | 16 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Community decisions | 39 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Elderly support services | 35 | 44 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 45 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Sealed local roads | 35 | 44 | 18 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Unsealed roads | 39 | 39 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 34 | 42 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Population growth | 36 | 38 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Informing the community | 30 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Appearance of public areas | 26 | 47 | 24 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Consultation & engagement | 29 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Family support services | 28 | 41 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Slashing & weed control | 30 | 40 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Traffic management | 27 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Recreational facilities | 24 | 46 | 26 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Environmental sustainability | 29 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 26 | 41 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Town planning policy | 26 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 27 | 38 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Planning & building permits | 27 | 38 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Parking facilities | 25 | 39 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Business & community dev. | 21 | 43 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Lobbying | 23 | 39 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 21 | 38 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Art centres & libraries | 15 | 39 | 34 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Tourism development | 16 | 34 | 34 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| Community & cultural | 12 | 35 | 39 | 11 | 2 | 1 |

**2017 Performance Summary Index Scores Over Time**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Art centres & libraries | 73 | 72 | 73 | 75 | 73 | 73 |
| Appearance of public areas | 71 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Waste management | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 71 | 72 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Recreational facilities | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Community & cultural | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| Elderly support services | 68 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| Family support services | 67 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 67 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 64 | 63 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 65 |
| Environmental sustainability | 64 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Tourism development | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 61 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 61 | 61 | 62 | 64 | 62 | 63 |
| Business & community dev. | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| Informing the community | 59 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Traffic management | 59 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 58 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 57 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 57 |
| Parking facilities | 55 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| Consultation & engagement | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Community decisions | 54 | 54 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| Lobbying | 54 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 55 |
| Sealed local roads | 53 | 54 | 55 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Slashing & weed control | 53 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 61 |
| Town planning policy | 53 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| Population growth | 52 | 51 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 52 |
| Planning & building permits | 51 | 50 | 54 | 53 | 55 | 54 |
| Unsealed roads | 44 | 43 | 45 | 45 | 44 | 46 |

**Individual Service Areas Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| Appearance of public areas | 25 | 46 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Waste management | 25 | 44 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| Art centres & libraries | 23 | 43 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| Recreational facilities | 22 | 43 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Community & cultural | 17 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 17 | 37 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 12 | 39 | 26 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| Traffic management | 10 | 38 | 30 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Environmental sustainability | 10 | 37 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| Informing the community | 11 | 35 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Tourism development | 13 | 34 | 29 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 13 | 33 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 2 |
| Elderly support services | 14 | 31 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 30 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 11 | 34 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 14 |
| Sealed local roads | 11 | 32 | 28 | 16 | 12 | 1 |
| Parking facilities | 10 | 33 | 32 | 16 | 8 | 2 |
| Family support services | 11 | 30 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 34 |
| Slashing & weed control | 10 | 31 | 27 | 18 | 11 | 3 |
| Business & community dev. | 7 | 33 | 32 | 9 | 3 | 16 |
| Consultation & engagement | 7 | 29 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 10 |
| Community decisions | 6 | 29 | 34 | 14 | 7 | 10 |
| Population growth | 7 | 24 | 29 | 16 | 7 | 16 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 6 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 39 |
| Town planning policy | 5 | 26 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 19 |
| Lobbying | 5 | 24 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 22 |
| Planning & building permits | 5 | 23 | 27 | 14 | 9 | 23 |
| Unsealed roads | 5 | 21 | 28 | 23 | 16 | 7 |

**2017 Importance Summary By Council Group**

**Top Three Most Important Service Areas**

**(Highest to lowest, i.e 1= most important)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Community decisions 3. Waste management |
| Metropolitan | 1. Waste management 2. Community decisions 3. Local streets & footpaths |
| Interface | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Population growth 3. Local streets and footpaths |
| Regional Centres | 1. Community decisions 2. Sealed roads 3. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Large Rural | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Sealed roads 3. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Small Rural | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Community decisions 3. Waste management |

**Bottom Three Least Important Service Areas**

**(Lowest to Highest, i.e 1= least important)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Community & cultural 2. Tourism development 3. Art centres & libraries |
| Metropolitan | 1. Bus/community dev./tourism 2. Community & cultural 3. Slashing & weed control |
| Interface | 1. Tourism development 2. Community & cultural 3. Art centres & libraries |
| Regional Centres | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Community & cultural 3. Planning permits |
| Large Rural | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Community & cultural 3. Traffic management |
| Small Rural | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Tourism development |

**2017 Performance Summary By Council Group**

**Top Three Highest Performing Service Areas**

**(Highest to lowest, i.e 1= highest performance)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Appearance of public areas 3. Waste management |
| Metropolitan | 1. Waste management 2. Arts centres & libraries 3. Recreational facilities |
| Interface | 1. Arts centres & libraries 2. Waste management 3. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Regional Centres | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Appearance of public areas 3. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Large Rural | 1. Appearance of public areas 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Arts centres & libraries |
| Small Rural | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Community & cultural |

**Top Three Lowest Performing Service Areas**

**(Lowest to Highest, i.e 1= lowest performance)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Planning permits 3. Population growth |
| Metropolitan | 1. Planning permits 2. Population growth 3. Parking facilities |
| Interface | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Planning permits 3. Population growth |
| Regional Centres | 1. Parking facilities 2. Community decisions 3. Unsealed roads |
| Large Rural | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Sealed roads 3. Slashing & weed control |
| Small Rural | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Sealed roads 3. Planning permits |

**Importance and Performance 2017 Index Scores Grid**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Service** | **Importance** | **Performance** |
| Consultation & engagement | 74 | 55 |
| Lobbying on behalf of the community | 69 | 54 |
| Making community decisions | 79 | 54 | |
| Condition of sealed local roads | 78 | 53 | |
| Informing the community | 74 | 59 |
| Condition of local streets & footpaths | 77 | 57 |
| Traffic management | 72 | 59 |
| Parking facilities | 70 | 55 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 71 | 64 |
| Family support services | 73 | 67 |
| Elderly support services | 78 | 68 |
| Disadvantaged support services | 71 | 61 |
| Recreational facilities | 72 | 70 |
| Appearance of public areas | 74 | 71 |
| Art centres & libraries | 64 | 73 |
| Community & cultural activities | 61 | 69 |
| Waste management | 79 | 71 |
| Business & community development & tourism | 67 | 61 |
| Town planning policy | 72 | 53 |
| Planning permits | 72 | 51 |
| Environmental sustainability | 72 | 64 |
| Emergency & disaster management | 80 | 70 |
| Planning for pop. growth | 76 | 52 |
| Slashing & weed control | 74 | 53 |
| Maintenance of unsealed roads | 79 | 44 |
| Business & community dev. | 70 | 60 | |
| Tourism development | 62 | 63 | |

**Individual Service Areas Index Score Summary Importance vs Performance**

Service areas where importance exceeds performance by 10 points or more, suggesting further investigation is necessary:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Importance** | **Performance** | **Net Differential** |
| Unsealed roads | 79 | 44 | |  | | --- | | -35 | |  | |
| Community decisions | 79 | 54 | -25 |
| Sealed local roads | 78 | 53 | -25 |
| Population growth | 76 | 52 | -24 |
| Planning & building permits | 72 | 51 | -21 |
| Slashing & weed control | 74 | 53 | -21 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 77 | 57 | -20 |
| Town planning policy | 72 | 53 | -19 |
| Consultation & engagement | 74 | 55 | -19 |
| Informing the community | 74 | 59 | -15 |
| Lobbying | 69 | 54 | -15 |
| Parking facilities | 70 | 55 | -15 |
| Traffic management | 72 | 59 | -13 |
| Business & community dev. | 70 | 60 | -10 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 71 | 61 | -10 |
| Elderly support services | 78 | 68 | -10 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 80 | 70 | -10 |

**2017 Best Things about Council Detailed Percentages**

**2017 Best Aspects**

**TOP MENTIONS ONLY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parks and Gardens | 10 |
| Recreational/Sporting Facilities | 8 |
| Customer Service | 7 |
| Road/Street Maintenance | 5 |
| Waste Management | 5 |
| Community Facilities | 4 |
| Public areas | 4 |
| Generally Good - Overall/No Complaints | 4 |
| Community/Public Events/Activities | 4 |
| Councillors | 4 |
| Nothing | 9 |
| Don't Know | 17 |

**2017 Services to Improve Detailed Percentages**

**2017 Areas for Improvement**

**TOP MENTIONS ONLY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sealed Road Maintenance | 15 |
| Community Consultation | 9 |
| Communication | 9 |
| Development - inappropriate | 5 |
| Financial Management | 5 |
| Parking Availability | 4 |
| Town Planning/Permits/Red Tape | 4 |
| Rates - too expensive | 4 |
| Traffic Management | 4 |
| Waste Management | 4 |
| Footpaths/Walking Tracks | 4 |
| Nothing | 8 |
| Don’t Know | 6 |

**POSITIVES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**Best Things**

|  |
| --- |
| * Parks and Gardens: 10% (equal points on 2016) |
| * Recreational/Sporting Facilities: 8% (equal points on 2016) |
| * Customer Service: 7% (up 1 point from 2016) |

**Areas for Improvement**

|  |
| --- |
| * Sealed Road Maintenance: 15% (up 2 points from 2016) |
| * Community Consultation: 9% (equal points on 2016) |
| * Communication: 9% (equal points on 2016) |

**DETAILED FINDINGS**

**KEY CORE MEASURE OVERALL PERFORMANCE**

**Overall Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 64 | 66 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 62 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| Interface | 60 | 61 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 60 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 61 |
| 65+ | 60 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 61 |
| Overall | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 60 |
| State-wide | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 60 |
| Small Rural | 58 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 59 |
| Men | 58 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 59 |
| Regional Centres | 57 | 55 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 57 | 57 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 58 |
| 50-64 | 55 | 55 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Large Rural | 54 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 56 |

**Overall Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 9 | 36 | 37 | 10 | 5 | 2 |
| 2016 Overall | 9 | 36 | 36 | 11 | 5 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 39 | 35 | 10 | 4 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 40 | 35 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 40 | 35 | 10 | 4 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 40 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 12 | 44 | 33 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Interface | 10 | 36 | 39 | 9 | 4 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 34 | 39 | 11 | 5 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 6 | 31 | 41 | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 10 | 35 | 36 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| Men | 9 | 36 | 37 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| Women | 9 | 37 | 38 | 10 | 4 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 43 | 35 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 7 | 37 | 37 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 32 | 39 | 13 | 6 | 2 |
| 65+ | 11 | 34 | 38 | 10 | 5 | 3 |

**KEY CORE MEASURE CUSTOMER SERVICE**

**Contact Last 12 Months Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall contact with Council | * 59%, equal with 2016 |
| Most contact with Council | * Aged 35-49 years |
| Least contact with Council | * Aged 18-34 years |
| Customer service rating | * Index score of 69, equal points on 2016 |
| Most satisfied with customer service | * Regional Centres * Women |
| Least satisfied with customer service | * Large Rural Shires * Men |

**2017 Contact with Council**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| 35-49 | 66 |
| Small Rural | 63 |
| 50-64 | 63 |
| Interface | 60 |
| Women | 60 |
| Overall | 59 |
| Metropolitan | 59 |
| Men | 58 |
| Large Rural | 57 |
| Regional Centres | 56 |
| 65+ | 56 |
| 18-34 | 52 |

**2017 Contact with Council**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Total have had contact | 61 | 60 | 61 | 61 | 59 | 59 |

**2017 Method of Contact with Council**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| By telephone | 36 | 37 | 39 | 35 | 32 | 32 |
| In person | 34 | 29 | 30 | 32 | 29 | 28 |
| By email | 13 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| In writing | 18 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 11 |
| Via website | 12 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| By social media | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| By text message | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

**2017 Most Recent Method of Contact With Council**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| By telephone | 38 | 42 | 44 | 40 | 38 | 39 |
| In person | 34 | 29 | 28 | 33 | 34 | 32 |
| By email | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| In writing | 12 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| Via website | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| By social media | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| By text message |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**2017 Contact Customer Service Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 72 | 70 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 73 |
| Metropolitan | 71 | 73 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 71 | 71 | 72 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Interface | 69 | 70 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 69 | 69 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| State-wide | 69 | 69 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| 18-34 | 69 | 68 | 69 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Small Rural | 69 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 35-49 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 70 |
| 50-64 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Men | 66 | 67 | 68 | 70 | 70 | 69 |
| Large Rural | 66 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 68 |

**2017 Contact Customer Service Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 30 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| 2016 Overall | 30 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 31 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 32 | 38 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 31 | 38 | 17 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 31 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 33 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 2 |
| Interface | 31 | 34 | 18 | 8 | 7 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 33 | 38 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 25 | 37 | 20 | 9 | 8 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 30 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 7 | 1 |
| Men | 26 | 37 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 2 |
| Women | 33 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 28 | 38 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 28 | 37 | 19 | 8 | 7 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 29 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 7 | 1 |
| 65+ | 34 | 35 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 1 |

**2017 Contact Customer Service Index Scores by Method of Last Contact**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| By text message | 84 | 79 | 79 | 82 | 61 | 68 |
| In person | 76 | 74 | 77 | 77 | 74 | 75 |
| Via website | 75 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 73 | 75 |
| By telephone | 73 | 71 | 73 | 75 | 72 | 73 |
| By social media | 69 | 74 | 66 | 73 | 75 | 79 |
| By email | 65 | 69 | 68 | 70 | 68 | 73 |
| In writing | 61 | 62 | 66 | 69 | 68 | 69 |

**2017 Contact Customer Service Detailed Percentages by Method of Last Contact**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| By text message\* | 45 | 51 | - | 4 | - | - |
| In person | 39 | 37 | 14 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Via website | 28 | 50 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| By telephone | 35 | 36 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| By social media | 22 | 41 | 24 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| By email | 26 | 34 | 21 | 8 | 9 | 2 |
| In writing | 18 | 34 | 25 | 11 | 7 | 3 |

**KEY CORE MEASURE COUNCIL DIRECTION INDICATORS**

**Council Direction**

**Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Council Direction from Q6 | * + 62% stayed about the same, equal points on 2016   + 19% improved, up 1 point on 2016   + 13% deteriorated, down 2 points on 2016 |
| Most satisfied with Council Direction from Q6 | * + Aged 18-34 years |
| Least satisfied with Council Direction from Q6 | * + Aged 50-64 years |
| Improvement from Q7 | * + 46% a lot of room for improvement   + 42% little room for improvement   + 7% not much room for improvement |
| Direction Headed from Q8 | * + 65% right direction (18% definitely and 47% probably)   + 22% wrong direction (12% probably and 10% definitely) |
| Rates vs Services Trade-Off from Q10 | * + 31% prefer rate rise, equal points on 2016   + 49% prefer service cuts, down 1 point on 2016 |

**2017 Overall Council Direction Last 12 Months Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 56 | 56 | 58 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| Regional Centres | 55 | 51 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 54 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 53 |
| Women | 54 | 52 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 52 |
| Metropolitan | 54 | 55 | 56 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 53 | 54 | 54 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 53 | 51 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 52 |
| State-wide | 53 | 51 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 52 |
| Small Rural | 52 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 52 | 50 |
| Men | 52 | 51 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 51 |
| Large Rural | 52 | 48 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 48 |
| 35-49 | 51 | 49 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 49 |
| 50-64 | 50 | 48 | 51 | 50 | 50 | 48 |

**2017 Overall Council Direction Last 12 Months Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Improved* | *Stayed the same* | *Deteriorated* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 19 | 62 | 13 | 6 |
| 2016 Overall | 18 | 62 | 15 | 5 |
| 2015 Overall | 20 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 64 | 15 | 4 |
| Metropolitan | 17 | 65 | 11 | 7 |
| Interface | 17 | 65 | 12 | 6 |
| Regional Centres | 24 | 57 | 14 | 6 |
| Large Rural | 19 | 61 | 15 | 5 |
| Small Rural | 19 | 61 | 15 | 5 |
| Men | 19 | 61 | 15 | 5 |
| Women | 19 | 62 | 12 | 7 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 63 | 10 | 6 |
| 35-49 | 17 | 63 | 15 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 17 | 60 | 17 | 6 |
| 65+ | 20 | 60 | 12 | 7 |

**2017 Room for Improvement in Services Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *A lot* | *A little* | *Not much* | *Not at all* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 46 | 42 | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| 2016 Overall | 40 | 48 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 47 | 44 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 41 | 50 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 46 | 46 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 47 | 45 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 34 | 52 | 9 | 1 | 4 |
| Large Rural | 58 | 33 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Men | 46 | 44 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 46 | 41 | 7 | 1 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 44 | 45 | 9 | \* | 2 |
| 35-49 | 47 | 44 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 49 | 41 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| 65+ | 46 | 39 | 8 | 2 | 6 |

**2017 Right/ Wrong Direction Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Definitely right direction* | *Probably right direction* | *Probably wrong direction* | *Definitely wrong direction* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 18 | 47 | 12 | 10 | 13 |
| 2016 Overall | 20 | 48 | 9 | 9 | 14 |
| 2015 Overall | 20 | 49 | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| 2014 Overall | 21 | 52 | 9 | 8 | 10 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 50 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 49 | 11 | 12 | 10 |
| Metropolitan | 19 | 50 | 10 | 8 | 14 |
| Interface | 12 | 48 | 15 | 14 | 10 |
| Large Rural | 17 | 45 | 13 | 12 | 14 |
| Small Rural | 22 | 45 | 9 | 10 | 13 |
| Men | 18 | 45 | 10 | 12 | 14 |
| Women | 17 | 49 | 13 | 9 | 12 |
| 18-34 | 17 | 51 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 17 | 43 | 14 | 12 | 14 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 46 | 12 | 11 | 16 |
| 65+ | 21 | 48 | 9 | 8 | 14 |

**2017 Rate/ Service Trade Off Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Definitely prefer rate rise | Probably prefer rate rise | Probably prefer service cuts | Definitely prefer service cuts | Can't say |
| 2017 Overall | 10 | 21 | 23 | 27 | 20 |
| 2016 Overall | 10 | 21 | 22 | 28 | 19 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 23 | 22 | 26 | 18 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 17 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 25 | 22 | 24 | 18 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 29 | 22 | 22 | 16 |
| Metropolitan | 10 | 22 | 22 | 27 | 19 |
| Interface | 8 | 18 | 28 | 26 | 21 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 17 | 24 | 29 | 23 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 21 | 22 | 26 | 21 |
| Small Rural | 13 | 20 | 22 | 27 | 18 |
| Men | 12 | 20 | 21 | 28 | 19 |
| Women | 8 | 21 | 24 | 25 | 21 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 25 | 25 | 23 | 15 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 19 | 22 | 29 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 19 | 22 | 28 | 21 |
| 65+ | 9 | 19 | 21 | 29 | 23 |

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**Communications Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall preferred forms of communication | * Newsletter sent via mail (34%) |
| Preferred forms of communication among over 50s | * Newsletter sent via mail (37%) |
| Preferred forms of communication among under 50s | * Newsletter sent via mail (32%) |
| Greatest change since 2016 | * Newsletter sent via mail (down 5 points on 2016) |

Note: Website and text message formats again did not rate as highly as other modes of communication, although further analysis is recommended to understand the demographic preference profiles of the various different forms of communication.

**2017 Best Forms of Communication**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 42 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 34 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 18 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 25 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 18 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 14 | 15 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local paper | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 12 |
| A text message | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The council website | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Can't say | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**2017 Best Forms of Communication: Under 50s**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 39 | 37 | 36 | 35 | 37 | 32 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 21 | 21 | 24 | 25 | 27 | 28 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 18 | 19 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 13 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local paper | 14 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 10 |
| A text message | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 |
| The council website | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Other | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Can't say | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

**2017 Best Forms of Communication: Over 50s**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 46 | 42 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 37 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 15 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 18 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local paper | 16 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| A text message | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| The council website | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Can't say | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

**INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AREAS**

**2017 Community Consultation and Engagement Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 50-64 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 |
| Household user | 77 | 77 | 77 | n/a | n/a | 78 |
| Personal user | 77 | 77 | 77 | n/a | n/a | 78 |
| Regional Centres | 76 | 75 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 76 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 |
| 65+ | 75 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 73 |
| 35-49 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 74 | 75 |
| Small Rural | 75 | 77 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 75 |
| Large Rural | 75 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 74 |
| Overall | 74 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| State-wide | 74 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| Interface | 72 | 75 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 72 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 72 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 72 | 68 | 68 | 67 | 68 |

**2017 Community Consultation and Engagement Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 29 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 32 | 41 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 29 | 42 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 28 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 26 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 26 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 33 | 39 | 24 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural | 31 | 41 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 30 | 42 | 23 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 26 | 40 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 32 | 42 | 22 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 35 | 36 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 42 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 36 | 42 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 29 | 46 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

**2017 Community Consultation And Engagement Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 58 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Metropolitan | 57 | 58 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 56 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 |
| Small Rural | 55 | 55 | 56 | 58 | 58 | 57 |
| 65+ | 55 | 55 | 56 | 58 | 58 | 58 |
| Overall | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Regional Centres | 54 | 52 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 53 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 53 | 53 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 56 |
| 35-49 | 53 | 54 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 55 |
| Large Rural | 52 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| 50-64 | 52 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 54 | 54 |

**2017 Community Consultation and Engagement Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 7 | 29 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 10 |
| 2016 Overall | 8 | 29 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 10 |
| 2015 Overall | 7 | 31 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 32 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 9 |
| 2013 Overall | 8 | 32 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 9 |
| 2012 Overall | 8 | 33 | 33 | 13 | 5 | 8 |
| Metropolitan | 7 | 31 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 13 |
| Interface | 6 | 28 | 33 | 16 | 5 | 12 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 29 | 33 | 15 | 7 | 8 |
| Large Rural | 6 | 28 | 33 | 16 | 8 | 9 |
| Small Rural | 9 | 30 | 30 | 15 | 7 | 9 |
| Men | 7 | 29 | 32 | 15 | 8 | 9 |
| Women | 8 | 30 | 32 | 14 | 5 | 11 |
| 18-34 | 7 | 34 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 7 | 29 | 32 | 16 | 7 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 26 | 33 | 17 | 8 | 9 |
| 65+ | 9 | 28 | 31 | 14 | 6 | 12 |

**2017 Lobbying on Behalf of The Community Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 72 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| Regional Centres | 72 | 69 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 72 |
| 35-49 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 72 |
| Small Rural | 70 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 73 |
| Overall | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Large Rural | 69 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 |
| 65+ | 68 | 68 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| Metropolitan | 67 | 68 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 67 | 70 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 66 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 68 |
| Men | 66 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 67 |

**2017 Lobbying on Behalf of The Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 23 | 39 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| 2016 Overall | 24 | 38 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 23 | 39 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 40 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 23 | 40 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 41 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 21 | 38 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Interface | 21 | 37 | 28 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 22 | 40 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 24 | 40 | 27 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Men | 19 | 38 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 2 |
| Women | 26 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 18 | 36 | 36 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 25 | 40 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 38 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| 65+ | 21 | 41 | 25 | 6 | 3 | 4 |

**2017 Lobbying on Behalf of The Community Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 57 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 60 |
| Metropolitan | 56 | 56 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 56 |
| 65+ | 55 | 54 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Women | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 56 |
| Interface | 54 | 55 | 56 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 54 | 52 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 54 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 55 |
| Men | 53 | 53 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| 35-49 | 52 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 53 | 53 |
| Large Rural | 51 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 53 | 53 |
| 50-64 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 52 |

**2017 Lobbying on Behalf of The Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 5 | 24 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 22 |
| 2016 Overall | 5 | 23 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 22 |
| 2015 Overall | 6 | 26 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 20 |
| 2014 Overall | 6 | 27 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 19 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 26 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 18 |
| 2012 Overall | 6 | 27 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 17 |
| Metropolitan | 5 | 24 | 30 | 11 | 3 | 27 |
| Interface | 5 | 23 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 23 |
| Regional Centres | 6 | 27 | 32 | 14 | 5 | 15 |
| Large Rural | 4 | 22 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 20 |
| Small Rural | 6 | 26 | 29 | 12 | 5 | 21 |
| Men | 5 | 24 | 31 | 13 | 6 | 20 |
| Women | 5 | 24 | 31 | 13 | 4 | 23 |
| 18-34 | 5 | 30 | 32 | 10 | 4 | 19 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 23 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 21 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 22 |
| 65+ | 6 | 23 | 29 | 12 | 5 | 26 |

**2017 Decisions Made in The Interest of The Community Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 82 | 82 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 81 | 82 | 81 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-60 | 81 | 80 | 82 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 80 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 80 | 80 | 80 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 79 | 79 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 79 | 79 | 78 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 78 | n/a | 82 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 78 | 79 | 78 | 78 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Decisions Made in The Interest of The Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 39 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2016 Overall | 39 | 42 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 38 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 37 | 43 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 38 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 39 | 41 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 44 | 39 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 40 | 41 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 34 | 46 | 17 | \* | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 36 | 42 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 42 | 42 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 36 | 42 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 42 | 40 | 15 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 40 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 35 | 44 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 3 |

**2017 Decisions Made in The Interest of The Community Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 58 | 59 | 59 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 60 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 55 | 56 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 55 | 54 | 55 | 58 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 55 | 55 | 56 | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 55 | 53 | 56 | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 54 | 54 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 53 | 53 | 54 | 56 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 52 | 51 | 52 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 51 | 50 | 52 | 53 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 51 | 50 | 52 | 53 | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Decisions Made in The Interest of The Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 6 | 29 | 34 | 14 | 7 | 10 |
| 2016 Overall | 7 | 29 | 33 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| 2015 Overall | 7 | 31 | 33 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| 2014 Overall | 7 | 33 | 34 | 12 | 5 | 10 |
| Metropolitan | 7 | 32 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 14 |
| Interface | 6 | 29 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 13 |
| Regional Centres | 7 | 28 | 34 | 17 | 8 | 7 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 26 | 36 | 16 | 8 | 9 |
| Small Rural | 7 | 31 | 33 | 14 | 7 | 9 |
| Men | 6 | 29 | 33 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| Women | 6 | 29 | 34 | 13 | 6 | 11 |
| 18-34 | 7 | 35 | 32 | 11 | 5 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 28 | 33 | 15 | 8 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 25 | 36 | 16 | 8 | 10 |
| 65+ | 8 | 28 | 34 | 13 | 6 | 12 |

**2017 The Condition of Sealed Local Roads in Your Area Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 81 | n/a | 78 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 80 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 80 | 79 | 78 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 80 | 79 | 78 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 79 | 79 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 78 | 78 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 77 | 80 | 78 | 80 | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 77 | 76 | 75 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 77 | 76 | 75 | 75 | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 75 | 76 | 73 | 73 | n/a | n/a |

**2017 The Condition of Sealed Local Roads in Your Area Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 35 | 44 | 18 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 34 | 46 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 32 | 44 | 20 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 45 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 32 | 47 | 18 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Interface | 38 | 42 | 18 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Regional Centres | 41 | 41 | 16 | 2 | - | \* |
| Large Rural | 36 | 40 | 21 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Small Rural | 41 | 43 | 14 | 1 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 32 | 45 | 20 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Women | 38 | 43 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 32 | 42 | 23 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| 35-49 | 38 | 41 | 18 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 39 | 45 | 14 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 65+ | 33 | 50 | 15 | 1 | \* | 1 |

**2017 The Condition of Sealed Local Roads in Your Area Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 66 | 67 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 59 | 60 | 60 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 56 | 58 | 57 | 59 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 54 | 56 | 57 | 56 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 54 | 54 | 55 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 53 | 54 | 55 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 53 | 54 | 55 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 53 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 54 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 52 | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 50 | 52 | 52 | 51 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 43 | 44 | 45 | 43 | n/a | n/a |

**2017 The Condition of Sealed Local Roads in Your Area Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 11 | 32 | 28 | 16 | 12 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 11 | 33 | 28 | 16 | 11 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 11 | 33 | 29 | 16 | 10 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 12 | 33 | 27 | 17 | 10 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 19 | 43 | 24 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| Interface | 13 | 38 | 27 | 13 | 8 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 30 | 28 | 17 | 13 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 6 | 22 | 29 | 22 | 19 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 8 | 28 | 30 | 19 | 14 | 2 |
| Men | 12 | 31 | 27 | 16 | 13 | 1 |
| Women | 11 | 32 | 28 | 16 | 12 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 14 | 34 | 24 | 15 | 12 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 30 | 28 | 17 | 13 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 30 | 28 | 18 | 13 | 1 |
| 65+ | 11 | 32 | 30 | 15 | 10 | 2 |

**2017 Informing the Community Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 77 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| Regional Centres | 77 | 76 | 76 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 76 | 77 | 78 |
| Small Rural | 76 | 78 | 76 | 76 | 77 | 76 |
| 65+ | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Interface | 74 | 77 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 74 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Large Rural | 74 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| 35-49 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 74 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 72 | 75 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 74 |
| Men | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 72 |

**2017 Informing the Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 30 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 2016 Overall | 33 | 42 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 30 | 44 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 30 | 43 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 30 | 44 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 31 | 44 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 27 | 43 | 24 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Interface | 31 | 43 | 21 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 35 | 41 | 21 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 30 | 41 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 32 | 44 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 25 | 42 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 35 | 44 | 18 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 18-34 | 27 | 39 | 27 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 30 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 34 | 43 | 19 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 30 | 47 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

**2017 Informing the Community Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 61 | 63 | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 61 | 59 | 61 | 65 | 63 | 62 |
| Women | 60 | 60 | 62 | 63 | 62 | 61 |
| 18-34 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| Large Rural | 60 | 56 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 57 |
| Overall | 59 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| 35-49 | 59 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 60 | 58 |
| Small Rural | 58 | 58 | 60 | 65 | 61 | 61 |
| Regional Centres | 58 | 59 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 58 | 58 | 60 | 62 | 61 | 59 |
| 50-64 | 57 | 56 | 58 | 60 | 59 | 57 |
| Interface | 55 | 55 | 56 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Informing the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 11 | 35 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| 2016 Overall | 12 | 35 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 4 |
| 2015 Overall | 12 | 38 | 31 | 12 | 4 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 40 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 12 | 38 | 32 | 11 | 3 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 12 | 38 | 31 | 13 | 4 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 12 | 37 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
| Interface | 8 | 29 | 37 | 17 | 5 | 4 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 33 | 32 | 15 | 5 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 10 | 38 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 35 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 3 |
| Men | 11 | 35 | 32 | 14 | 5 | 3 |
| Women | 12 | 36 | 32 | 13 | 4 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 38 | 32 | 13 | 4 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 34 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 33 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 3 |
| 65+ | 14 | 35 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 4 |

**2017 The Condition of Local Streets and Footpaths in Your Area Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 80 | 79 | 78 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 79 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 81 | 79 |
| Metropolitan | 78 | 78 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 |
| 35-49 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 77 |
| 65+ | 78 | 77 | 78 | 77 | 78 | 78 |
| Overall | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 77 |
| Regional Centres | 77 | 77 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 76 | 75 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 76 |
| Large Rural | 75 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 78 |
| Men | 75 | 74 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| 18-34 | 74 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 74 |

**2017 The Condition of Local Streets and Footpaths in Your Area Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 34 | 42 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 34 | 43 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 34 | 43 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 44 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 35 | 44 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 32 | 46 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 36 | 43 | 18 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 40 | 41 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 34 | 42 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 31 | 42 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 32 | 43 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Men | 29 | 43 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 39 | 41 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 31 | 39 | 25 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| 35-49 | 37 | 41 | 19 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 37 | 41 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 33 | 47 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

**2017 The Condition of Local Streets and Footpaths in Your Area Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 62 | 63 | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 62 | 63 | 62 |
| Men | 57 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 58 |
| Regional Centres | 57 | 58 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 57 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 57 |
| 65+ | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Small Rural | 57 | 58 | 59 | 58 | 56 | 56 |
| 35-49 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| Women | 56 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 56 | 56 |
| Interface | 56 | 57 | 56 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| Large Rural | 53 | 53 | 54 | 53 | 52 | 51 |

**2017 The Condition Of Local Streets And Footpaths In Your Area Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 13 | 33 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 2 |
| 2016 Overall | 12 | 34 | 28 | 14 | 8 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 7 | 3 |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 7 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 14 | 33 | 28 | 15 | 8 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 15 | 40 | 27 | 12 | 5 | 1 |
| Interface | 12 | 33 | 28 | 15 | 10 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 33 | 30 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 10 | 29 | 28 | 17 | 11 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 13 | 32 | 28 | 14 | 9 | 4 |
| Men | 13 | 35 | 28 | 14 | 8 | 2 |
| Women | 12 | 32 | 29 | 15 | 9 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 37 | 25 | 13 | 8 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 13 | 33 | 28 | 16 | 9 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 32 | 30 | 16 | 9 | 3 |
| 65+ | 13 | 32 | 29 | 14 | 8 | 4 |

**2017 Traffic Management Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 76 | 75 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 75 | 75 | 73 | 73 | 75 | 76 |
| 65+ | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 75 |
| 50-64 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 74 | 74 |
| Overall | 72 | 72 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 |
| 35-49 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 69 | 71 | 73 |
| Regional Centres | 71 | 72 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 71 | 70 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 72 |
| Men | 69 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 69 | 70 |
| Large Rural | 67 | 70 | 68 | 67 | 69 | 68 |
| Interface | 67 | 71 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 62 | 63 | 57 | 64 | 66 | 68 |

**2017 Traffic Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 27 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 27 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 25 | 41 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 26 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 29 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 33 | 43 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 24 | 33 | 29 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 25 | 42 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 19 | 41 | 29 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 16 | 34 | 35 | 13 | 3 | - |
| Men | 23 | 41 | 26 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 31 | 42 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 26 | 40 | 25 | 8 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 28 | 40 | 24 | 6 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 28 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 27 | 45 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

**2017 Traffic Management Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 67 | 65 | 67 | 68 | 64 | 65 |
| Large Rural | 62 | 62 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 59 |
| Regional Centres | 61 | 59 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 62 |
| 65+ | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 61 | 60 |
| Women | 60 | 60 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 59 |
| Interface | 59 | 57 | 61 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 59 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 58 |
| Men | 58 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 58 |
| 35-49 | 58 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 58 | 55 |
| 50-64 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 56 |
| Metropolitan | 56 | 56 | 57 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Traffic Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 10 | 38 | 30 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| 2016 Overall | 10 | 38 | 30 | 13 | 6 | 4 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 40 | 31 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| 2014 Overall | 10 | 40 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 39 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 38 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Metropolitan | 9 | 35 | 30 | 17 | 6 | 3 |
| Interface | 9 | 39 | 33 | 11 | 6 | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 11 | 41 | 31 | 10 | 5 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 10 | 41 | 31 | 8 | 4 | 6 |
| Small Rural | 14 | 45 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 6 |
| Men | 10 | 37 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 3 |
| Women | 10 | 39 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 42 | 29 | 12 | 5 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 36 | 31 | 14 | 6 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 37 | 31 | 15 | 6 | 3 |
| 65+ | 11 | 37 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 6 |

**2017 Parking Facilities Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 73 | 73 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Women | 73 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 72 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 72 | 73 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 72 |
| Overall | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 70 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
| Men | 66 | 66 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 68 |
| Large Rural | 66 | 68 | 67 | 66 | 69 | 69 |
| Interface | 64 | 68 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 64 | 65 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 |

**2017 Parking Facilities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 25 | 39 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 24 | 41 | 27 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 24 | 41 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 24 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 42 | 26 | 6 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 28 | 43 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 16 | 37 | 35 | 10 | 2 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 29 | 38 | 27 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 19 | 36 | 34 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 18 | 34 | 35 | 9 | 3 | \* |
| Men | 20 | 38 | 32 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 29 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 35 | 34 | 8 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 24 | 39 | 29 | 6 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 26 | 39 | 27 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 28 | 45 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 1 |

**2017 Parking Facilities Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 63 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Large Rural | 60 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 56 |
| Interface | 57 | 56 | 60 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 56 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| 35-49 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 57 | 55 |
| Men | 56 | 56 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 57 |
| Overall | 55 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| Women | 55 | 56 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 56 |
| 65+ | 54 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 56 | 55 |
| 50-64 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| Metropolitan | 53 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 52 | 54 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Parking Facilities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 10 | 33 | 32 | 16 | 8 | 2 |
| 2016 Overall | 9 | 34 | 32 | 14 | 7 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 9 | 36 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 3 |
| 2014 Overall | 10 | 35 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 9 | 36 | 33 | 14 | 6 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 35 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 8 | 29 | 34 | 18 | 8 | 2 |
| Interface | 9 | 36 | 32 | 13 | 7 | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 10 | 27 | 32 | 19 | 11 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 40 | 31 | 11 | 5 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 14 | 41 | 27 | 10 | 5 | 2 |
| Men | 10 | 33 | 32 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| Women | 9 | 32 | 32 | 16 | 8 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 35 | 31 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 33 | 33 | 14 | 8 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 31 | 34 | 16 | 8 | 2 |
| 65+ | 10 | 30 | 30 | 18 | 8 | 4 |

**2017 Enforcement of Local Laws Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| 65+ | 73 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 71 |
| Interface | 73 | 73 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 72 | 71 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 71 | 70 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 70 |
| Overall | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 |
| 18-34 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 72 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 68 | 70 | 68 |
| Large Rural | 68 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 69 |
| Men | 68 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 68 | 66 |
| Small Rural | 67 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 |

**2017 Enforcement of Local Laws Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 27 | 38 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 26 | 38 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 25 | 41 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 24 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 41 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 29 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 31 | 36 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 28 | 37 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 23 | 37 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 22 | 38 | 29 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| Men | 23 | 37 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 31 | 39 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 27 | 36 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 27 | 35 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 39 | 26 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 26 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

**2017 Enforcement of Local Laws Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 67 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Regional Centres | 66 | 64 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 65 | 64 | 66 | 67 | 65 | 65 |
| Women | 65 | 65 | 67 | 67 | 66 | 67 |
| 35-49 | 64 | 63 | 65 | 66 | 65 | 64 |
| Metropolitan | 64 | 64 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 64 | 63 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 65 |
| Large Rural | 63 | 63 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| Men | 63 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 64 | 64 |
| 65+ | 63 | 62 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| 50-64 | 61 | 61 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 63 |
| Interface | 60 | 61 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Enforcement of Local Laws Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 12 | 39 | 26 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| 2016 Overall | 12 | 37 | 26 | 8 | 4 | 14 |
| 2015 Overall | 13 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 12 |
| 2014 Overall | 14 | 41 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| 2013 Overall | 13 | 40 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 12 |
| 2012 Overall | 13 | 40 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| Metropolitan | 13 | 38 | 26 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| Interface | 10 | 34 | 29 | 9 | 5 | 13 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 42 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 10 |
| Large Rural | 10 | 40 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| Small Rural | 13 | 40 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 12 |
| Men | 11 | 38 | 26 | 8 | 4 | 11 |
| Women | 13 | 39 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 14 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 40 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 35 | 28 | 9 | 4 | 14 |
| 65+ | 11 | 35 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 16 |

**2017 Family Support Services Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 78 |
| Regional Centres | 76 | 73 | 75 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 75 |
| Interface | 74 | 75 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| 35-49 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| Large Rural | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| 50-64 | 72 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 |
| 65+ | 71 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 |
| Small Rural | 71 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 74 |
| Men | 69 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 69 |

**2017 Family Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 28 | 41 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 2016 Overall | 28 | 41 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 28 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 26 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 44 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 44 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 29 | 41 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 31 | 40 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 34 | 40 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 27 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 24 | 42 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Men | 22 | 40 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Women | 35 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 33 | 42 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 30 | 40 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 38 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 23 | 44 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 5 |

**2017 Family Support Services Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 70 | 69 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 70 |
| Metropolitan | 68 | 69 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 68 | 66 | 67 | 69 | 67 | 67 |
| Women | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 68 | 67 |
| Regional Centres | 67 | 66 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 67 | 66 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 68 |
| Overall | 67 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 67 |
| Men | 66 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 66 |
| 35-49 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 65 |
| Interface | 65 | 65 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 65 | 64 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 |
| 50-64 | 64 | 62 | 65 | 66 | 64 | 64 |

**2017 Family Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 11 | 30 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 34 |
| 2016 Overall | 10 | 31 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 32 |
| 2015 Overall | 11 | 34 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| 2014 Overall | 12 | 33 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 33 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 34 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 26 |
| Metropolitan | 10 | 28 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 38 |
| Interface | 9 | 30 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 36 |
| Regional Centres | 14 | 33 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 24 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 31 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 31 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 31 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 33 |
| Men | 9 | 30 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 35 |
| Women | 12 | 30 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 32 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 35 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 24 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 32 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 29 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 26 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 41 |
| 65+ | 12 | 27 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 41 |

**2017 Elderly Support Services Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 82 | 82 | 82 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Regional Centres | 80 | 78 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 81 | 81 |
| 65+ | 79 | 79 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 81 |
| Small Rural | 79 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 | 80 |
| Interface | 78 | 79 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 78 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 80 |
| Overall | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 80 |
| 35-49 | 77 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 80 |
| Metropolitan | 77 | 78 | 78 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 |
| Men | 74 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 76 |

**2017 Elderly Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 35 | 44 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 36 | 44 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 36 | 44 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 35 | 46 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 36 | 45 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 37 | 46 | 14 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 33 | 45 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 34 | 45 | 19 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 39 | 43 | 16 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural | 36 | 43 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 37 | 44 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 27 | 46 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 42 | 43 | 13 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 31 | 44 | 22 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 34 | 44 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 40 | 43 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 36 | 46 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

**2017 Elderly Support Services Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 72 | 71 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 73 |
| Small Rural | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| Women | 68 | 69 | 69 | 71 | 70 | 69 |
| Overall | 68 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| Men | 68 | 67 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| Regional Centres | 68 | 66 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 67 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 67 | 66 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| 35-49 | 66 | 65 | 66 | 68 | 67 | 66 |
| 50-64 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 69 | 67 | 67 |
| Interface | 64 | 59 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Elderly Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 14 | 31 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 30 |
| 2016 Overall | 14 | 30 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 30 |
| 2015 Overall | 15 | 34 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 26 |
| 2014 Overall | 16 | 34 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 27 |
| 2013 Overall | 15 | 33 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 28 |
| 2012 Overall | 15 | 34 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 25 |
| Metropolitan | 11 | 27 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 39 |
| Interface | 10 | 26 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 36 |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 36 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| Large Rural | 14 | 31 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 27 |
| Small Rural | 19 | 35 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 22 |
| Men | 13 | 32 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 30 |
| Women | 15 | 29 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 30 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 33 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 31 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 27 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 38 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 29 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 30 |
| 65+ | 22 | 32 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 22 |

**2017 Disadvantaged Support Services Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 75 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 77 |
| Regional Centres | 75 | 73 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 72 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 75 |
| Interface | 72 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Overall | 71 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Metropolitan | 71 | 73 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Large Rural | 70 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 70 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Small Rural | 70 | 75 | n/a | n/a | 70 | n/a |
| Men | 67 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 69 | 69 |

**2017 Disadvantaged Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 26 | 41 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 2016 Overall | 27 | 42 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 28 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 44 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 26 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 30 | 39 | 20 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 34 | 40 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 25 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 24 | 40 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Men | 20 | 40 | 28 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| Women | 32 | 42 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 27 | 41 | 26 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 26 | 39 | 25 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 28 | 39 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 24 | 45 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 4 |

**2017 Disadvantaged Support Services Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 64 | 64 | 65 | 67 | 64 | 66 |
| Regional Centres | 63 | 59 | 61 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 62 | 62 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 62 | 61 | 62 | 65 | 64 | 63 |
| 18-34 | 61 | 60 | 62 | 65 | 65 | 66 |
| Overall | 61 | 61 | 62 | 64 | 62 | 63 |
| Large Rural | 61 | 61 | 62 | 64 | 62 | 62 |
| Women | 61 | 60 | 62 | 63 | 61 | 63 |
| Small Rural | 61 | 57 | 62 | 66 | 62 | 63 |
| 35-49 | 60 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| 50-64 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 59 |
| Interface | 56 | 58 | 61 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Disadvantaged Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 6 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 39 |
| 2016 Overall | 6 | 24 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 39 |
| 2015 Overall | 7 | 28 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 35 |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 28 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 35 |
| 2013 Overall | 7 | 27 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 36 |
| 2012 Overall | 8 | 28 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 34 |
| Metropolitan | 6 | 23 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 43 |
| Interface | 2 | 23 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 37 |
| Regional Centres | 10 | 30 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 26 |
| Large Rural | 6 | 25 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 40 |
| Small Rural | 8 | 26 | 28 | 6 | 4 | 29 |
| Men | 6 | 25 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 39 |
| Women | 6 | 25 | 21 | 7 | 2 | 39 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 30 | 24 | 7 | 2 | 31 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 22 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 42 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 21 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 44 |
| 65+ | 8 | 25 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 41 |

**2017 Recreational Facilities Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 35-49 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 75 |
| Women | 74 | 75 | 73 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Regional Centres | 73 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 |
| Large Rural | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 74 | 72 |
| Overall | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Interface | 72 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| Small Rural | 71 | 72 | 73 | 71 | 71 | 72 |
| 18-34 | 71 | 72 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Men | 70 | 71 | 71 | 70 | 70 | 70 |

**2017 Recreational Facilities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 24 | 46 | 26 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 2016 Overall | 25 | 45 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 23 | 46 | 26 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 47 | 26 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 23 | 47 | 26 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 22 | 49 | 25 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 24 | 47 | 26 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 23 | 46 | 27 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 24 | 46 | 26 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 24 | 46 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 23 | 43 | 28 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 22 | 44 | 28 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 25 | 47 | 24 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 18-34 | 22 | 43 | 30 | 5 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 28 | 45 | 24 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 24 | 47 | 25 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 20 | 49 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

**2017 Recreational Facilities Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 73 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 74 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 73 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Overall | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Small Rural | 69 | 68 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Men | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 69 |
| Regional Centres | 69 | 70 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 69 | 67 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| 18-34 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 35-49 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 67 |
| Large Rural | 66 | 65 | 66 | 68 | 66 | 67 |
| Interface | 66 | 67 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Recreational Facilities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 22 | 43 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| 2016 Overall | 21 | 43 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| 2015 Overall | 22 | 43 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 44 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 22 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 21 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Metropolitan | 25 | 45 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Interface | 16 | 42 | 26 | 9 | 3 | 4 |
| Regional Centres | 23 | 42 | 20 | 9 | 2 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 19 | 41 | 23 | 9 | 3 | 5 |
| Small Rural | 23 | 42 | 21 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Men | 21 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Women | 23 | 42 | 21 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 21 | 42 | 24 | 8 | 3 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 20 | 43 | 22 | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 20 | 43 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| 65+ | 26 | 44 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 7 |

**2017 The Appearance of Public Areas Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 76 | 75 |
| 50-64 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 76 | 74 |
| 35-49 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 74 |
| Interface | 75 | 75 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 75 | 74 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 75 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| Overall | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 73 |
| Small Rural | 74 | 74 | 73 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Regional Centres | 74 | 74 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 72 |
| Men | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 71 |
| 18-34 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 71 |

**2017 The Appearance of Public Areas Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 26 | 47 | 24 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2016 Overall | 26 | 48 | 23 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 2015 Overall | 24 | 47 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 48 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 26 | 48 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 49 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Metropolitan | 27 | 48 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 27 | 48 | 22 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 45 | 26 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 25 | 46 | 27 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Small Rural | 26 | 47 | 23 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 23 | 47 | 26 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 29 | 47 | 21 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 25 | 42 | 29 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 28 | 47 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 28 | 47 | 22 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 65+ | 24 | 52 | 21 | 2 | \* | 1 |

**2017 The Appearance of Public Areas Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 74 | 73 | 74 | 76 | 73 | 74 |
| Regional Centres | 73 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 |
| Women | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 72 |
| 35-49 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 70 |
| Metropolitan | 72 | 72 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 |
| Overall | 71 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Men | 71 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| 50-64 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 69 | 70 |
| Large Rural | 69 | 69 | 69 | 71 | 69 | 70 |
| Interface | 66 | 66 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 The Appearance of Public Areas Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 25 | 46 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 24 | 46 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 24 | 47 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 46 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 24 | 46 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 48 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 24 | 48 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 17 | 43 | 30 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 28 | 46 | 18 | 6 | 2 | \* |
| Large Rural | 20 | 45 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 30 | 44 | 17 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Men | 23 | 47 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 27 | 44 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 25 | 46 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 25 | 47 | 19 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 46 | 22 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 26 | 44 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 2 |

**2017 Art Centres and Libraries Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 71 |
| Metropolitan | 67 | 68 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 66 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 68 |
| 35-49 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 67 | 67 |
| Overall | 64 | 66 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| 50-64 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 67 |
| Large Rural | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 63 |
| Regional Centres | 62 | 64 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 62 | 66 | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 61 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 |
| Small Rural | 61 | 65 | 62 | 64 | 66 | n/a |
| Men | 60 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 |

**2017 Art Centres and Libraries Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 15 | 39 | 34 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 18 | 40 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 16 | 40 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 17 | 40 | 33 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 16 | 42 | 33 | 7 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 17 | 42 | 33 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 18 | 41 | 32 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 14 | 36 | 36 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 14 | 36 | 36 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 15 | 39 | 32 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 36 | 38 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| Men | 12 | 34 | 37 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 19 | 43 | 32 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 35 | 40 | 11 | 2 | \* |
| 35-49 | 18 | 39 | 32 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 38 | 34 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 16 | 44 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 1 |

**2017 Art Centres and Libraries Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 23 | 43 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| 2016 Overall | 23 | 42 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| 2015 Overall | 24 | 44 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| 2014 Overall | 27 | 44 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 44 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 44 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Metropolitan | 25 | 44 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| Interface | 21 | 42 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 11 |
| Regional Centres | 27 | 42 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| Large Rural | 18 | 43 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 12 |
| Small Rural | 22 | 43 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| Men | 20 | 43 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 12 |
| Women | 26 | 44 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 45 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 43 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 20 | 43 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 12 |
| 65+ | 27 | 43 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 11 |

**2017 Art Centres and Libraries Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 65 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 35-49 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Regional Centres | 62 | 62 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 62 | 64 | 65 | 60 | 64 | 63 |
| Metropolitan | 61 | 62 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 61 | 64 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 63 |
| Overall | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| 65+ | 61 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 63 | 62 |
| Large Rural | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 59 |
| 50-64 | 60 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 61 |
| Men | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 58 |
| Interface | 57 | 63 | 59 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Community and Cultural Activities Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 65 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 35-49 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Regional Centres | 62 | 62 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 62 | 64 | 65 | 60 | 64 | 63 |
| Metropolitan | 61 | 62 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 61 | 64 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 63 |
| Overall | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| 65+ | 61 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 63 | 62 |
| Large Rural | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 59 |
| 50-64 | 60 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 61 |
| Men | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 58 |
| Interface | 57 | 63 | 59 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Community and Cultural Activities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 12 | 35 | 39 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 12 | 37 | 38 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 11 | 37 | 40 | 10 | 2 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 37 | 39 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 13 | 35 | 39 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 8 | 30 | 45 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 36 | 38 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 36 | 38 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 35 | 41 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 10 | 30 | 42 | 14 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 14 | 39 | 37 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 32 | 42 | 11 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 13 | 37 | 37 | 10 | 2 | \* |
| 50-64 | 11 | 34 | 40 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 10 | 37 | 38 | 10 | 3 | 2 |

**2017 Community and Cultural Activities Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 71 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 35-49 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 69 | 68 |
| 65+ | 70 | 69 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Metropolitan | 70 | 71 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 69 | 65 | 68 | 71 | 68 | 67 |
| Overall | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| Large Rural | 69 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 66 |
| Regional Centres | 69 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 68 | 67 |
| Men | 67 | 67 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 67 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 68 |
| Interface | 64 | 63 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Community and Cultural Activities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 17 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| 2016 Overall | 17 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 9 |
| 2015 Overall | 18 | 43 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| 2014 Overall | 18 | 44 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 2013 Overall | 17 | 44 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 2012 Overall | 15 | 44 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| Metropolitan | 18 | 43 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 11 |
| Interface | 11 | 38 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 13 |
| Regional Centres | 18 | 43 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| Large Rural | 17 | 42 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 9 |
| Small Rural | 18 | 42 | 26 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| Men | 14 | 41 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 10 |
| Women | 19 | 43 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 42 | 27 | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| 35-49 | 19 | 44 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 41 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| 65+ | 18 | 41 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 12 |

**2017 Waste Management Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 81 | 82 | 81 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 81 | 82 | 80 | 80 | 81 | 80 |
| 50-64 | 80 | 81 | 81 | 80 | 81 | 79 |
| 35-49 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 79 |
| Interface | 79 | 81 | 79 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 79 | 79 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 79 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| Overall | 79 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 78 |
| Large Rural | 78 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 78 | 76 |
| 18-34 | 78 | 79 | 76 | 77 | 76 | 76 |
| Men | 77 | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 |
| Small Rural | 76 | 79 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 |

**2017 Waste Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 36 | 46 | 16 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 2016 Overall | 38 | 45 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 35 | 46 | 16 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 35 | 47 | 16 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 36 | 47 | 15 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 32 | 49 | 16 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 40 | 46 | 13 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 37 | 45 | 16 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Regional Centres | 39 | 40 | 17 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 34 | 46 | 18 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| Small Rural | 30 | 48 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 32 | 46 | 18 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Women | 40 | 45 | 14 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 35 | 42 | 20 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 39 | 43 | 17 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 38 | 46 | 14 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 65+ | 33 | 52 | 13 | 1 | \* | 1 |

**2017 Waste Management Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 75 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 74 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 75 |
| Men | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 |
| Overall | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 71 | 72 |
| Women | 71 | 70 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 72 |
| 18-34 | 71 | 70 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| Interface | 71 | 71 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 70 | 69 | 71 | 73 | 71 | 72 |
| 35-49 | 70 | 68 | 69 | 71 | 69 | 69 |
| 50-64 | 69 | 67 | 70 | 71 | 69 | 70 |
| Regional Centres | 69 | 69 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 68 | 66 | 68 | 70 | 68 | 69 |

**2017 Waste Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 25 | 44 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| 2016 Overall | 24 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 25 | 47 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 26 | 47 | 16 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 24 | 47 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 48 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Metropolitan | 29 | 48 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 25 | 46 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 25 | 41 | 19 | 9 | 4 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 21 | 44 | 21 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 25 | 42 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| Men | 26 | 44 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| Women | 25 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 25 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 44 | 19 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 23 | 44 | 20 | 8 | 3 | 2 |
| 65+ | 30 | 44 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 3 |

**2017 Business and Community Development and Tourism Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 74 | 73 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 72 | 71 | 70 | 68 | 70 | 70 |
| Women | 69 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| 35-49 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 66 |
| 65+ | 68 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 |
| Overall | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 |
| 50-64 | 67 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 67 |
| Large Rural | 67 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 70 |
| 18-34 | 66 | 67 | 65 | 66 | 65 | 64 |
| Men | 65 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 63 |
| Interface | 65 | 65 | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 60 | 60 | 59 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Business and Community Development and Tourism Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 21 | 38 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 21 | 38 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 21 | 38 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 38 | 31 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 20 | 39 | 31 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 39 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 12 | 33 | 36 | 15 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 17 | 38 | 32 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 29 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 18 | 41 | 31 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 26 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Men | 19 | 36 | 31 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 23 | 40 | 28 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 19 | 37 | 33 | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 37 | 29 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 21 | 39 | 28 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 20 | 40 | 28 | 8 | 2 | 3 |

**2017 Business and Community Development and Tourism Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 66 | n/a | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 64 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| Small Rural | 64 | 61 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 63 |
| Women | 63 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| 18-34 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Overall | 61 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| Regional Centres | 61 | 62 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 60 | 62 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Men | 60 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 60 |
| Large Rural | 60 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 |
| 50-64 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 |

**2017 Business and Community Development and Tourism Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 11 | 34 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 14 |
| 2016 Overall | 10 | 32 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 14 |
| 2015 Overall | 11 | 34 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 12 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 2012 Overall | 10 | 35 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| Metropolitan | 6 | 31 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 22 |
| Interface | 15 | 36 | 26 | 8 | 2 | 13 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 35 | 28 | 12 | 4 | 8 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 33 | 31 | 12 | 4 | 9 |
| Small Rural | 15 | 36 | 27 | 9 | 4 | 10 |
| Men | 10 | 33 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 13 |
| Women | 12 | 34 | 29 | 9 | 2 | 14 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 37 | 28 | 10 | 2 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 33 | 29 | 11 | 4 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 30 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 15 |
| 65+ | 12 | 34 | 28 | 7 | 3 | 16 |

**2017 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 50-64 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 77 | 76 |
| 65+ | 76 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| Small Rural | 76 | 77 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| Women | 74 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Large Rural | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 72 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 |
| Regional Centres | 71 | 72 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 71 | 71 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 70 |
| Interface | 70 | 72 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 64 | 68 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 66 |

**2017 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 26 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 2016 Overall | 27 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 2015 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 42 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 2012 Overall | 25 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Metropolitan | 26 | 41 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Interface | 23 | 37 | 26 | 5 | 2 | 6 |
| Regional Centres | 22 | 42 | 27 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Large Rural | 27 | 41 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 30 | 44 | 20 | 3 | \* | 2 |
| Men | 23 | 40 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Women | 28 | 41 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 35 | 36 | 8 | 1 | 4 |
| 35-49 | 28 | 43 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 32 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 65+ | 30 | 43 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 6 |

**2017 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 57 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 59 |
| Regional Centres | 56 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 54 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 54 | 50 |
| 65+ | 54 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| Men | 53 | 51 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
| Overall | 53 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| Metropolitan | 53 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 53 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 54 |
| 35-49 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 52 |
| Small Rural | 51 | 49 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 |
| Interface | 51 | 52 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 49 | 48 | 51 | 51 | 50 | 50 |

**2017 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 5 | 26 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 19 |
| 2016 Overall | 5 | 25 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 19 |
| 2015 Overall | 5 | 28 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 17 |
| 2014 Overall | 6 | 28 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 17 |
| 2013 Overall | 5 | 29 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 5 | 29 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 15 |
| Metropolitan | 5 | 25 | 28 | 14 | 6 | 20 |
| Interface | 4 | 22 | 31 | 15 | 7 | 21 |
| Regional Centres | 6 | 29 | 33 | 11 | 5 | 16 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 29 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 18 |
| Small Rural | 4 | 25 | 29 | 15 | 8 | 19 |
| Men | 5 | 28 | 29 | 14 | 7 | 16 |
| Women | 5 | 24 | 30 | 13 | 6 | 22 |
| 18-34 | 5 | 31 | 29 | 9 | 5 | 20 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 25 | 29 | 15 | 8 | 19 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 22 | 31 | 18 | 8 | 18 |
| 65+ | 6 | 25 | 30 | 13 | 6 | 20 |

**2017 Planning and Building Permits Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 76 | 74 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 75 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| 50-64 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 74 |
| Women | 74 | 74 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| 35-49 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Overall | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| Large Rural | 72 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 |
| Men | 70 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Interface | 69 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 69 | 69 | 70 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 68 | 71 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| 18-34 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 66 |

**2017 Planning and Building Permits Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 27 | 38 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2016 Overall | 26 | 39 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 26 | 39 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 40 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Metropolitan | 34 | 38 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 24 | 38 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 22 | 36 | 30 | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 25 | 40 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 22 | 37 | 28 | 6 | 3 | 5 |
| Men | 24 | 38 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Women | 30 | 38 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 19 | 34 | 34 | 8 | 1 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 29 | 38 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 32 | 37 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 29 | 42 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 6 |

**2017 Planning and Building Permits Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 60 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 55 | 55 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 60 |
| Small Rural | 51 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 57 |
| Women | 51 | 52 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 54 |
| 65+ | 51 | 50 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 53 |
| Overall | 51 | 50 | 54 | 53 | 55 | 54 |
| Men | 50 | 49 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 53 |
| 35-49 | 49 | 48 | 53 | 51 | 54 | 51 |
| Metropolitan | 49 | 50 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 48 | 50 | 54 | 53 | 54 | 51 |
| 50-64 | 47 | 48 | 51 | 50 | 50 | 49 |
| Interface | 46 | 46 | 49 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Planning and Building Permits Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 5 | 23 | 27 | 14 | 9 | 23 |
| 2016 Overall | 5 | 22 | 25 | 13 | 8 | 27 |
| 2015 Overall | 6 | 25 | 28 | 12 | 6 | 23 |
| 2014 Overall | 5 | 25 | 26 | 12 | 7 | 25 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 26 | 27 | 12 | 6 | 23 |
| 2012 Overall | 5 | 26 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 23 |
| Metropolitan | 5 | 22 | 26 | 15 | 10 | 22 |
| Interface | 2 | 20 | 31 | 16 | 10 | 21 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 31 | 27 | 8 | 5 | 22 |
| Large Rural | 4 | 21 | 26 | 15 | 11 | 24 |
| Small Rural | 6 | 21 | 28 | 13 | 8 | 24 |
| Men | 6 | 23 | 28 | 14 | 10 | 19 |
| Women | 5 | 22 | 25 | 13 | 8 | 26 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 28 | 29 | 10 | 8 | 21 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 21 | 27 | 15 | 10 | 23 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 21 | 27 | 16 | 12 | 20 |
| 65+ | 6 | 21 | 24 | 14 | 8 | 27 |

**2017 Environmental Sustainability Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 76 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 76 | 75 |
| 18-34 | 75 | 77 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 73 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 74 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Overall | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| Interface | 72 | 77 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 72 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 68 |
| 50-64 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| Regional Centres | 72 | 71 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 70 | 74 | 77 | 76 | 71 | 75 |
| 65+ | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 69 |
| Men | 68 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 67 |

**2017 Environmental Sustainability Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 29 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 30 | 40 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 29 | 41 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 29 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 42 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 26 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 30 | 41 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 31 | 40 | 20 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 27 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 31 | 36 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 26 | 36 | 29 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 24 | 38 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 34 | 42 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 33 | 38 | 24 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 29 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 29 | 39 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 24 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 2 |

**2017 Environmental Sustainability Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 65 | 63 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 64 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 66 | 67 |
| Metropolitan | 64 | 64 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 64 | 63 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 35-49 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 63 |
| Men | 64 | 62 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Overall | 64 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Women | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 65 |
| Small Rural | 63 | 61 | 63 | 64 | 62 | 63 |
| Interface | 62 | 60 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 62 | 62 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 64 |
| 50-64 | 62 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |

**2017 Environmental Sustainability Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 10 | 37 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| 2016 Overall | 11 | 36 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 39 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 13 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 39 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 12 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 40 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 39 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
| Metropolitan | 10 | 37 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 16 |
| Interface | 9 | 38 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 39 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 11 |
| Large Rural | 8 | 37 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 14 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 35 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| Men | 11 | 38 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| Women | 10 | 37 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 40 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 38 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 15 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 34 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 15 |
| 65+ | 11 | 36 | 30 | 6 | 2 | 15 |

**2017 Emergency and Disaster Management Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 84 | 84 | 84 | 85 | 85 | 84 |
| Interface | 82 | 83 | 81 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 81 | 81 | 81 | 83 | 82 | 81 |
| 18-34 | 81 | 81 | 80 | 82 | 82 | 81 |
| Small Rural | 81 | 82 | 80 | 81 | 81 | 81 |
| 50-64 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| Regional Centres | 80 | 80 | 81 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| 65+ | 80 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| 35-49 | 78 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 |
| Metropolitan | 77 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 76 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 76 |

**2017 Emergency and Disaster Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 45 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 45 | 36 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 44 | 35 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 45 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 46 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 43 | 38 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 40 | 35 | 17 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 52 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 45 | 33 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 47 | 35 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 45 | 36 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 39 | 35 | 18 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 51 | 34 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 48 | 32 | 15 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 44 | 32 | 16 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 47 | 33 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 41 | 40 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 3 |

**2017 Emergency and Disaster Management Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 72 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 65+ | 72 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| 18-34 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 75 | 72 | 73 |
| Women | 71 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 70 | 70 |
| Regional Centres | 70 | 68 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Large Rural | 70 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 69 | 69 |
| Men | 69 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| Interface | 69 | 69 | 70 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| Metropolitan | 68 | 68 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 67 |

**2017 Emergency and Disaster Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 17 | 37 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| 2016 Overall | 17 | 36 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| 2015 Overall | 17 | 39 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 38 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 18 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 37 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 19 | 38 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 16 |
| Metropolitan | 11 | 31 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 34 |
| Interface | 15 | 41 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| Regional Centres | 19 | 39 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 16 |
| Large Rural | 18 | 39 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 16 |
| Small Rural | 23 | 38 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 16 |
| Men | 16 | 37 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 20 |
| Women | 19 | 37 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| 18-34 | 18 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 17 |
| 35-49 | 16 | 37 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 15 | 34 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 23 |
| 65+ | 20 | 35 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 23 |

**2017 Planning for Population Growth in The Area Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 80 | 79 | 76 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 79 | 77 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| 35-49 | 78 | 77 | 78 | 78 | 77 | 77 |
| Women | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 |
| Large Rural | 78 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 76 |
| 65+ | 77 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 75 |
| Overall | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Metropolitan | 75 | 75 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 75 | 76 | 76 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 75 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| 18-34 | 73 | 74 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 73 |

**2017 Planning for Population Growth in The Area Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 36 | 38 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 35 | 37 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 34 | 38 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 38 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 34 | 38 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 34 | 39 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 36 | 37 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 44 | 36 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 32 | 40 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 38 | 37 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 34 | 38 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 39 | 38 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 32 | 34 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 40 | 38 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 39 | 40 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 35 | 40 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 3 |

**2017 Planning for Population Growth in The Area Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 62 | 59 | 61 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 57 | 55 | 60 | 59 | 59 | 58 |
| Men | 53 | 52 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 52 |
| Overall | 52 | 51 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 52 |
| 65+ | 52 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 52 |
| Women | 52 | 51 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 52 |
| Metropolitan | 51 | 51 | 54 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 50 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 50 | 49 | 51 | 52 | 51 | 48 |
| 50-64 | 49 | 48 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 49 |
| Large Rural | 48 | 47 | 50 | 51 | 53 | 50 |

**2017 Planning for Population Growth in The Area Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 7 | 24 | 29 | 16 | 7 | 16 |
| 2016 Overall | 6 | 23 | 30 | 16 | 8 | 16 |
| 2015 Overall | 7 | 28 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 15 |
| 2014 Overall | 7 | 28 | 30 | 15 | 6 | 15 |
| 2013 Overall | 7 | 26 | 31 | 14 | 6 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 6 | 25 | 31 | 16 | 7 | 14 |
| Metropolitan | 6 | 22 | 30 | 17 | 7 | 18 |
| Interface | 7 | 22 | 30 | 18 | 10 | 12 |
| Regional Centres | 14 | 33 | 26 | 10 | 4 | 12 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 21 | 30 | 19 | 9 | 17 |
| Men | 8 | 24 | 29 | 17 | 7 | 15 |
| Women | 7 | 24 | 29 | 15 | 8 | 17 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 30 | 27 | 14 | 6 | 14 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 23 | 30 | 19 | 9 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 20 | 31 | 17 | 9 | 17 |
| 65+ | 7 | 22 | 29 | 15 | 7 | 21 |

**2017 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 50-64 | 78 | 76 | 76 | 78 | 78 | 74 |
| Small Rural | 76 | n/a | 77 | 78 | 79 | 76 |
| 65+ | 76 | 73 | 74 | 76 | 77 | 73 |
| Interface | 76 | 76 | 75 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 76 | 75 | 75 | 78 | 77 | 74 |
| Large Rural | 75 | 75 | 74 | 77 | 77 | 72 |
| Overall | 74 | 73 | 73 | 75 | 74 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 71 |
| Men | 71 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 68 |
| 18-34 | 66 | 69 | 65 | 68 | 66 | 65 |
| Metropolitan | 65 | 64 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 30 | 40 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 28 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 28 | 40 | 26 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 32 | 40 | 23 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 30 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 42 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Metropolitan | 15 | 38 | 36 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 34 | 40 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 33 | 39 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 32 | 44 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 27 | 38 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 33 | 41 | 21 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 37 | 33 | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 37 | 28 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 38 | 40 | 18 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 65+ | 31 | 45 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

**2017 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 68 | 68 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 58 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 67 |
| 35-49 | 54 | 57 | 55 | 53 | 56 | 59 |
| Interface | 54 | 56 | 52 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 54 | 57 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 61 |
| Overall | 53 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 61 |
| Men | 52 | 55 | 54 | 55 | 57 | 60 |
| 65+ | 51 | 54 | 52 | 53 | 55 | 59 |
| Small Rural | 51 | 51 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 59 |
| Large Rural | 50 | 54 | 53 | 50 | 52 | 57 |
| 50-64 | 50 | 52 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 58 |

**2017 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 10 | 31 | 27 | 18 | 11 | 3 |
| 2016 Overall | 11 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 3 |
| 2015 Overall | 10 | 32 | 30 | 16 | 9 | 2 |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 32 | 28 | 17 | 10 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 35 | 28 | 16 | 8 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 14 | 38 | 28 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| Metropolitan | 17 | 47 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Interface | 10 | 31 | 29 | 19 | 9 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 8 | 30 | 28 | 19 | 13 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 11 | 27 | 27 | 19 | 14 | 3 |
| Men | 10 | 31 | 26 | 20 | 11 | 3 |
| Women | 10 | 32 | 28 | 16 | 11 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 38 | 22 | 13 | 11 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 32 | 30 | 18 | 9 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 28 | 28 | 21 | 13 | 2 |
| 65+ | 8 | 29 | 28 | 19 | 12 | 5 |

**2017 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads in Your Area Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 81 | 81 | 82 | 80 | 81 | 81 |
| 50-64 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 82 | 81 |
| Women | 80 | 80 | 80 | 81 | 83 | 82 |
| Interface | 79 | 79 | 78 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 79 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 80 | 79 |
| Overall | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 81 | 80 |
| 35-49 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 82 | 80 |
| Men | 77 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 79 | 78 |
| Large Rural | 77 | 78 | 76 | 78 | 81 | 81 |
| 18-34 | 76.37 | 78 | 76 | 77 | 80 | 79 |
| Regional Centres | 76.04 | 70 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads in Your Area Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 39 | 39 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 40 | 37 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 39 | 39 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 39 | 38 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 44 | 39 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 41 | 39 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 41 | 36 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 33 | 41 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 35 | 39 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 43 | 41 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 35 | 41 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 43 | 38 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 37 | 36 | 23 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 40 | 37 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 44 | 38 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 35 | 45 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 3 |

**2017 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads in Your Area Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 52 | n/a | 51 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 45 | 44 | 47 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 45 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 48 | 50 |
| 18-34 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 46 | 47 | 48 |
| Men | 44 | 43 | 45 | 46 | 45 | 46 |
| 35-49 | 44 | 42 | 44 | 45 | 42 | 44 |
| Overall | 44 | 43 | 45 | 45 | 44 | 46 |
| Women | 43 | 43 | 45 | 45 | 43 | 46 |
| Small Rural | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 46 | 48 |
| Large Rural | 42 | 43 | 44 | 43 | 41 | 40 |
| 50-64 | 41 | 40 | 43 | 42 | 40 | 43 |

**2017 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads in Your Area Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 5 | 21 | 28 | 23 | 16 | 7 |
| 2016 Overall | 5 | 20 | 29 | 22 | 16 | 7 |
| 2015 Overall | 5 | 22 | 30 | 22 | 15 | 7 |
| 2014 Overall | 5 | 22 | 30 | 22 | 14 | 7 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 20 | 29 | 24 | 16 | 4 |
| 2012 Overall | 7 | 22 | 29 | 21 | 15 | 7 |
| Interface | 5 | 21 | 29 | 22 | 14 | 9 |
| Regional Centres | 9 | 25 | 28 | 18 | 8 | 13 |
| Large Rural | 4 | 20 | 28 | 25 | 17 | 6 |
| Small Rural | 6 | 20 | 28 | 23 | 18 | 5 |
| Men | 6 | 22 | 28 | 23 | 17 | 6 |
| Women | 5 | 20 | 28 | 23 | 15 | 8 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 24 | 26 | 25 | 15 | 4 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 20 | 28 | 24 | 17 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 20 | 29 | 24 | 18 | 6 |
| 65+ | 5 | 19 | 30 | 20 | 14 | 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**2017 Business and Community Development Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 72 | 72 | 69 | 70 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 71 | 73 | 70 | 71 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 70 | 71 | 72 | 71 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 70 | 70 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 69 | 69 | 67 | 67 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 68 | 67 | 68 | 68 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 67 | 69 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Business and Community Development Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 21 | 43 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 22 | 43 | 27 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2015 Overall | 20 | 42 | 31 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 45 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 18 | 40 | 32 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 25 | 46 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 21 | 42 | 29 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 20 | 42 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 23 | 43 | 28 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 48 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 23 | 42 | 29 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 22 | 40 | 30 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 19 | 42 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 3 |

**2017 Business and Community Development Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 65 | 62 | 61 | 63 | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 61 | 59 | 61 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 60 | 62 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 60 | 60 | 61 | 63 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 60 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 59 | 59 | 59 | 60 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 59 | 58 | 60 | 61 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 59 | 58 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 58 | 61 | 54 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 56 | 56 | 58 | 59 | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Business and Community Development Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 7 | 33 | 32 | 9 | 3 | 16 |
| 2016 Overall | 7 | 33 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 17 |
| 2015 Overall | 8 | 34 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 35 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 17 |
| Metropolitan | 6 | 31 | 34 | 7 | 1 | 22 |
| Interface | 5 | 31 | 35 | 8 | 2 | 17 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 33 | 35 | 9 | 5 | 10 |
| Large Rural | 7 | 33 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 16 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 43 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| Men | 7 | 34 | 32 | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| Women | 7 | 32 | 33 | 8 | 3 | 18 |
| 18-34 | 8 | 39 | 32 | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 7 | 33 | 33 | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 28 | 34 | 11 | 4 | 17 |
| 65+ | 7 | 30 | 30 | 7 | 3 | 23 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**2017 Tourism Development Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 70 | n/a | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 64 | 64 | 67 | 66 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 63 | 64 | 67 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 63 | 67 | 67 | 67 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 63 | 65 | 66 | 67 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 62 | 63 | 65 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 61 | 62 | 63 | 63 | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 59 | 62 | 59 | 63 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 53 | 57 | 50 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Tourism Development Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 16 | 34 | 34 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| 2016 Overall | 18 | 34 | 35 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| 2015 Overall | 19 | 36 | 32 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| 2014 Overall | 18 | 37 | 31 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 9 | 27 | 34 | 23 | 6 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 23 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 16 | 35 | 37 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 16 | 33 | 34 | 13 | 4 | 1 |
| Women | 16 | 35 | 34 | 12 | 2 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 14 | 31 | 35 | 17 | 3 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 16 | 32 | 35 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 17 | 36 | 33 | 10 | 4 | 1 |
| 65+ | 16 | 38 | 32 | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| Personal user\* | 6 | 43 | 34 | 14 | 3 | - |
| Household user\* | 6 | 44 | 33 | 14 | 3 | - |

**2017 Tourism Development Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 67 | 64 | 63 | 66 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 65 | 64 | 66 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 65 | 71 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 64 | 64 | 64 | 66 | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 63 | 62 | 65 | 66 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 63 | 63 | 61 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 61 | 60 | 62 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 56 | 56 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 54 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2017 Tourism Development Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2017 Overall | 13 | 34 | 29 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 2016 Overall | 13 | 34 | 27 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 2015 Overall | 12 | 35 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 2 | 13 |
| Metropolitan | 4 | 24 | 31 | 13 | 3 | 25 |
| Interface | 5 | 25 | 38 | 12 | 2 | 18 |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 37 | 29 | 7 | 4 | 9 |
| Large Rural | 13 | 40 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 11 |
| Small Rural | 24 | 33 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 7 |
| Men | 12 | 34 | 29 | 10 | 4 | 11 |
| Women | 14 | 34 | 28 | 8 | 3 | 14 |
| 18-34 | 14 | 35 | 32 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| 35-49 | 13 | 35 | 26 | 10 | 3 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 33 | 30 | 10 | 3 | 12 |
| 65+ | 14 | 32 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 16 |
| Personal user\* | 11 | 14 | 28 | 20 | 12 | 14 |
| Household user\* | 11 | 16 | 28 | 19 | 12 | 14 |

**DETAILED DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Gender Split**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Men | 49% |
| Women | 51% |

**Age Split**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18-24 | 8% |
| 25-34 | 18% |
| 35-49 | 24% |
| 50-64 | 23% |
| 65+ | 27% |

*Please note that for the reason of simplifying reporting, interlocking age and gender reporting has not been included in this report. Interlocking age and gender analysis is still available in the dashboard and data tables provided alongside this report.*

**2017 Household Structure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| Single person living alone | 13 |
| Single living with friends or housemates | 7 |
| Single living with children 16 or under | 3 |
| Single with children but none 16 or under living at home | 3 |
| Married or living with partner, no children | 23 |
| Married or living with partner with children 16 or under at home | 26 |
| Married or living with partner with children but none 16 or under at home | 22 |
| Do not wish to answer | 4 |

**2017 Years Lived in Area**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0-5 years | 5-10 years | 10-20 years | 20-30 years | 30+ years | Can't say |
| 2017 Overall | 14 | 17 | 24 | 18 | 28 | \* |
| 2016 Overall | 15 | 16 | 25 | 17 | 27 | \* |
| Metropolitan | 16 | 15 | 22 | 20 | 27 | \* |
| Interface | 13 | 28 | 33 | 12 | 15 | - |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 14 | 27 | 19 | 25 | - |
| Large Rural | 13 | 17 | 24 | 20 | 27 | \* |
| Small Rural | 10 | 13 | 20 | 16 | 40 | \* |
| Men | 14 | 16 | 24 | 17 | 28 | \* |
| Women | 14 | 17 | 23 | 18 | 28 | \* |
| 18-34 | 25 | 21 | 23 | 25 | 7 | \* |
| 35-49 | 16 | 25 | 32 | 11 | 16 | - |
| 50-64 | 6 | 10 | 23 | 22 | 39 | \* |
| 65+ | 7 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 54 | \* |

**2017 Home Ownership**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Own | Rent |
| 2017 Overall | 83 | 15 |
| 2016 Overall | 79 | 20 |
| 2015 Overall | 82 | 17 |
| 2014 Overall | 83 | 16 |
| 2013 Overall | 83 | 16 |
| 2012 Overall | 81 | 18 |
| Metropolitan | 80 | 18 |
| Regional Centres | 80 | 17 |
| Small Rural | 91 | 8 |
| Men | 85 | 13 |
| Women | 81 | 17 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 30 |
| 35-49 | 82 | 16 |
| 50-64 | 91 | 6 |
| 65+ | 93 | 6 |

**2017 Languages Spoken at Home**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| English Only | 54 |
| Italian | 6 |
| Vietnamese | 5 |
| Hindi | 4 |
| Chinese | 3 |
| Greek | 3 |
| Arabic | 2 |
| Spanish | 2 |
| Croatian | 1 |
| French | 1 |

**2017 Countries of Birth**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| Australia | 47 |
| India | 7 |
| China | 6 |
| Other Asian | 5 |
| United Kingdom | 4 |
| Germany | 1 |
| Greece | 1 |
| Other European | 1 |
| Other Americas | 1 |
| New Zealand | 1 |

**2017 Personal and Household Use and Experience of Council Services Percentage Results**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Personal use (%) | Total household use (%) |
| Appearance of public areas | 80 | 82 |
| Parking facilities | 79 | 81 |
| Waste management | 79 | 81 |
| Recreational facilities | 65 | 70 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 63 | 65 |
| Sealed local roads | 58 | 61 |
| Art centres & libraries | 51 | 58 |
| Informing the community | 47 | 51 |
| Unsealed roads | 49 | 51 |
| Community & cultural | 39 | 42 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 21 | 24 |
| Consultation & engagement | 20 | 23 |
| Environmental sustainability | 20 | 22 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 19 | 21 |
| Town planning policy | 17 | 18 |
| Community decisions | 16 | 18 |
| Planning & building permits | 15 | 17 |
| Lobbying | 13 | 15 |
| Business & community dev. | 14 | 15 |
| Population growth | 13 | 14 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 11 | 13 |
| Family support services | 10 | 12 |
| Elderly support services | 8 | 12 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 4 | 5 |
| Tourism development | 5 | 5 |

**APPENDIX: FURTHER PROJECT INFORMATION**

**Appendix: Background and Objectives**

The survey was revised in 2012. As a result:

* The survey is now conducted as a representative random probability survey of residents aged 18 years or over in local councils, whereas previously it was conducted as a ‘head of household’ survey.
* As part of the change to a representative resident survey, results are now weighted post survey to the known population distribution of Overall according to the most recently available Australian Bureau of Statistics population estimates, whereas the results were previously not weighted.
* The service responsibility area performance measures have changed significantly and the rating scale used to assess performance has also changed.

As such, the results of the 2012 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey should be considered as a benchmark. Please note that comparisons should not be made with the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey results from 2011 and prior due to the methodological and sampling changes. Comparisons in the period 2012-2017 have been made throughout this report as appropriate.

**Appendix:** **Margins of Error**

The sample size for the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey was n=27,907. Unless otherwise noted, this is the total sample base for all reported charts and tables.

The maximum margin of error on a sample of approximately n=27,907 interviews is +/-0.6% at the 95% confidence level for results around 50%. Margins of error will be larger for any sub-samples. As an example, a result of 50% can be read confidently as falling midway in the range 49.4% - 50.6%.

Maximum margins of error are listed in the table below, based on a population of 3,081,000 people aged 18 years or over, according to ABS estimates.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Demographic | Actual survey sample size | Weighted base | Maximum margin of error at 95% confidence interval |
| State-wide | 27907 | 27200 | +/-0.6 |
| Men | 12608 | 13388 | +/-0.9 |
| Women | 15299 | 13812 | +/-0.8 |
| Metropolitan | 7300 | 7200 | +/-1.1 |
| Interface | 2500 | 2400 | +/-2.0 |
| Regional Centres | 3600 | 3600 | +/-1.6 |
| Large Rural | 8102 | 7600 | +/-1.1 |
| Small Rural | 6405 | 6400 | +/-1.2 |
| 18-34 years | 3288 | 6943 | +/-1.7 |
| 35-49 years | 5532 | 6652 | +/-1.3 |
| 50-64 years | 8713 | 6188 | +/-1.0 |
| 65+ years | 10374 | 7418 | +/-1.0 |

**Appendix: Analysis and Reporting**

In 2017, 68 of the 79 Victorian councils chose to participate in this survey. For consistency of analysis and reporting across all projects, Local Government Victoria has aligned its presentation of data to use standard council groupings, as classified below. Accordingly, the council reports for the community satisfaction survey provide analysis using these standard council groupings.

Please note that councils participating in 2012-2016 vary slightly to those participating in 2017, and that council grouping classifications significantly changed for 2015. As such, comparisons to previous council group results can not be made to any period prior to 2015.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Metropolitan** | **Interface** | **Regional Centres** | **Large Rural** | **Small Rural** |
| Banyule | Cardinia | Greater Bendigo | Bass Coast | Alpine |
| Bayside | Casey | Greater Geelong | Baw Baw | Ararat |
| Boroondara | Melton | Greater Shepparton | Campaspe | Benalla |
| Brimbank | Mornington Peninsula | Horsham | Colac Otway | Buloke |
| Frankston | Whittlesea | Latrobe | Corangamite | Central Goldfields |
| Glen Eira | Yarra Ranges | Mildura | East Gippsland | Gannawarra |
| Greater Dandenong |  | Wangaratta | Glenelg | Hepburn |
| Kingston |  | Warrnambool | Golden Plains | Hindmarsh |
| Knox |  | Wodonga | Macedon Ranges | Indigo |
| Manningham |  |  | Mitchell | Loddon |
| Maroondah |  |  | Moira | Mansfield |
| Melbourne |  |  | Moorabool | Murrindindi |
| Monash |  |  | Mount Alexander | Pyrenees |
| Moonee Valley |  |  | Moyne | Queenscliffe |
| Moreland |  |  | South Gippsland | West Wimmera |
| Port Phillip |  |  | Southern Grampians | Yarriambiack |
| Stonnington |  |  | Surf Coast |  |
| Whitehorse |  |  | Swan Hill |  |
|  |  |  | Wellington |  |
|  | | | | |

Non-participating councils: Ballarat, Darebin, Hobsons Bay, Hume, Maribyrnong, Nillumbik, Northern Grampians, Strathbogie, Towong, Wyndham, and Yarra.

**Appendix: Analysis and Reporting**

**Index Scores**

Many questions ask respondents to rate council performance on a five-point scale, for example, from ‘very good’ to ‘very poor’, with ‘can’t say’ also a possible response category. To facilitate ease of reporting and comparison of results over time, starting from the 2012 survey and measured against the state-wide result and the council group, an ‘Index Score’ has been calculated for such measures.

The Index Score is calculated and represented as a score out of 100 (on a 0 to 100 scale), with ‘can’t say’ responses excluded from the analysis. The ‘% RESULT’ for each scale category is multiplied by the ‘INDEX FACTOR’. This produces an ‘INDEX VALUE’ for each category, which are then summed to produce the ‘INDEX SCORE’, equating to ‘60’ in the following example.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SCALE CATEGORIES | % RESULT | INDEX FACTOR | INDEX VALUE |
| Very good | 9% | 100 | 9 |
| Good | 40% | 75 | 30 |
| Average | 37% | 50 | 19 |
| Poor | 9% | 25 | 2 |
| Very poor | 4% | 0 | 0 |
| Can’t say | 1% | -- | INDEX SCORE 60 |

**Appendix: Analysis and Reporting**

Similarly, an Index Score has been calculated for the Core question ‘Performance direction in the last 12 months’, based on the following scale for each performance measure category, with ‘Can’t say’ responses excluded from the calculation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SCALE CATEGORIES | % RESULT | INDEX FACTOR | INDEX VALUE |
| Improved | 36% | 100 | 36 |
| Stayed the same | 40% | 50 | 20 |
| Deteriorated | 23% | 0 | 0 |
| Can’t say | 1% | -- | INDEX SCORE 56 |

**Appendix: Index Score Implications**

Index scores are indicative of an overall rating on a particular service area. In this context, index scores indicate:

1. how well council is seen to be performing in a particular service area; or
2. the level of importance placed on a particular service area.

For ease of interpretation, index score ratings can be categorised as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **INDEX SCORE** | **Performance implication** | **Importance implication** |
| **75 – 100** | Council is performing **very well** in this service area | This service area is seen to be  **extremely important** |
| **60 – 75** | Council is performing **well** in this service area, but there is room for improvement | This service area is seen to be  **very important** |
| **50 – 60** | Council is performing **satisfactorily** in this service area but needs to improve | This service area is seen to be  **fairly important** |
| **40 – 50** | Council is performing **poorly**  in this service area | This service area is seen to be  **somewhat important** |
| **0 – 40** | Council is performing **very** **poorly**  in this service area | This service area is seen to be  **not that important** |

**Appendix: Index Score Significant Difference Calculation**

The test applied to the Indexes was an Independent Mean Test, as follows:

Z Score = ($1 - $2) / Sqrt (($3\*2 / $5) + ($4\*2 / $6))

Where:

* + $1 = Index Score 1
  + $2 = Index Score 2
  + $3 = unweighted sample count 1
  + $4 = unweighted sample count 1
  + $5 = standard deviation 1
  + $6 = standard deviation 2

All figures can be sourced from the detailed cross tabulations.

The test was applied at the 95% confidence interval, so if the Z Score was greater than +/- 1.954 the scores are significantly different.

**Appendix: Analysis and Reporting**

**Core, Optional and Tailored Questions**

Over and above necessary geographic and demographic questions required to ensure sample representativeness, a base set of questions for the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey was designated as ‘Core’ and therefore compulsory inclusions for all participating Councils.

These core questions comprised:

* Overall performance last 12 months (Overall performance)
* Lobbying on behalf of community (Advocacy)
* Community consultation and engagement (Consultation)
* Decisions made in the interest of the community (Making community decisions)
* Condition of sealed local roads (Sealed local roads)
* Contact in last 12 months (Contact)
* Rating of contact (Customer service)
* Overall council direction last 12 months (Council direction)

Reporting of results for these core questions can always be compared against other participating councils in the council group and against all participating councils state-wide. Alternatively, some questions in the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey were optional. Councils also had the ability to ask tailored questions specific only to their council.

**Appendix: Analysis and Reporting**

**Reporting**

Every council that participated in the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey receives a customised report. In addition, the state government is supplied with this State-wide summary report of the aggregate results of ‘Core’ and ‘Optional’ questions asked across all council areas surveyed, which is available at:

<https://www.localgovernment.vic.gov.au/our-programs/council-community-satisfaction-survey>

Tailored questions commissioned by individual councils are reported only to the commissioning council and not otherwise shared unless by express written approval of the commissioning council.

**Appendix: Glossary of Terms**

**Core questions:** Compulsory inclusion questions for all councils participating in the CSS.

**CSS:** 2017 Victorian Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey.

**Council group:** One of five classified groups, comprising: metropolitan, interface, regional centres, large rural and small rural.

**Council group average:** The average result for all participating councils in the council group.

**Highest / lowest:** The result described is the highest or lowest result across a particular demographic sub-group e.g. men, for the specific question being reported. Reference to the result for a demographic sub-group being the highest or lowest does not imply that it is significantly higher or lower, unless this is specifically mentioned.

**Index score:** A score calculated and represented as a score out of 100 (on a 0 to 100 scale). This score is sometimes reported as a figure in brackets next to the category being described, e.g. men 50+ (60).

**Optional questions:** Questions which councils had an option to include or not.

**Percentages:** Also referred to as ‘detailed results’, meaning the proportion of responses, expressed as a percentage.

**Sample:** The number of completed interviews, e.g. for a council or within a demographic sub-group.

**Significantly higher / lower:** The result described is significantly higher or lower than the comparison result based on a statistical significance test at the 95% confidence limit. If the result referenced is statistically higher or lower then this will be specifically mentioned, however not all significantly higher or lower results are referenced in summary reporting.

**Statewide average:** The average result for all participating councils in the State.

**Tailored questions:** Individual questions tailored by and only reported to the commissioning council.

**Weighting:** Weighting factors are applied to the sample for each council based on available age and gender proportions from ABS census information to ensure reported results are proportionate to the actual population of the council, rather than the achieved survey sample.