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**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES**

Welcome to the report of results and recommendations for the 2018 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 State-wide performance overall 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 council as determined by the most recent ABS population estimates was purchased from an accredited supplier of publicly available phone records, including up to 40% mobile phone numbers to cater to the diversity of residents within councils, particularly younger people.

A total of n=26,814 completed interviews were achieved overall. Survey fieldwork was conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March, 2018.

The 2018 results are compared with previous years, as detailed below:

* 2017, n=27,907 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February-30th March.
* 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.

Further, results shown in blue and red indicate significantly higher or lower results than in 2017. Therefore in the example below:

* + The result among 35-49 year olds is significantly higher than the result achieved among this group in 2017.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

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

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

**CONTACTS**

For further queries about the conduct and reporting of the 2018 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 both the 2016 and 2017 result, though it remains just lower than the peak index score of 61 in 2014.

* **Councils in the Metropolitan group (index score of 65) perform *significantly higher*** (at the 95% confidence interval) than the average for councils State-wide on the measure of overall performance. Conversely, average ratings for **councils in the Small Rural, Large Rural and Regional Centres groups are *significantly lower*** than the State-wide average (index scores of 56, 56 and 58 respectively).
* The youngest **(aged 18 to 34 years)** resident cohort has ***significantly more favourable* impressions** of council performance overall than the State-wide average (index score of 62). Those aged 35 to 64 years are *significantly less favourable* (index score of 57 among those aged 35 to 49 years and 54 among those aged 50 to 64 years).
* **Women** (index score of 59) and **residents aged 50+ years** (index score of 54 among those aged 50 to 64 years and 59 among those aged 65+ years) rate overall performance a *significant* one index point lower than in 2017. Overall performance ratings among these cohorts have declined a total of three index points each since 2014/2015.

**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 largely stable** compared to State-wide results in 2017. Average ratings for councils State-wide stayed the same on five of the seven measures, the other two measures moving by only index point.

* In addition to overall performance, ratings for **sealed local roads** (index score of 53), **consultation and engagement** (index score of 55), **community decisions** (index score of 54), and **advocacy** (index score of 54) remain unchanged from 2017.
* State-wide average ratings for **customer service** increased in the past year(index score of 70, one point higher than 2017).
* State-wide average ratings for **overall council direction** decreased in the past year (index score of 52, one point lower than 2017).

**Core performance measures are all lower (by one to three points) than previously achieved peak ratings.** With an index score of 54, **community decisions** is three index points lower than the peak rating achieved on this measure in 2014. **Council direction** is only one index point lower than its highest rating, which was last achieved in 2017. (All other core measures are two points lower than peak ratings.)

* **Council direction** (index score of 52) comprises the only core measure to decline in the past year.
* In the past year, a rating decline on the measure of council direction were *significant* among **residents aged 50+ years**.

Ratings for overall council direction are *significantly lower* than the State-wide average for councils in the Small Rural group (index score of 50). Ratings are *significantly higher* for councils in the Metropolitan group (index score of 54).

Average ratings on **core measures** for councils in the Metropolitan group are *significantly higher* than average for councils State-wide, while ratings for councils in the Small Rural group are *significantly lower*. This pattern is consistent across all core measures. Average ratings for councils in the Large Rural group are also *significantly* *lower* on core measures with the exception of **overall council direction**.

**CUSTOMER CONTACT AND SERVICE**

**Three in five (62%) residents State-wide have had recent contact with their council**. Contact with councils increased significantly by three percentage points since 2017 (59% in 2017).

* The main methods of contacting councils remain by telephone and in person (36% and 30% respectively). This pattern has not changed over time, with telephone used more often than in person contact, though the gap between the two widened slightly in the past year. These methods of contact remain well ahead of email (18%).
* Council **residents aged 35 to 49 years** have had the most contact with their local councils (68%), while **residents aged 18 to 34 years** have had the least contact (55%).

**The customer service index score of 70 is a positive result for councils State-wide. Customer service is one of the highest performing areas (it is the highest performing core measure), and perceptions of councils’ customer service increased by one index point since 2017**.

* Almost one third (31%) of Victorians rate councils’ customer service as ‘very good’, with a further 36% rating customer service as ‘good’.
* **Customer service ratings for councils in the Metropolitan group and Regional Centres, as well as ratings *among* women** and **residents** **aged 65+ years** (index scores of 72 for/among each group)**,** are *significantly higher* than the overall average for councils State-wide.
* **Men** and **residents aged 35 to 49 and 50 to 64 years** are *significantly less favourable* in their impressions of councils’ customer service (index scores of 68, 68, and 69 respectively).
* Among **male** residents (index score of 68), perceptions of councils’ customer service increased *significantly* by two index points since 2017, notwithstanding lower than average ratings among this group.
* Councils in the **Small Rural** and **Large Rural** groups (index scores of 69 and 67 respectively) also perform *significantly lower* in the area of customer service than other groups.
* **Among those whose most recent contact with their council was in writing, customer service index scores have *increased significantly* in the last 12 months** (index score of 65, four points higher than 2017).
* **Conversely, among those whose most recent contact with their council was in person** (index score of 74, down two points from 2017) **or by telephone** (index score of 71, down two points from 2017), **customer service index scores have *declined significantly* in the last 12 months**.

**Newsletters**, sent via mail (32%) or email (26%), are the preferred methods for councils to inform residents about news, information and upcoming events. The gap between mail and email preferences has narrowed over time.

* **Preference for receiving information via email has increased steadily** (from 18% in 2012), **while preference for mailed communications has declined** (from 42%) since 2012.
* Residents aged 50 years or younger divide virtually equally in their preference for a newsletter via mail (30%) versus email (28%). Older residents (aged 50+ years) exhibit a greater – though dwindling – preference for receiving a newsletter in the mail (33%) to email (25%).
* The popularity of text messaging has increased to 8% in 2018 from 2% in 2012. Gains have occurred largely among residents aged under 50 years of age (12% in 2018, 8% in 2017, 3% in 2012).

**AREAS WHERE COUNCIL IS PERFORMING WELL**

**Art centres** and **libraries** continues to be the area where councils **perform most strongly** (index score of 74). Overall performance State-wide **increased in this area by one index point** from 2017, building on last year’s one-point increase.

* Two-thirds of residents (67%) 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 65).

**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. Ratings in this area have not changed since 2016.

* Seven in ten residents (69%) rate councils’ performance in this area as ‘very good’ or ‘good’.
* Parks and gardens (12%) and public areas (5%) 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).

**Emergency and disaster 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.

* Three in five residents (57%) rate councils’ performance in the area of emergency and disaster management as ‘very good’ or ‘good’ compared to only 6% who rate it as ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’. A further one in five (19%) provide ‘average ratings’ and 18% ‘can’t say’.
* This service area also has the highest importance score (importance index of 81).

Ratings for Regional Centres and councils in the Metropolitan group are *significantly higher* than the averages for councils State-wide in the areas of art centres and libraries and the appearance of public areas, while in the Large Rural group they are *significantly lower* on these measures. In the case of emergency and disaster management, councils in the Regional Centres group continue to rate *significantly higher* than the average for councils State-wide, but in this case, councils in the Metropolitan group rate *significantly lower*.

In addition to increases on the measures of art centres and libraries and emergency and disaster management, State-wide averages for councils increased by one to two index points since 2017 in the areas of local streets and footpaths, parking facilities, slashing and weed control, town planning policy, and planning and building permits.

**AREAS IN NEED OF ATTENTION**

**The most significant decline** in 2018 was a two-point decline on the measure of **traffic management** (index score of 57). 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 among this group are *significantly lower* than the average.

**Performance index scores for six other measures declined by a significant one index point in the past year**. Impressions of **waste management, recreational facilities, family support services, environmental sustainability, business/community development/tourism, traffic management, and unsealed roads** all declined State-wide since 2017.

* Waste management and recreational facilities remain top rated services.

**Roads** remain a priority area for residents, with **sealed local roads** (importance index score of 80, performance index score of 53) and **unsealed roads** (importance index score of 80, performance index score of 43) rating among the most important service areas. However, with a performance index score of 43, **the** **maintenance of unsealed roads** **is the lowest rated service area**. Furthermore, **sealed roads** is the lowest rated *core* measure for councils State-wide.

* Two in five residents (41%) rate Council performance in the area of **unsealed roads** as ‘very poor’ or ‘poor’.
* Almost one in five (17%) council residents State-wide mention sealed road maintenance as their council area most in need of improvement.
* Councils in the Small and Large Rural groups rate on average *significantly lower* on both measures than councils State-wide, while councils in the Interface group rate *significantly higher*.

**FURTHER INSIGHTS**

If forced to choose, more residents prefer to see **service cuts (48%) to maintain council rates at current levels over rate rises (32%) 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 and 48% in 2018. This contrasts with the 40% of residents who in 2012 had a preference for rate rises to improve local services (compared to 32% currently).

Residents are almost three times as likely to ‘definitely prefer service cuts’ (24%) as they are to ‘definitely prefer rate rises’ (9%). However, the proportion of residents who ‘definitely prefer service cuts’ has trended downwards over the past few years (from 28% in 2016).

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 (15%), though 44% still believe there is ‘a lot’ of room for improvement.

Further, residents State-wide are also more likely to agree that councils are heading in the ‘right’ direction (64%) than the ‘wrong’ direction (25%) (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 **20 points or greater**:

* **Unsealed roads** (margin of 38 points)
* **Sealed local roads** (margin of 26 points)
* **Making community decisions** (margin of 26 points)
* **Population growth** (margin of 25 points)
* **Local streets and footpaths** (margin of 20 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 2018.

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 emergency and disaster 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 18 to 34 and 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 2018**

* + Customer service
  + Art centres and libraries
  + Emergency and disaster management
  + Local streets and footpaths
  + Parking facilities
  + Slashing and weed control
  + Town planning
  + Planning and building permits

**Lower results in 2018**

* Council direction
* Waste   
  management
* Recreational facilities
* Family support services
* Environmental sustainability
* Business/ Community development/ Tourism
* Traffic management
* Unsealed roads

**Most favourably disposed towards Council**

* Aged 65+ years
* Aged 18 to 34 years
* Metropolitan councils

**Least favourably disposed towards Council**

* + Aged 50-64 years
  + Large Rural councils

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**2018 Summary of Core Measures Index Score Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Overall 2012 | Overall 2013 | Overall 2014 | Overall 2015 | Overall 2016 | Overall 2017 | Overall 2018 |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | 60 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**  (Community consultation and engagement) | 57 | 57 | 57 | 56 | 54 | 55 | 55 |
| **ADVOCACY**  (Lobbying on behalf of the community) | 55 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 53 | 54 | 54 |
| **MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS**  (Decisions made in the interest of the community) | n/a | n/a | 57 | 55 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| **SEALED LOCAL ROADS**  (Condition of sealed local roads) | n/a | n/a | 55 | 55 | 54 | 53 | 53 |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | 71 | 71 | 72 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 70 |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | 52 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 51 | 53 | 52 |

**2018 Summary of Core Measures Detailed Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Overall 2018 | Overall 2017 | Highest score | Lowest score |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | **59** | 59 | Metropolitan | Aged 50-64 years |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**  (Community consultation and engagement) | **55** | 55 | Aged 18-34 years | Aged 50-64 years |
| **ADVOCACY**  (Lobbying on behalf of the community) | **54** | 54 | Aged 18-34 years | Aged 50-64 years |
| **MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS**  (Decisions made in the interest of the community) | **54** | 54 | Metropolitan | Aged 50-64 years |
| **SEALED LOCAL ROADS**  (Condition of sealed local roads) | **53** | 53 | Metropolitan | Large Rural |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | **70** | 69 | Metropolitan, Regional, Aged 65+, Women | Large Rural |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | **52** | 53 | Aged 18-34 years | Aged 50-64 years |

**2018 Summary of Key Community Satisfaction Percentage Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | 9 | 37 | 36 | 11 | 5 | 2 |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION** | 8 | 30 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 9 |
| **ADVOCACY** | 5 | 24 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 20 |
| **MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS** | 6 | 30 | 34 | 14 | 7 | 9 |
| **SEALED LOCAL ROADS** | 11 | 31 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 1 |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | 31 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key Measures Summary Results | *Improved* | *Stayed the same* | *Deteriorated* | *Can’t say* |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | 19 | 60 | 15 | 5 |

**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 | 80 | 43 | -38 |
| Sealed local roads | 80 | 53 | -26 |
| Community decisions | 80 | 54 | -26 |
| Population growth | 77 | 52 | -25 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 78 | 58 | -20 |
| Town planning policy | 73 | 54 | -19 |
| Planning & building permits | 71 | 52 | -19 |
| Consultation & engagement | 74 | 55 | -19 |
| Slashing & weed control | 73 | 55 | -18 |
| Traffic management | 74 | 57 | -17 |
| Informing the community | 75 | 59 | -16 |
| Parking facilities | 71 | 56 | -15 |
| Lobbying | 68 | 54 | -14 |
| Elderly support services | 79 | 68 | -12 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 72 | 61 | -11 |
| Waste management | 81 | 70 | -11 |
| Environmental sustainability | 73 | 63 | -10 |

**2018 Importance Summary Index Scores Over Time**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Priority Area | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 81 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| Waste management | 81 | 79 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 78 |
| Unsealed roads | 80 | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 81 | 80 |
| Community decisions | 80 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Sealed roads | 80 | 78 | 78 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a |
| Elderly support services | 79 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 80 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 77 |
| Population growth | 77 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Informing the community | 75 | 74 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Appearance of public areas | 74 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 73 |
| Traffic management | 74 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 |
| Consultation & engagement | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| Family support services | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Slashing & weed control | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 75 | 74 | 71 |
| Environmental sustainability | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| Recreational facilities | 73 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Town planning policy | 73 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 72 | 71 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Parking facilities | 71 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 71 |
| Planning & building permits | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 71 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 |
| Business & community dev. | 69 | 70 | 70 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a |
| Lobbying | 68 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 66 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 |
| Art centres & libraries | 65 | 64 | 66 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| Tourism development | 61 | 62 | 63 | 65 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| Community & cultural | 61 | 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 | 42 | 43 | 13 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Sealed local roads | 38 | 44 | 15 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Elderly support services | 38 | 43 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 48 | 33 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Community decisions | 39 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Unsealed roads | 43 | 38 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 35 | 43 | 18 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Population growth | 39 | 36 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Informing the community | 32 | 41 | 22 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Appearance of public areas | 26 | 46 | 24 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Traffic management | 31 | 40 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Recreational facilities | 25 | 46 | 25 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Consultation & engagement | 30 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Family support services | 30 | 40 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Environmental sustainability | 31 | 39 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Slashing & weed control | 29 | 40 | 25 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 27 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Town planning policy | 27 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Parking facilities | 27 | 39 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Planning & building permits | 26 | 39 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 27 | 37 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Lobbying | 23 | 37 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Business & community dev. | 21 | 40 | 31 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 21 | 36 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Art centres & libraries | 16 | 39 | 34 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Tourism development | 16 | 32 | 35 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| Community & cultural | 12 | 34 | 40 | 10 | 2 | 1 |

**2018 Performance Summary Index Scores Over Time**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Art centres & libraries | 74 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 75 | 73 | 73 |
| Appearance of public areas | 71 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 71 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Waste management | 70 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 71 | 72 |
| Recreational facilities | 69 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Community & cultural | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| Elderly support services | 68 | 68 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| Family support services | 66 | 67 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 67 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 64 | 64 | 63 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 65 |
| Environmental sustainability | 63 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Tourism development | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 64 | 62 | 63 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 60 | 61 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| Business & community dev. | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| Informing the community | 59 | 59 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 58 | 57 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 57 |
| Traffic management | 57 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 58 |
| Parking facilities | 56 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| Slashing & weed control | 55 | 53 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 61 |
| Consultation & engagement | 55 | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Lobbying | 54 | 54 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 55 |
| Town planning policy | 54 | 53 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| Community decisions | 54 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| Sealed roads | 53 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Population growth | 52 | 52 | 51 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 52 |
| Planning & building permits | 52 | 51 | 50 | 54 | 53 | 55 | 54 |
| Unsealed roads | 43 | 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 | 24 | 45 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Waste management | 24 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| Art centres & libraries | 25 | 42 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| Recreational facilities | 22 | 42 | 22 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| Community & cultural | 17 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 9 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 18 | 39 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 18 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 12 | 39 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| Traffic management | 12 | 37 | 26 | 11 | 3 | 11 |
| Environmental sustainability | 14 | 34 | 28 | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| Informing the community | 11 | 36 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Tourism development | 10 | 37 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 12 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 10 | 36 | 30 | 15 | 7 | 3 |
| Elderly support services | 14 | 32 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 29 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 9 | 35 | 31 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| Sealed local roads | 10 | 33 | 31 | 10 | 4 | 12 |
| Parking facilities | 10 | 34 | 29 | 16 | 9 | 3 |
| Family support services | 11 | 31 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 32 |
| Slashing & weed control | 11 | 31 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 1 |
| Business & community dev. | 7 | 34 | 30 | 10 | 3 | 15 |
| Consultation & engagement | 8 | 30 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 9 |
| Community decisions | 6 | 30 | 34 | 14 | 7 | 9 |
| Population growth | 5 | 27 | 31 | 13 | 7 | 18 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 8 | 24 | 30 | 16 | 8 | 14 |
| Town planning policy | 6 | 25 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 38 |
| Lobbying | 5 | 24 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 20 |
| Planning & building permits | 5 | 24 | 27 | 13 | 8 | 23 |
| Unsealed roads | 5 | 19 | 28 | 24 | 17 | 7 |

**2018 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. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Community decisions |
| Interface | 1. Traffic management 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Waste management |
| Regional Centres | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Sealed roads 3. Community decisions |
| Large Rural | 1. Sealed roads 2. Unsealed roads 3. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Small Rural | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Waste management 3. Community decisions |

**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. Bus/community dev./tourism |
| Regional Centres | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Lobbying |
| Large Rural | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Traffic management |
| Small Rural | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Tourism development |

**2018 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. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Metropolitan | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Waste management 3. Recreational facilities |
| Interface | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Recreational facilities |
| Regional Centres | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Appearance of public areas 3. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Large Rural | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Appearance of public areas |
| Small Rural | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Appearance of public areas |

**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. Population growth 2. Planning permits 3. Town planning policy |
| Interface | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Population growth 3. Traffic management |
| Regional Centres | 1. Parking facilities 2. Community decisions 3. Unsealed roads |
| Large Rural | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Sealed roads 3. Planning permits |
| Small Rural | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Sealed roads 3. Population growth |

**2018 Best Things about Council Detailed Percentages**

**2018 Best Aspects**

**TOP MENTIONS ONLY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parks and Gardens | 12 |
| Recreational/Sporting Facilities | 9 |
| Customer Service | 8 |
| Community Facilities | 6 |
| Waste Management | 6 |
| Public Areas | 5 |
| Road/Street Maintenance | 5 |
| Generally Good - Overall/No Complaints | 5 |
| Community/Public Events/Activities | 5 |
| Parks and Gardens | 12 |
| Recreational/Sporting Facilities | 9 |
| Customer Service | 8 |

**2018 Services to Improve Detailed Percentages**

**2018 Areas for Improvement**

**TOP MENTIONS ONLY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sealed Road Maintenance | 17 |
| Community Consultation | 11 |
| Communication | 7 |
| Development - Inappropriate | 5 |
| Financial Management | 5 |
| Traffic Management | 5 |
| Waste Management | 5 |
| Nothing | 7 |
| Sealed Road Maintenance | 17 |
| Community Consultation | 11 |
| Communication | 7 |
| Development - Inappropriate | 5 |
| Financial Management | 5 |

**POSITIVES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**Best Things**

|  |
| --- |
| * Parks and Gardens: 12% (up 2 points from 2017) |
| * Recreational/Sporting Facilities: 9% (up 1 point from 2017) |
| * Customer Service - Positive: 8% (up 1 point from 2017) |

**Areas for Improvement**

|  |
| --- |
| * Sealed Road Maintenance: 17% (up 2 points from 2017) |
| * Community Consultation: 11% (up 2 points from 2017) |
| * Communication: 7% (down 2 points from 2017) |

**REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

To predict a respondent’s score on a question related to overall performance, based on knowledge of their performance scores for individual areas, we use *regression analysis*. For example, suppose we are interested in predicting which areas of local government responsibility could influence a person’s opinion on overall council performance. The *independent variables* would be areas of responsibility tested (e.g. community consultation, traffic management, etc.) and the *dependent variable* would be overall performance.

The stronger the correlation between the dependent variable (overall performance) and individual areas of responsibility, the closer the scores will fall to the regression line and the more accurate the prediction. Multiple regression can predict one variable on the basis of several other variables. Therefore, **we can test perceptions of council’s overall performance to investigate which set of service areas are influencing respondents' opinions**.

In the chart of the regression results overleaf, the horizontal axis represents the net council performance (total above average minus total below average) for each area of responsibility. Areas plotted on the right-side have a higher net performance than those on the left.

The vertical axis represents the Standardised Beta Coefficient from the linear regression performed. This measures the contribution of each variable (i.e. each area) to the model, with a larger Beta value indicating a greater effect on overall performance. Therefore areas of responsibility located near the top of the following chart are more likely to have an impact on respondent’s overall rating, than the areas closest to the axis.

**Regression analysis – Results considerations**

**The individual service areas which have the strongest influence on the overall performance rating are:**

* + **Decisions made in the interest of the community**
  + **The condition of sealed roads** (includes local streets and roads managed by each council but excluding highways and main roads that are managed by VicRoads).

Other key areas with a positive influence on overall performance include:

* + Council’s general town planning
  + Appearance of public areas
  + Community and cultural activities
  + Support services
  + Business and community development.

The appearance of public areas has the strongest positive net performance and a positive relationship to the overall performance rating. Currently, Councils State-wide are performing *very well* in this area (performance index of 71) and, while public areas should remain a focus, there is greater work to be done elsewhere. This is followed by community and cultural activities.

Decisions made in the community’s interest, condition of sealed roads and Councils’ general town planning, have lower (though still positive) performance index scores, and continuing efforts in these areas has the capacity to lift Councils’ overall performance rating. These areas are among Council’s lower rated performance areas (indices of 53-54).

Good communication with residents promoting Council’s decisions made in the communities’ interest, promotion of road improvements and transparency of town planning could help improve opinion in these areas and drive up overall opinion of Victorian Councils’ performance.

**DETAILED FINDINGS**

**KEY CORE MEASURE OVERALL PERFORMANCE**

**Overall Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 65 | 64 | 66 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| Interface | 60 | 60 | 61 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 59 | 60 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 61 |
| 65+ | 59 | 60 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 61 |
| Overall | 59 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 60 |
| Regional Centres | 58 | 57 | 55 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 58 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 59 |
| 35-49 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 58 |
| Large Rural | 56 | 54 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| Small Rural | 56 | 58 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 59 |
| 50-64 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Metropolitan | 65 | 64 | 66 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**Overall Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 9 | 37 | 36 | 11 | 5 | 2 |
| 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 | 48 | 29 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Interface | 9 | 39 | 36 | 9 | 5 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 10 | 35 | 39 | 11 | 5 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 7 | 34 | 39 | 13 | 6 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 8 | 34 | 37 | 13 | 7 | 2 |
| Men | 9 | 37 | 35 | 12 | 6 | 1 |
| Women | 9 | 38 | 36 | 10 | 5 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 9 | 46 | 31 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 8 | 37 | 35 | 12 | 6 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 31 | 39 | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| 65+ | 11 | 35 | 38 | 10 | 5 | 2 |

**KEY CORE MEASURE CUSTOMER SERVICE**

**Contact Last 12 Months Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall contact with Council | * 62%, up 3 points on 2017 |
| Most contact with Council | * Aged 35-49 years |
| Least contact with Council | * Aged 18-34 years |
| Customer service rating | * Index score of 70, up 1 point on 2017 |
| Most satisfied with customer service | * Metropolitan * Regional Centres * Aged 65+ years * Women |
| Least satisfied with customer service | * Large Rural |

**2018 Contact with Council**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 35-49 | 68 |
| 50-64 | 66 |
| Interface | 64 |
| Small Rural | 64 |
| Women | 63 |
| Overall | 62 |
| Large Rural | 61 |
| Metropolitan | 60 |
| Men | 60 |
| Regional Centres | 59 |
| 65+ | 59 |
| 18-34 | 55 |

**2018 Contact with Council**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Total have had contact | 61 | 60 | 61 | 61 | 59 | 59 | 62 |

**2018 Method of Contact with Council**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| 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 |  |

**2018 Most Recent Method of Contact With Council**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| By telephone | 38 | 42 | 44 | 40 | 38 | 39 | 39 |
| In person | 34 | 29 | 28 | 33 | 34 | 32 | 30 |
| By email | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 14 |
| In writing | 12 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 |
| Via website | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| By social media | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| By text message |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**2018 Contact Customer Service Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 72 | 71 | 73 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 72 | 72 | 70 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 72 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Women | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 73 |
| Overall | 70 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Interface | 70 | 69 | 70 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 69 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 70 |
| Small Rural | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 18-34 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 69 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 50-64 | 68 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Men | 68 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 70 | 70 | 69 |
| Large Rural | 67 | 66 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 68 |
| Metropolitan | 72 | 71 | 73 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Contact Customer Service Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 31 | 36 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
| 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 | 38 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Interface | 32 | 35 | 16 | 8 | 7 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 32 | 38 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 28 | 36 | 19 | 9 | 7 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 31 | 35 | 19 | 8 | 7 | 1 |
| Men | 28 | 37 | 19 | 8 | 7 | 2 |
| Women | 34 | 35 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 27 | 39 | 19 | 7 | 6 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 36 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 30 | 35 | 18 | 9 | 7 | 1 |
| 65+ | 34 | 35 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 1 |

**2018 Contact Customer Service Index Scores by Method of Last Contact**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Via website | 75 | 75 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 73 | 75 |
| In person | 74 | 76 | 74 | 77 | 77 | 74 | 75 |
| By social media | 72 | 69 | 74 | 66 | 73 | 75 | 79 |
| By telephone | 71 | 73 | 71 | 73 | 75 | 72 | 73 |
| In writing | 65 | 61 | 62 | 66 | 69 | 68 | 69 |
| By email | 64 | 65 | 69 | 68 | 70 | 68 | 73 |
| By text message | 57 | 84 | 79 | 79 | 82 | 61 | 68 |

**2018 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 | * + 60% stayed about the same, down 2 points on 2017   + 19% improved, equal points on 2017   + 15% deteriorated, up 2 points on 2017 |
| Most satisfied with council direction | * + Aged 18-34 years   + Metropolitan |
| Least satisfied with council direction | * + Aged 50-64 years   + Small Rural   + Aged 35-49 years |
| Improvement | * + 44% a lot of room for improvement   + 45% little room for improvement   + 7% not much room for improvement |
| Direction headed | * + 65% right direction (17% definitely and 47% probably)   + 24% wrong direction (14% probably and 11% definitely) |
| Rates vs services trade-off | * + 33% prefer rate rise, up 2 points on 2017   + 48% prefer service cuts, down 1 point on 2017 |

**2018 Overall Council Direction Last 12 Months Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 57 | 56 | 56 | 58 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| Metropolitan | 54 | 54 | 55 | 56 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 53 | 53 | 54 | 54 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 53 | 55 | 51 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 53 | 54 | 52 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 52 |
| 65+ | 52 | 54 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 53 |
| Overall | 52 | 53 | 51 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 52 |
| Large Rural | 52 | 52 | 48 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 48 |
| Men | 51 | 52 | 51 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 51 |
| 35-49 | 50 | 51 | 49 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 49 |
| Small Rural | 50 | 52 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 52 | 50 |
| 50-64 | 48 | 50 | 48 | 51 | 50 | 50 | 48 |
| 18-34 | 57 | 56 | 56 | 58 | 57 | 57 | 56 |

**2018 Overall Council Direction Last 12 Months Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Improved* | *Stayed the same* | *Deteriorated* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 19 | 60 | 15 | 5 |
| 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 | 19 | 64 | 11 | 6 |
| Interface | 19 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| Regional Centres | 23 | 56 | 17 | 4 |
| Large Rural | 19 | 61 | 16 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 18 | 58 | 19 | 5 |
| Men | 19 | 60 | 17 | 4 |
| Women | 20 | 61 | 14 | 5 |
| 18-34 | 24 | 61 | 11 | 4 |
| 35-49 | 17 | 62 | 17 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 17 | 59 | 20 | 4 |
| 65+ | 19 | 60 | 15 | 6 |

**2018 Room for Improvement in Services Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *A lot* | *A little* | *Not much* | *Not at all* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 44 | 45 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| 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 | 36 | 51 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 51 | 40 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 42 | 46 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 45 | 45 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 37 | 51 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 40 | 51 | 7 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 51 | 39 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 46 | 40 | 7 | 1 | 5 |

**2018 Right/ Wrong Direction Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Definitely right direction* | *Probably right direction* | *Probably wrong direction* | *Definitely wrong direction* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 17 | 47 | 14 | 11 | 11 |
| 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 | 20 | 47 | 11 | 9 | 13 |
| Interface | 22 | 46 | 10 | 9 | 13 |
| Regional Centres | 9 | 46 | 20 | 18 | 7 |
| Large Rural | 17 | 47 | 15 | 10 | 11 |
| Small Rural | 15 | 49 | 13 | 11 | 11 |
| Men | 17 | 46 | 14 | 13 | 11 |
| Women | 18 | 48 | 13 | 9 | 12 |
| 18-34 | 19 | 53 | 15 | 5 | 8 |
| 35-49 | 15 | 45 | 14 | 14 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 42 | 15 | 16 | 12 |
| 65+ | 19 | 47 | 11 | 9 | 13 |

**2018 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* |
| 2018 Overall | 9 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 19 |
| 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 | 23 | 25 | 23 | 19 |
| Interface | 9 | 20 | 27 | 27 | 16 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 22 | 27 | 23 | 20 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 22 | 23 | 25 | 22 |
| Small Rural | 11 | 27 | 23 | 22 | 17 |
| Men | 11 | 23 | 23 | 25 | 18 |
| Women | 8 | 24 | 25 | 22 | 21 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 25 | 29 | 20 | 15 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 23 | 22 | 25 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 22 | 23 | 26 | 21 |
| 65+ | 8 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 21 |

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**Communications Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall preferred forms of communication | * Newsletter sent via mail (32%) |
| Preferred forms of communication among over 50s | * Newsletter sent via mail (33%) |
| Preferred forms of communication among under 50s | * Newsletter sent via mail (30%) * Newsletter sent via email (28%) |
| Greatest change since 2017 | * A text message (+3) |

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.

**2018 Best Forms of Communication**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 42 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 34 | 32 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 18 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 18 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 14 | 15 | 14 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local paper | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 12 |
| A text message | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| The council website | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Can't say | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**2018 Best Forms of Communication: Under 50s**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 39 | 37 | 36 | 35 | 37 | 32 | 30 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 21 | 21 | 24 | 25 | 27 | 28 | 28 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 18 | 19 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 11 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local paper | 14 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 9 |
| A text message | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 12 |
| The council website | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Other | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| Can't say | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**2018 Best Forms of Communication: Over 50s**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 46 | 42 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 37 | 33 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 15 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 25 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 17 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local paper | 16 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| A text message | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| The council website | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Can't say | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |

**INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AREAS**

**2018 Community Consultation and Engagement Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 50-64 | 77 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 |
| 65+ | 76 | 75 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 73 |
| Large Rural | 76 | 75 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 74 |
| Women | 76 | 76 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 |
| Regional Centres | 75 | 76 | 75 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 75 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 74 | 75 |
| Small Rural | 74 | 75 | 77 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 75 |
| Overall | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| Men | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| Metropolitan | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 70 | 72 | 75 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 68 | 67 | 72 | 68 | 68 | 67 | 68 |

**2018 Community Consultation and Engagement Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 30 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 26 | 38 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 32 | 41 | 23 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural | 33 | 41 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 31 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 27 | 40 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 32 | 41 | 23 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 37 | 35 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 32 | 41 | 23 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 36 | 41 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 31 | 44 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

**2018 Community Consultation and Engagement Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 58 | 58 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Metropolitan | 57 | 57 | 58 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 56 | 56 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 |
| Interface | 56 | 53 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 55 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 58 | 58 | 58 |
| Overall | 55 | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| 35-49 | 55 | 53 | 54 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 55 |
| Regional Centres | 55 | 54 | 52 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 54 | 52 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| Small Rural | 54 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 58 | 58 | 57 |
| Men | 54 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 56 |
| 50-64 | 51 | 52 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 54 | 54 |

**2018 Community Consultation and Engagement Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 8 | 30 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 9 |
| 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 | 9 | 29 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 11 |
| Interface | 7 | 30 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 12 |
| Regional Centres | 7 | 31 | 33 | 15 | 7 | 7 |
| Large Rural | 7 | 30 | 33 | 15 | 7 | 8 |
| Small Rural | 8 | 30 | 30 | 16 | 8 | 7 |
| Men | 7 | 30 | 31 | 16 | 8 | 8 |
| Women | 9 | 30 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| 18-34 | 8 | 35 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 8 |
| 35-49 | 8 | 31 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 26 | 33 | 18 | 9 | 8 |
| 65+ | 9 | 28 | 31 | 15 | 6 | 10 |

**2018 Lobbying on Behalf of The Community Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 71 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| Regional Centres | 70 | 72 | 69 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 70 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 73 |
| 35-49 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 72 |
| 50-64 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 72 |
| Interface | 68 | 67 | 70 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 68 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Large Rural | 68 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 |
| 65+ | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| Metropolitan | 66 | 67 | 68 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 66 | 66 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 68 |
| Men | 65 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 67 |

**2018 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* |
| 2018 Overall | 23 | 37 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| 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 | 36 | 29 | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| Interface | 25 | 35 | 27 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 28 | 36 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 22 | 39 | 26 | 8 | 3 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 25 | 39 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 19 | 36 | 30 | 10 | 3 | 2 |
| Women | 27 | 39 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 36 | 32 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 26 | 37 | 26 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 26 | 36 | 26 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 21 | 41 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 3 |

**2018 Lobbying on Behalf of The Community Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 60 |
| Metropolitan | 56 | 56 | 56 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 55 | 55 | 54 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Interface | 54 | 54 | 55 | 56 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 54 | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 56 |
| Overall | 54 | 54 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 55 |
| Regional Centres | 54 | 54 | 52 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 53 | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 56 |
| Men | 53 | 53 | 53 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| Large Rural | 52 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 53 | 53 |
| 35-49 | 52 | 52 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 53 | 53 |
| 50-64 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 52 |

**2018 Lobbying on Behalf of The Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 5 | 24 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 20 |
| 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 | 31 | 10 | 4 | 26 |
| Interface | 5 | 24 | 32 | 11 | 5 | 23 |
| Regional Centres | 6 | 26 | 35 | 14 | 5 | 14 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 23 | 34 | 14 | 6 | 19 |
| Small Rural | 6 | 25 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 19 |
| Men | 5 | 25 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 19 |
| Women | 5 | 24 | 33 | 12 | 5 | 21 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 31 | 33 | 11 | 4 | 17 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 23 | 33 | 13 | 6 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 20 | 33 | 16 | 7 | 19 |
| 65+ | 6 | 24 | 31 | 12 | 5 | 23 |

**2018 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 81 | 81 | 82 | 81 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 81 | 82 | 82 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 81 | 81 | 80 | 82 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 80 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 80 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 80 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 79 | 79 | 79 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 79 | 78 | 79 | 78 | 78 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 78 | 79 | 79 | 78 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 78 | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 77 | 78 | n/a | 82 | 81 | n/a | n/a |

**2018 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* |
| 2018 Overall | 39 | 42 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 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 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 33 | 47 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 42 | 41 | 13 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural | 40 | 41 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 34 | 41 | 21 | 2 | \* | 2 |
| Men | 35 | 43 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 42 | 41 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 37 | 44 | 17 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 35-49 | 42 | 39 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 39 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 35 | 46 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 3 |

**2018 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 58 | 58 | 59 | 59 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 60 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 56 | 55 | 56 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 54 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 54 | 55 | 54 | 55 | 58 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 54 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 53 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 56 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 52 | 55 | 53 | 56 | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 52 | 52 | 51 | 52 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 52 | 51 | 50 | 52 | 53 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 52 | 53 | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 6 | 30 | 34 | 14 | 7 | 9 |
| 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 | 8 | 32 | 32 | 10 | 5 | 13 |
| Interface | 6 | 32 | 33 | 11 | 6 | 12 |
| Regional Centres | 7 | 28 | 35 | 18 | 8 | 6 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 28 | 36 | 15 | 8 | 7 |
| Small Rural | 6 | 29 | 34 | 15 | 9 | 7 |
| Men | 6 | 29 | 33 | 15 | 8 | 8 |
| Women | 6 | 30 | 35 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 37 | 32 | 12 | 6 | 7 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 29 | 34 | 15 | 8 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 25 | 35 | 17 | 9 | 9 |
| 65+ | 7 | 27 | 35 | 14 | 7 | 10 |

**2018 The Condition of Sealed Local Roads in Your Area Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 84 | 81 | n/a | 78 | 81 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 82 | 79 | 79 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 82 | 80 | 79 | 78 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 81 | 80 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 81 | 80 | 79 | 78 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 80 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 79 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 80 | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 80 | 77 | 80 | 78 | 80 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 80 | 78 | 78 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 78 | 77 | 76 | 75 | 75 | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 78 | 77 | 76 | 75 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 77 | 75 | 76 | 73 | 73 | n/a | n/a |

**2018 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* |
| 2018 Overall | 38 | 44 | 15 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 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 | 33 | 46 | 18 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Interface | 45 | 41 | 12 | 1 | 1 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 41 | 44 | 13 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 39 | 43 | 15 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Small Rural | 47 | 45 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 35 | 45 | 17 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Women | 40 | 44 | 13 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 35 | 42 | 19 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 39 | 45 | 14 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 43 | 41 | 14 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 65+ | 36 | 50 | 12 | 1 | \* | 1 |

**2018 The Condition of Sealed Local Roads in Your Area Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 68 | 66 | 67 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 57 | 59 | 60 | 60 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 55 | 56 | 58 | 57 | 59 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 55 | 54 | 56 | 57 | 56 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 54 | 53 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 53 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 53 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 53 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 55 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 54 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 50 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 52 | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 49 | 50 | 52 | 52 | 51 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 45 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 43 | n/a | n/a |

**2018 The Condition of Sealed Local Roads in Your Area Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 11 | 31 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 1 |
| 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 | 20 | 44 | 23 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| Interface | 12 | 37 | 27 | 15 | 8 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 31 | 29 | 17 | 10 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 6 | 24 | 29 | 22 | 18 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 7 | 27 | 31 | 19 | 14 | 1 |
| Men | 11 | 32 | 27 | 17 | 12 | 1 |
| Women | 10 | 31 | 29 | 17 | 11 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 34 | 26 | 16 | 11 | \* |
| 35-49 | 11 | 31 | 27 | 18 | 13 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 28 | 29 | 20 | 14 | 1 |
| 65+ | 10 | 33 | 31 | 15 | 10 | 1 |

**2018 Informing the Community Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 77 | 77 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| Regional Centres | 77 | 77 | 76 | 76 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 77 | 74 | 77 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 76 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| 50-64 | 76 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 76 | 77 | 78 |
| Small Rural | 75 | 76 | 78 | 76 | 76 | 77 | 76 |
| Large Rural | 75 | 74 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Overall | 75 | 74 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| 35-49 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 73 | 74 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 73 | 72 | 75 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 74 |
| Men | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 72 |

**2018 Informing the Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 32 | 41 | 22 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 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 | 29 | 41 | 24 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Interface | 35 | 42 | 21 | 1 | 1 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 37 | 41 | 17 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 32 | 41 | 23 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Small Rural | 32 | 40 | 23 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 27 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 2 | \* |
| Women | 36 | 41 | 20 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 31 | 37 | 26 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 32 | 39 | 24 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 34 | 41 | 20 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 30 | 46 | 19 | 3 | 1 | \* |

**2018 Informing the Community Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 61 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| Metropolitan | 61 | 61 | 63 | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 60 | 55 | 55 | 56 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 63 | 62 | 61 |
| 65+ | 60 | 61 | 59 | 61 | 65 | 63 | 62 |
| Large Rural | 59 | 60 | 56 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 57 |
| Overall | 59 | 59 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Regional Centres | 59 | 58 | 59 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 60 | 58 |
| Men | 58 | 58 | 58 | 60 | 62 | 61 | 59 |
| Small Rural | 56 | 58 | 58 | 60 | 65 | 61 | 61 |
| 50-64 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 58 | 60 | 59 | 57 |

**2018 Informing the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 11 | 36 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| 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 | 31 | 12 | 4 | 3 |
| Interface | 11 | 40 | 30 | 13 | 4 | 3 |
| Regional Centres | 14 | 33 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 36 | 31 | 14 | 5 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 10 | 34 | 31 | 14 | 7 | 3 |
| Men | 11 | 35 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 3 |
| Women | 12 | 36 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 39 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 35 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 32 | 32 | 16 | 7 | 3 |
| 65+ | 12 | 36 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |

**2018 The Condition of Local Streets and Footpaths in Your Area Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 80 | 80 | 79 | 78 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 79 | 79 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 81 | 79 |
| 50-64 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 |
| Metropolitan | 79 | 78 | 78 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 79 | 77 | 77 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 78 | 78 | 77 | 78 | 77 | 78 | 78 |
| 35-49 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 77 |
| Overall | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 77 |
| Large Rural | 77 | 75 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 78 |
| Men | 76 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| Small Rural | 76 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 76 |
| 18-34 | 75 | 74 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 74 |

**2018 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* |
| 2018 Overall | 35 | 43 | 18 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| 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 | 44 | 17 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 40 | 41 | 17 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Regional Centres | 37 | 42 | 17 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural | 34 | 41 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 31 | 44 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 32 | 43 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 39 | 42 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 34 | 39 | 22 | 4 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 36 | 43 | 18 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 38 | 42 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 34 | 47 | 15 | 2 | \* | 2 |

**2018 The Condition of Local Streets and Footpaths in Your Area Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 64 | 62 | 63 | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 62 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 62 | 63 | 62 |
| Interface | 59 | 56 | 57 | 56 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 59 | 57 | 58 | 58 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 59 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 58 |
| Overall | 58 | 57 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 57 |
| 35-49 | 58 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| Women | 58 | 56 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 56 | 56 |
| 65+ | 58 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| Small Rural | 57 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 58 | 56 | 56 |
| 50-64 | 56 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| Large Rural | 54 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 53 | 52 | 51 |

**2018 The Condition of Local Streets and Footpaths in Your Area Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 14 | 34 | 28 | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| 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 | 18 | 39 | 26 | 11 | 4 | 1 |
| Interface | 14 | 38 | 25 | 15 | 8 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 17 | 31 | 28 | 16 | 7 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 10 | 32 | 29 | 16 | 10 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 33 | 29 | 14 | 8 | 4 |
| Men | 14 | 36 | 26 | 14 | 8 | 3 |
| Women | 13 | 33 | 29 | 15 | 7 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 17 | 38 | 25 | 13 | 6 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 14 | 35 | 27 | 14 | 8 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 11 | 32 | 30 | 16 | 8 | 3 |
| 65+ | 12 | 33 | 29 | 14 | 7 | 4 |

**2018 Traffic Management Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 84 | 67 | 71 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 77 | 75 | 75 | 73 | 73 | 75 | 76 |
| Metropolitan | 76 | 76 | 75 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 74 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 69 | 71 | 73 |
| 65+ | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 75 |
| Overall | 74 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 |
| Regional Centres | 74 | 71 | 72 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 74 | 74 |
| 18-34 | 73 | 71 | 70 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 72 |
| Men | 71 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 69 | 70 |
| Large Rural | 67 | 67 | 70 | 68 | 67 | 69 | 68 |
| Small Rural | 63 | 62 | 63 | 57 | 64 | 66 | 68 |

**2018 Traffic Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 31 | 40 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 34 | 42 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 51 | 35 | 12 | 1 | 1 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 29 | 40 | 26 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural | 22 | 40 | 26 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 16 | 35 | 35 | 13 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 26 | 40 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 36 | 40 | 19 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 18-34 | 31 | 39 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 32 | 41 | 21 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 33 | 37 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 30 | 44 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

**2018 Traffic Management Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 65 | 67 | 65 | 67 | 68 | 64 | 65 |
| Large Rural | 60 | 62 | 62 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 59 |
| 18-34 | 58 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 62 |
| Women | 58 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 59 |
| 65+ | 57 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 61 | 60 |
| Metropolitan | 57 | 56 | 56 | 57 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 57 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 58 |
| Regional Centres | 56 | 61 | 59 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 56 | 58 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 58 |
| 50-64 | 55 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 56 |
| 35-49 | 55 | 58 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 58 | 55 |
| Interface | 51 | 59 | 57 | 61 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Traffic Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 10 | 36 | 30 | 15 | 7 | 3 |
| 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 | 10 | 37 | 29 | 15 | 7 | 2 |
| Interface | 7 | 31 | 29 | 21 | 11 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 11 | 32 | 33 | 14 | 8 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 37 | 32 | 10 | 5 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 14 | 44 | 25 | 10 | 2 | 5 |
| Men | 10 | 34 | 30 | 16 | 8 | 3 |
| Women | 10 | 37 | 29 | 14 | 7 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 39 | 28 | 13 | 8 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 34 | 28 | 18 | 8 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 34 | 31 | 16 | 7 | 3 |
| 65+ | 9 | 35 | 32 | 13 | 6 | 5 |

**2018 Parking Facilities Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 75 | 72 | 73 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 74 | 73 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| 65+ | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 72 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 72 |
| Overall | 71 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 70 |
| 18-34 | 69 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
| Men | 69 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 68 |
| Large Rural | 66 | 66 | 68 | 67 | 66 | 69 | 69 |
| Small Rural | 64 | 64 | 65 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 |

**2018 Parking Facilities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 27 | 39 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 29 | 40 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 33 | 39 | 21 | 6 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 19 | 37 | 33 | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 16 | 37 | 33 | 11 | 2 | \* |
| Men | 22 | 39 | 29 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 31 | 39 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 27 | 34 | 31 | 8 | 1 | - |
| 35-49 | 25 | 38 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |

**2018 Parking Facilities Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 60 | 63 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Large Rural | 59 | 60 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 56 |
| 18-34 | 58 | 56 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Interface | 57 | 57 | 56 | 60 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 56 | 56 | 56 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 57 |
| Overall | 56 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 56 |
| 50-64 | 56 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| 35-49 | 56 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 57 | 55 |
| Women | 55 | 55 | 56 | 56 | 57 | 56 | 56 |
| Metropolitan | 55 | 53 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 54 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 56 | 55 |
| Regional Centres | 51 | 52 | 54 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Parking Facilities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 9 | 35 | 31 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| 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 | 9 | 34 | 32 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| Interface | 7 | 39 | 31 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 10 | 29 | 28 | 19 | 13 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 39 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 37 | 33 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| Men | 9 | 36 | 31 | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| Women | 10 | 34 | 32 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 37 | 31 | 13 | 7 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 36 | 29 | 15 | 9 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 33 | 33 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| 65+ | 8 | 32 | 33 | 15 | 8 | 3 |

**2018 Enforcement of Local Laws Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| Interface | 74 | 73 | 73 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 72 | 71 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 72 | 73 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 71 |
| Regional Centres | 71 | 71 | 70 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 70 |
| Overall | 71 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 |
| 18-34 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 72 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 68 | 70 | 68 |
| Large Rural | 68 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 69 |
| Men | 67 | 68 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 68 | 66 |
| Small Rural | 66 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 |

**2018 Enforcement of Local Laws Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 27 | 37 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 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 | 30 | 39 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 33 | 38 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 29 | 35 | 28 | 6 | 2 | \* |
| Large Rural | 23 | 36 | 31 | 7 | 2 | \* |
| Small Rural | 19 | 38 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 23 | 36 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 31 | 39 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 29 | 35 | 26 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 26 | 34 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 37 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 25 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

**2018 Enforcement of Local Laws Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Regional Centres | 66 | 66 | 64 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 65 | 65 | 65 | 67 | 67 | 66 | 67 |
| Metropolitan | 64 | 64 | 64 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 65 | 66 | 65 | 64 |
| Large Rural | 64 | 63 | 63 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| Overall | 64 | 64 | 63 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 65 |
| Small Rural | 63 | 65 | 64 | 66 | 67 | 65 | 65 |
| 65+ | 62 | 63 | 62 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Men | 62 | 63 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 64 | 64 |
| Interface | 61 | 60 | 61 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 63 |

**2018 Enforcement of Local Laws Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 12 | 39 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| 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 | 12 | 39 | 24 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Interface | 12 | 35 | 27 | 12 | 3 | 11 |
| Regional Centres | 16 | 39 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 10 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 40 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 13 |
| Small Rural | 11 | 39 | 25 | 8 | 4 | 12 |
| Men | 11 | 38 | 27 | 9 | 4 | 11 |
| Women | 13 | 40 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 14 |
| 18-34 | 16 | 44 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 7 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 40 | 24 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 35 | 28 | 9 | 4 | 14 |
| 65+ | 10 | 35 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 16 |

**2018 Family Support Services Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 78 |
| 18-34 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 75 |
| Interface | 76 | 74 | 75 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 75 | 76 | 73 | 75 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 75 | 73 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 74 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| Overall | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| 65+ | 72 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 |
| Large Rural | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| 50-64 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 |
| Small Rural | 69 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 74 |
| Men | 69 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 69 |

**2018 Family Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 30 | 40 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 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 | 32 | 40 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 34 | 40 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 34 | 39 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 27 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 23 | 40 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Men | 23 | 38 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 37 | 41 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 35 | 39 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 32 | 39 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 28 | 39 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 25 | 43 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 4 |

**2018 Family Support Services Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 68 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 70 |
| Metropolitan | 68 | 68 | 69 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 67 | 68 | 66 | 67 | 69 | 67 | 67 |
| Interface | 67 | 65 | 65 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 67 | 67 | 66 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 68 |
| Women | 67 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 68 | 67 |
| 35-49 | 67 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 65 |
| Overall | 66 | 67 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 67 |
| Men | 66 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 66 |
| Regional Centres | 66 | 67 | 66 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 65 | 65 | 64 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 |
| 50-64 | 63 | 64 | 62 | 65 | 66 | 64 | 64 |

**2018 Family Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 11 | 31 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 32 |
| 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 | 29 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 37 |
| Interface | 11 | 33 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 30 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 36 | 25 | 5 | 3 | 18 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 31 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 30 |
| Small Rural | 11 | 31 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 34 |
| Men | 9 | 32 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 33 |
| Women | 12 | 31 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 30 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 36 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 22 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 34 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 27 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 27 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 38 |
| 65+ | 10 | 28 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 40 |

**2018 Elderly Support Services Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 83 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| 50-64 | 81 | 80 | 78 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 81 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 81 | 81 |
| Regional Centres | 80 | 79 | 79 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 81 |
| 65+ | 80 | 79 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 | 80 |
| Small Rural | 80 | 78 | 79 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 79 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 80 |
| Metropolitan | 79 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 80 |
| 35-49 | 79 | 77 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 80 |
| Large Rural | 78 | 77 | 78 | 78 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 77 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 78 |
| Men | 75 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 76 |

**2018 Elderly Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 38 | 43 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 36 | 44 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 40 | 43 | 13 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 44 | 38 | 15 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 36 | 44 | 17 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Small Rural | 39 | 41 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Men | 30 | 44 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 45 | 41 | 11 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 35 | 41 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 38 | 42 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 40 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 37 | 46 | 13 | 2 | \* | 1 |

**2018 Elderly Support Services Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 70 | 72 | 71 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 73 |
| Small Rural | 69 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| Women | 68 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 71 | 70 | 69 |
| Overall | 68 | 68 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| Men | 67 | 68 | 67 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| Metropolitan | 67 | 67 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 67 | 67 | 66 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| Interface | 67 | 64 | 59 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 67 | 66 | 65 | 66 | 68 | 67 | 66 |
| Regional Centres | 66 | 68 | 66 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 69 | 67 | 67 |

**2018 Elderly Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 14 | 32 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 29 |
| 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 | 10 | 27 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 40 |
| Interface | 11 | 30 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 34 |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 37 | 22 | 8 | 2 | 15 |
| Large Rural | 14 | 32 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 26 |
| Small Rural | 18 | 35 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 22 |
| Men | 12 | 32 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 29 |
| Women | 15 | 31 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 29 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 33 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 30 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 29 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 37 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 29 | 21 | 6 | 3 | 29 |
| 65+ | 19 | 34 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 22 |

**2018 Disadvantaged Support Services Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 76 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 77 |
| Metropolitan | 74 | 71 | 73 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 73 | 72 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 75 |
| 65+ | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Overall | 72 | 71 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| 50-64 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| Interface | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 72 | 70 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Large Rural | 70 | 70 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 71 |
| Men | 69 | 67 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 69 | 69 |

**2018 Disadvantaged Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 27 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 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 | 29 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 24 | 45 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 24 | 39 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Men | 21 | 42 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 33 | 41 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 28 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 26 | 40 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 28 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 25 | 45 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 3 |

**2018 Disadvantaged Support Services Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 64 | 64 | 64 | 65 | 67 | 64 | 66 |
| Men | 63 | 62 | 61 | 62 | 65 | 64 | 63 |
| Interface | 62 | 56 | 58 | 61 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 62 | 61 | 60 | 62 | 65 | 65 | 66 |
| Metropolitan | 61 | 62 | 62 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 64 | 62 | 63 |
| Large Rural | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 64 | 62 | 62 |
| Regional Centres | 61 | 63 | 59 | 61 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 61 | 60 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Women | 60 | 61 | 60 | 62 | 63 | 61 | 63 |
| 50-64 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 59 |

**2018 Disadvantaged Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 6 | 25 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 38 |
| 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 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 43 |
| Interface | 6 | 26 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 38 |
| Regional Centres | 10 | 29 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 20 |
| Large Rural | 6 | 25 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 39 |
| Men | 7 | 25 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 38 |
| Women | 6 | 24 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 38 |
| 18-34 | 7 | 29 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 29 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 22 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 43 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 21 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 42 |
| 65+ | 7 | 25 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 41 |

**2018 Recreational Facilities Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 35-49 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 75 |
| Women | 75 | 74 | 75 | 73 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Regional Centres | 74 | 73 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 74 | 72 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 74 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 74 | 72 |
| 50-64 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 |
| Overall | 73 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 72 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 71 | 71 | 72 |
| 65+ | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| 18-34 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Men | 72 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 70 | 70 | 70 |

**2018 Recreational Facilities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 25 | 46 | 25 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 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 | 23 | 48 | 25 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Interface | 26 | 46 | 24 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Regional Centres | 27 | 45 | 24 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 26 | 46 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 25 | 45 | 25 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 23 | 46 | 27 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 27 | 47 | 23 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 24 | 44 | 28 | 4 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 29 | 46 | 22 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 26 | 46 | 25 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 21 | 50 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

**2018 Recreational Facilities Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 72 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 74 |
| Women | 70 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Regional Centres | 70 | 69 | 70 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 69 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 18-34 | 69 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Men | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 69 |
| Small Rural | 69 | 69 | 68 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Interface | 68 | 66 | 67 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 68 | 69 | 67 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| 35-49 | 68 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 67 |
| Large Rural | 66 | 66 | 65 | 66 | 68 | 66 | 67 |

**2018 Recreational Facilities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 22 | 42 | 22 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| 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 | 26 | 45 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Interface | 22 | 40 | 23 | 8 | 3 | 4 |
| Regional Centres | 24 | 41 | 24 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 19 | 41 | 24 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
| Small Rural | 22 | 42 | 21 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| Men | 22 | 43 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| Women | 23 | 41 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 42 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 22 | 41 | 22 | 9 | 4 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 21 | 41 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| 65+ | 24 | 44 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 6 |

**2018 The Appearance of Public Areas Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 76 | 75 | 75 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 76 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 76 | 75 |
| 50-64 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 76 | 74 |
| 35-49 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 74 |
| 65+ | 75 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| Regional Centres | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 74 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Overall | 74 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 73 |
| Metropolitan | 74 | 75 | 74 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 73 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 72 |
| Men | 72 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 71 |
| 18-34 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 71 |

**2018 The Appearance of Public Areas Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 26 | 46 | 24 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 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 | 25 | 48 | 24 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 30 | 47 | 21 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Regional Centres | 29 | 44 | 23 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 24 | 46 | 27 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Small Rural | 26 | 46 | 24 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Men | 23 | 46 | 28 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Women | 29 | 47 | 21 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 24 | 41 | 30 | 4 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 27 | 47 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 29 | 46 | 22 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 25 | 52 | 21 | 2 | \* | 1 |

**2018 The Appearance of Public Areas Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 72 | 74 | 73 | 74 | 76 | 73 | 74 |
| Women | 72 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 72 |
| 65+ | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 |
| 18-34 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 |
| 35-49 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 70 |
| Overall | 71 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Men | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| 50-64 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 69 | 70 |
| Large Rural | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 71 | 69 | 70 |
| Interface | 68 | 66 | 66 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 The Appearance of Public Areas Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 24 | 45 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 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 | 49 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 17 | 49 | 24 | 7 | 3 | \* |
| Regional Centres | 29 | 42 | 21 | 5 | 2 | \* |
| Large Rural | 22 | 45 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 27 | 43 | 21 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Men | 23 | 47 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 26 | 44 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 23 | 48 | 21 | 5 | 2 | \* |
| 35-49 | 26 | 44 | 20 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 23 | 44 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 24 | 45 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

**2018 Art Centres and Libraries Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 69 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 71 |
| 65+ | 67 | 66 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 68 |
| Metropolitan | 67 | 67 | 68 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 67 | 62 | 66 | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 67 | 67 |
| 50-64 | 65 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 67 |
| Overall | 65 | 64 | 66 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| Regional Centres | 63 | 62 | 64 | 66 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 62 | 61 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 |
| Large Rural | 62 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 63 |
| Small Rural | 61 | 61 | 65 | 62 | 64 | 66 | n/a |
| Men | 61 | 60 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 |

**2018 Art Centres and Libraries Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 16 | 39 | 34 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 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 | 42 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 18 | 37 | 36 | 7 | \* | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 36 | 33 | 12 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 12 | 36 | 39 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 13 | 35 | 35 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| Men | 12 | 35 | 36 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 19 | 42 | 31 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 14 | 34 | 38 | 13 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 17 | 39 | 32 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 17 | 37 | 35 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 16 | 46 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 2 |

**2018 Art Centres and Libraries Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 76 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 78 | 76 | 76 |
| Regional Centres | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 75 | 75 | 74 | 75 | 77 | 74 | 74 |
| Interface | 75 | 72 | 68 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 75 | 75 | 74 | 75 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 74 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 76 | 73 | 72 |
| Overall | 74 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 75 | 73 | 73 |
| Small Rural | 73 | 72 | 71 | 69 | 75 | 59 | 63 |
| 18-34 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| Men | 73 | 72 | 70 | 72 | 74 | 72 | 71 |
| 50-64 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| Large Rural | 71 | 70 | 70 | 73 | 73 | 71 | 73 |

**2018 Art Centres and Libraries Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 16 | 39 | 34 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 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 | 42 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 18 | 37 | 36 | 7 | \* | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 15 | 36 | 33 | 12 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 12 | 36 | 39 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 13 | 35 | 35 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| Men | 12 | 35 | 36 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 19 | 42 | 31 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 14 | 34 | 38 | 13 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 17 | 39 | 32 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 17 | 37 | 35 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 16 | 46 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 2 |

**2018 Community and Cultural Activities Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 64 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 18-34 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 61 | 60 |
| Regional Centres | 62 | 62 | 62 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 61 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 60 | 64 | 63 |
| Metropolitan | 61 | 61 | 62 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 61 | 61 | 64 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 63 |
| 65+ | 61 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| 35-49 | 60 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 63 | 62 |
| Large Rural | 60 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 59 |
| Small Rural | 60 | 60 | 61 | 61 | 61 | 62 | 61 |
| 50-64 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 58 |
| Men | 57 | 57 | 63 | 59 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Community and Cultural Activities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 12 | 34 | 40 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| 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 | 12 | 34 | 41 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 13 | 35 | 39 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 14 | 36 | 36 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 33 | 43 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 11 | 31 | 46 | 11 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 10 | 30 | 42 | 14 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 14 | 38 | 39 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 34 | 39 | 10 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 11 | 34 | 42 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 11 | 32 | 42 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| 65+ | 11 | 36 | 38 | 11 | 2 | 2 |

**2018 Community and Cultural Activities Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 70 | 70 | 71 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 65+ | 69 | 70 | 69 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 69 | 68 |
| Small Rural | 69 | 69 | 65 | 68 | 71 | 68 | 67 |
| Overall | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| Regional Centres | 68 | 69 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 68 |
| Men | 67 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 67 |
| Interface | 67 | 64 | 63 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 67 | 69 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 66 |
| 50-64 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 68 | 67 |

**2018 Community and Cultural Activities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 17 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 9 |
| 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 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 11 |
| Interface | 14 | 42 | 27 | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| Regional Centres | 18 | 43 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 6 |
| Large Rural | 16 | 41 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| Small Rural | 18 | 41 | 28 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| Men | 15 | 41 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| Women | 19 | 43 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 8 |
| 18-34 | 18 | 41 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| 35-49 | 18 | 44 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 15 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 10 |
| 65+ | 17 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 12 |

**2018 Waste Management Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 84 | 79 | 81 | 79 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 83 | 81 | 82 | 81 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 83 | 81 | 82 | 80 | 80 | 81 | 80 |
| 65+ | 82 | 79 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| 50-64 | 82 | 80 | 81 | 81 | 80 | 81 | 79 |
| 35-49 | 82 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 79 |
| Overall | 81 | 79 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 78 |
| Regional Centres | 81 | 79 | 79 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 81 | 78 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 78 | 76 |
| Men | 80 | 77 | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 |
| 18-34 | 79 | 78 | 79 | 76 | 77 | 76 | 76 |
| Small Rural | 78 | 76 | 79 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 |

**2018 Waste Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 42 | 43 | 13 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 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 | 46 | 42 | 11 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Interface | 46 | 43 | 10 | \* | \* | \* |
| Regional Centres | 41 | 43 | 14 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural | 40 | 42 | 15 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Small Rural | 35 | 46 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 39 | 43 | 15 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Women | 45 | 43 | 11 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 39 | 42 | 17 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 44 | 41 | 14 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 44 | 42 | 12 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 65+ | 41 | 47 | 10 | 1 | \* | 1 |

**2018 Waste Management Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 75 | 75 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 73 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 75 |
| Men | 70 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 |
| Overall | 70 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 71 | 72 |
| Women | 70 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 72 |
| Regional Centres | 70 | 69 | 69 | 71 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| 35-49 | 69 | 70 | 68 | 69 | 71 | 69 | 69 |
| Small Rural | 69 | 70 | 69 | 71 | 73 | 71 | 72 |
| 50-64 | 68 | 69 | 67 | 70 | 71 | 69 | 70 |
| Interface | 68 | 71 | 71 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 67 | 68 | 66 | 68 | 70 | 68 | 69 |

**2018 Waste Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 24 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| 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 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Interface | 22 | 44 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 41 | 20 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 20 | 45 | 20 | 9 | 4 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 23 | 44 | 19 | 8 | 4 | 3 |
| Men | 24 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| Women | 24 | 44 | 19 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 47 | 19 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 23 | 44 | 19 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 43 | 21 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| 65+ | 28 | 45 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 3 |

**2018 Business and Community Development and Tourism Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 71 | 72 | 71 | 70 | 68 | 70 | 70 |
| Women | 68 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| 50-64 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 67 |
| 35-49 | 67 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 66 |
| 65+ | 66 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 |
| Overall | 66 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 66 |
| Large Rural | 65 | 67 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 70 |
| Men | 65 | 65 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 63 |
| 18-34 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 65 | 66 | 65 | 64 |
| Interface | 62 | 65 | 65 | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 59 | 60 | 60 | 59 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 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* |
| 2018 Overall | 21 | 36 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 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 | 30 | 39 | 14 | 3 | 1 |
| Interface | 15 | 33 | 35 | 13 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 30 | 41 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 17 | 37 | 34 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 27 | 39 | 26 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 20 | 34 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 22 | 38 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 33 | 33 | 12 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 23 | 34 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 37 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 19 | 40 | 29 | 7 | 3 | 2 |

**2018 Business and Community Development and Tourism Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 65 | 66 | n/a | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Women | 62 | 63 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| 65+ | 62 | 64 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| Large Rural | 61 | 60 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 |
| Overall | 60 | 61 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| Metropolitan | 60 | 60 | 62 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 59 | 64 | 61 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 63 |
| 35-49 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Regional Centres | 59 | 61 | 62 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 59 | 60 | 59 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 60 |
| 50-64 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 |

**2018 Business and Community Development and Tourism Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 10 | 33 | 31 | 10 | 4 | 12 |
| 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 | 8 | 28 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 22 |
| Interface | 9 | 42 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 15 |
| Regional Centres | 12 | 33 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 5 |
| Large Rural | 12 | 37 | 29 | 11 | 3 | 8 |
| Small Rural | 12 | 33 | 31 | 11 | 5 | 8 |
| Men | 10 | 33 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 11 |
| Women | 11 | 34 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 38 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 7 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 34 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 28 | 31 | 13 | 4 | 13 |
| 65+ | 11 | 33 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 15 |

**2018 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 76 | 76 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| 50-64 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 77 | 76 |
| Small Rural | 75 | 76 | 77 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 71 |
| Women | 74 | 74 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Large Rural | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| 35-49 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| Overall | 73 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 72 |
| Metropolitan | 73 | 73 | 72 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 72 | 71 | 72 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 72 | 71 | 71 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 70 |
| Interface | 71 | 70 | 72 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 67 | 64 | 68 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 66 |

**2018 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* |
| 2018 Overall | 27 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 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 | 27 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Interface | 24 | 38 | 30 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 40 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Large Rural | 29 | 41 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Small Rural | 30 | 41 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 25 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Women | 30 | 39 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 17 | 38 | 34 | 6 | 1 | 4 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 37 | 26 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 33 | 41 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 65+ | 30 | 45 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 4 |

**2018 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 59 | 57 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 60 | 59 |
| Interface | 55 | 51 | 52 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 54 | 56 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 54 | 54 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| Women | 54 | 53 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 55 | 54 |
| Overall | 54 | 53 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| Large Rural | 54 | 54 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 54 | 50 |
| Men | 54 | 53 | 51 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
| Metropolitan | 53 | 53 | 54 | 55 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 53 | 51 | 49 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 |
| 35-49 | 51 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 52 |
| 50-64 | 50 | 49 | 48 | 51 | 51 | 50 | 50 |

**2018 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 5 | 27 | 31 | 13 | 7 | 18 |
| 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 | 26 | 29 | 12 | 6 | 21 |
| Interface | 5 | 31 | 27 | 13 | 5 | 19 |
| Regional Centres | 6 | 29 | 32 | 14 | 7 | 12 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 27 | 32 | 12 | 7 | 16 |
| Small Rural | 5 | 25 | 34 | 14 | 7 | 15 |
| Men | 6 | 29 | 31 | 13 | 7 | 14 |
| Women | 5 | 26 | 30 | 12 | 6 | 21 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 34 | 29 | 9 | 4 | 18 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 26 | 30 | 13 | 9 | 18 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 22 | 33 | 16 | 7 | 18 |
| 65+ | 6 | 26 | 31 | 14 | 6 | 17 |

**2018 Planning and Building Permits Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 65+ | 75 | 75 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Metropolitan | 74 | 76 | 74 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 74 |
| Women | 73 | 74 | 74 | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 |
| 35-49 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Overall | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| Interface | 71 | 69 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 71 | 69 | 69 | 70 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 70 | 72 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 |
| Men | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Small Rural | 68 | 68 | 71 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| 18-34 | 64 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 66 |

**2018 Planning and Building Permits Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 26 | 39 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 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 | 32 | 38 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 25 | 37 | 32 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 24 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural | 25 | 38 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 23 | 39 | 24 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| Men | 24 | 38 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 28 | 39 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 18 | 33 | 35 | 10 | 2 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 27 | 39 | 26 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 31 | 40 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 30 | 43 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 4 |

**2018 Planning and Building Permits Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 57 | 55 | 55 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 60 |
| Regional Centres | 57 | 60 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 54 | 46 | 46 | 49 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 52 | 51 | 52 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 54 |
| Overall | 52 | 51 | 50 | 54 | 53 | 55 | 54 |
| Men | 51 | 50 | 49 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 53 |
| Metropolitan | 51 | 49 | 50 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 51 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 57 |
| 65+ | 50 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 53 |
| 35-49 | 50 | 49 | 48 | 53 | 51 | 54 | 51 |
| Large Rural | 49 | 48 | 50 | 54 | 53 | 54 | 51 |
| 50-64 | 49 | 47 | 48 | 51 | 50 | 50 | 49 |

**2018 Planning and Building Permits Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 5 | 24 | 27 | 13 | 8 | 23 |
| 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 | 25 | 27 | 14 | 9 | 21 |
| Interface | 4 | 25 | 25 | 11 | 6 | 28 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 28 | 27 | 9 | 7 | 21 |
| Large Rural | 4 | 22 | 27 | 15 | 9 | 23 |
| Small Rural | 6 | 21 | 28 | 14 | 9 | 23 |
| Men | 6 | 25 | 27 | 14 | 9 | 19 |
| Women | 5 | 22 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 26 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 30 | 29 | 10 | 5 | 20 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 24 | 26 | 13 | 11 | 21 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 21 | 29 | 15 | 9 | 22 |
| 65+ | 6 | 20 | 26 | 14 | 8 | 27 |

**2018 Environmental Sustainability Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 77 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 76 | 75 |
| 18-34 | 76 | 75 | 77 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 73 |
| Metropolitan | 74 | 73 | 74 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 73 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| Regional Centres | 73 | 72 | 71 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Large Rural | 73 | 72 | 73 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 68 |
| 50-64 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 72 | 71 |
| 65+ | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 69 |
| Small Rural | 70 | 70 | 74 | 77 | 76 | 71 | 75 |
| Men | 69 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 67 |
| Women | 77 | 76 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 76 | 75 |

**2018 Environmental Sustainability Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 31 | 39 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 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 | 32 | 40 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 31 | 39 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 31 | 37 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 27 | 37 | 26 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 26 | 37 | 27 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 36 | 40 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 35 | 38 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 32 | 37 | 24 | 5 | 2 | \* |
| 50-64 | 31 | 38 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 26 | 41 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 2018 Overall | 31 | 39 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

**2018 Environmental Sustainability Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 18-34 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 66 | 67 |
| Metropolitan | 64 | 64 | 64 | 65 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 64 | 65 | 63 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 64 | 62 | 60 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 63 | 64 | 63 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 35-49 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 63 |
| Men | 63 | 64 | 62 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Overall | 63 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| Women | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 65 |
| Small Rural | 62 | 63 | 61 | 63 | 64 | 62 | 63 |
| Large Rural | 61 | 62 | 62 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 64 |
| 50-64 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |

**2018 Environmental Sustainability Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 10 | 37 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 12 |
| 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 | 38 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 14 |
| Interface | 7 | 41 | 30 | 6 | 2 | 14 |
| Regional Centres | 13 | 38 | 32 | 7 | 3 | 8 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 35 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| Small Rural | 10 | 37 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| Men | 10 | 38 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| Women | 10 | 36 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 13 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 40 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 9 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 38 | 28 | 8 | 3 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 34 | 32 | 10 | 3 | 13 |
| 65+ | 10 | 36 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 14 |

**2018 Emergency and Disaster Management Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Women | 85 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 85 | 85 | 84 |
| Interface | 84 | 82 | 83 | 81 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 83 | 81 | 81 | 80 | 82 | 82 | 81 |
| Large Rural | 82 | 81 | 81 | 81 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 82 | 80 | 80 | 81 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 81 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| 35-49 | 81 | 78 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 |
| 65+ | 81 | 80 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| 50-64 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| Small Rural | 80 | 81 | 82 | 80 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Metropolitan | 80 | 77 | 76 | 77 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 77 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 76 |

**2018 Emergency and Disaster Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 48 | 33 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 45 | 32 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 53 | 33 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 50 | 34 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 50 | 32 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural | 43 | 35 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 41 | 34 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 55 | 32 | 10 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 52 | 32 | 13 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 49 | 31 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 48 | 30 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 43 | 39 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

**2018 Emergency and Disaster Management Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 73 | 70 | 68 | 68 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 75 | 72 | 73 |
| Small Rural | 72 | 72 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| Women | 72 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 70 | 70 |
| 65+ | 72 | 72 | 71 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 |
| Overall | 71 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 70 |
| 35-49 | 71 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 70 | 69 | 68 |
| Large Rural | 71 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 69 | 69 |
| Interface | 70 | 69 | 69 | 70 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 70 | 69 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| Metropolitan | 69 | 68 | 68 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 67 | 67 |

**2018 Emergency and Disaster Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 18 | 39 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 18 |
| 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 | 12 | 35 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 29 |
| Interface | 17 | 39 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 20 |
| Regional Centres | 23 | 40 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 13 |
| Large Rural | 19 | 41 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 16 |
| Small Rural | 22 | 39 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 15 |
| Men | 16 | 40 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 18 |
| Women | 20 | 38 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 19 |
| 18-34 | 21 | 45 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 11 |
| 35-49 | 18 | 39 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 19 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 36 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| 65+ | 18 | 36 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 22 |

**2018 Planning for Population Growth in The Area Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 50-64 | 80 | 79 | 77 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| Interface | 79 | 80 | 79 | 76 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 79 | 78 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 |
| 35-49 | 78 | 78 | 77 | 78 | 78 | 77 | 77 |
| Metropolitan | 78 | 75 | 75 | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 78 | 78 | 74 | 74 | 75 | 75 | 76 |
| Overall | 77 | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| 65+ | 77 | 77 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 75 |
| Men | 76 | 75 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| Regional Centres | 75 | 75 | 76 | 76 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 74 | 73 | 74 | 70 | 70 | 71 | 73 |

**2018 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* |
| 2018 Overall | 39 | 36 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 41 | 36 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 45 | 33 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 33 | 39 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 41 | 36 | 18 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 37 | 37 | 19 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 41 | 36 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 34 | 35 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 42 | 35 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 44 | 36 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 37 | 40 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

**2018 Planning for Population Growth in The Area Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 62 | 62 | 59 | 61 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 56 | 57 | 55 | 60 | 59 | 59 | 58 |
| Women | 52 | 52 | 51 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 52 |
| Overall | 52 | 52 | 51 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 52 |
| Men | 52 | 53 | 52 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 52 |
| 65+ | 51 | 52 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 52 |
| 35-49 | 51 | 50 | 49 | 51 | 52 | 51 | 48 |
| Metropolitan | 50 | 51 | 51 | 54 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 50 | 49 | 48 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 49 |
| Interface | 49 | 50 | 55 | 57 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 48 | 48 | 47 | 50 | 51 | 53 | 50 |

**2018 Planning for Population Growth in The Area Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 8 | 24 | 30 | 16 | 8 | 14 |
| 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 | 4 | 23 | 32 | 17 | 8 | 16 |
| Interface | 6 | 23 | 28 | 21 | 10 | 13 |
| Regional Centres | 16 | 31 | 28 | 10 | 5 | 10 |
| Large Rural | 7 | 20 | 29 | 19 | 10 | 15 |
| Men | 9 | 24 | 29 | 17 | 9 | 12 |
| Women | 7 | 24 | 30 | 16 | 7 | 16 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 29 | 28 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 8 | 23 | 31 | 17 | 9 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 22 | 29 | 18 | 8 | 16 |
| 65+ | 7 | 21 | 31 | 17 | 7 | 19 |

**2018 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| 50-64 | 78 | 78 | 76 | 76 | 78 | 78 | 74 |
| 65+ | 76 | 76 | 73 | 74 | 76 | 77 | 73 |
| Small Rural | 76 | 76 | n/a | 77 | 78 | 79 | 76 |
| Women | 76 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 78 | 77 | 74 |
| Large Rural | 75 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 77 | 77 | 72 |
| Interface | 75 | 76 | 76 | 75 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 73 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 75 | 74 | 71 |
| 35-49 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 76 | 71 |
| Men | 71 | 71 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 68 |
| 18-34 | 67 | 66 | 69 | 65 | 68 | 66 | 65 |
| Metropolitan | 62 | 65 | 64 | 62 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 29 | 40 | 25 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 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 | 12 | 36 | 43 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Interface | 31 | 39 | 27 | 3 | - | \* |
| Large Rural | 33 | 41 | 22 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Small Rural | 32 | 43 | 21 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 26 | 40 | 27 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 33 | 40 | 23 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 18-34 | 22 | 36 | 33 | 8 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 29 | 38 | 28 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 37 | 41 | 19 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 31 | 45 | 21 | 2 | \* | 1 |

**2018 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Metropolitan | 67 | 68 | 68 | 69 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 61 | 58 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 67 |
| Interface | 60 | 54 | 56 | 52 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 56 | 54 | 57 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 61 |
| 35-49 | 55 | 54 | 57 | 55 | 53 | 56 | 59 |
| Overall | 55 | 53 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 61 |
| Men | 54 | 52 | 55 | 54 | 55 | 57 | 60 |
| Small Rural | 54 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 59 |
| 65+ | 53 | 51 | 54 | 52 | 53 | 55 | 59 |
| 50-64 | 51 | 50 | 52 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 58 |
| Large Rural | 51 | 50 | 54 | 53 | 50 | 52 | 57 |

**2018 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 Overall | 10 | 34 | 29 | 16 | 9 | 3 |
| 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 | 16 | 45 | 29 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| Interface | 12 | 39 | 27 | 13 | 6 | 3 |
| Large Rural | 9 | 28 | 30 | 18 | 12 | 2 |
| Small Rural | 8 | 33 | 29 | 17 | 9 | 3 |
| Men | 10 | 34 | 28 | 16 | 10 | 2 |
| Women | 11 | 34 | 30 | 15 | 8 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 41 | 28 | 10 | 7 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 35 | 27 | 16 | 9 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 30 | 29 | 19 | 11 | 2 |

**2018 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads in Your Area Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 84 | 81 | 81 | 82 | 80 | 81 | 81 |
| 50-64 | 82 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 82 | 81 |
| Women | 82 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 81 | 83 | 82 |
| Interface | 81 | 79 | 79 | 78 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 80 | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 81 | 80 |
| 65+ | 80 | 79 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 80 | 79 |
| 35-49 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 82 | 80 |
| 18-34 | 79 | 76 | 78 | 76 | 77 | 80 | 79 |
| Men | 78 | 77 | 77 | 76 | 76 | 79 | 78 |
| Large Rural | 78 | 77 | 78 | 76 | 78 | 81 | 81 |
| Regional Centres | 77 | 76 | 70 | 72 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 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* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 Overall | 43 | 38 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 46 | 37 | 12 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 36 | 41 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 40 | 38 | 18 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Small Rural | 49 | 37 | 11 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| Men | 39 | 39 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 46 | 36 | 15 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 43 | 35 | 18 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 43 | 36 | 17 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 46 | 38 | 13 | 2 | \* | 1 |

**2018 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads in Your Area Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 52 | 52 | n/a | 51 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 48 | 45 | 44 | 47 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 44 | 45 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 48 | 50 |
| 18-34 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 46 | 47 | 48 |
| 35-49 | 43 | 44 | 42 | 44 | 45 | 42 | 44 |
| Men | 43 | 44 | 43 | 45 | 46 | 45 | 46 |
| Overall | 43 | 44 | 43 | 45 | 45 | 44 | 46 |
| Women | 42 | 43 | 43 | 45 | 45 | 43 | 46 |
| Large Rural | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 43 | 41 | 40 |
| 50-64 | 40 | 41 | 40 | 43 | 42 | 40 | 43 |
| Small Rural | 40 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 46 | 48 |

**2018 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads in Your Area Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 5 | 19 | 28 | 24 | 17 | 7 |
| 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 | 7 | 23 | 27 | 20 | 11 | 12 |
| Regional Centres | 8 | 26 | 27 | 18 | 8 | 13 |
| Large Rural | 5 | 18 | 28 | 25 | 18 | 6 |
| Small Rural | 4 | 17 | 30 | 25 | 20 | 4 |
| Men | 5 | 20 | 29 | 23 | 18 | 6 |
| Women | 5 | 19 | 28 | 24 | 16 | 8 |
| 18-34 | 7 | 21 | 27 | 25 | 17 | 4 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 22 | 27 | 24 | 17 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 17 | 28 | 25 | 19 | 6 |
| 65+ | 5 | 18 | 31 | 21 | 14 | 11 |

**2018 Business and Community Development Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 71 | 73 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 70 | 71 | 73 | 70 | 71 | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 70 | 72 | 72 | 69 | 70 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 70 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 71 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 69 | 70 | 70 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 71 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 68 | 67 | 69 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 68 | 69 | 69 | 67 | 67 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 68 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 66 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 68 | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Business and Community Development Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 21 | 40 | 31 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 19 | 40 | 33 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Regional Centres | 25 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural | 21 | 40 | 31 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 21 | 38 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 20 | 43 | 30 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 45 | 30 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 39 | 30 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 37 | 34 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 17 | 41 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 3 |

**2018 Business and Community Development Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Interface | 63 | 59 | 58 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 62 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 61 | 65 | 62 | 61 | 63 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 61 | 60 | 60 | 61 | 63 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 60 | 61 | 59 | 61 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 60 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 60 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 60 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 58 | 59 | 58 | 60 | 61 | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 58 | 59 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 55 | 58 | 61 | 54 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 63 | 59 | 58 | 63 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Business and Community Development Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 7 | 34 | 30 | 10 | 3 | 15 |
| 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 |
| Interface | 8 | 38 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 17 |
| Regional Centres | 5 | 33 | 34 | 15 | 5 | 8 |
| Large Rural | 8 | 31 | 30 | 12 | 4 | 15 |
| Small Rural | 7 | 40 | 28 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| Men | 7 | 34 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 15 |
| Women | 8 | 35 | 30 | 10 | 3 | 15 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 42 | 27 | 10 | 3 | 8 |
| 35-49 | 7 | 37 | 30 | 11 | 3 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 28 | 34 | 13 | 3 | 16 |
| 65+ | 7 | 31 | 29 | 9 | 2 | 23 |

**2018 Tourism Development Importance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Regional Centres | 71 | 70 | n/a | 64 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 67 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 63 | 63 | 65 | 66 | 67 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 62 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 62 | 64 | 64 | 67 | 66 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 62 | 63 | 67 | 67 | 67 | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 61 | 62 | 63 | 65 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 63 | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 59 | 59 | 62 | 59 | 63 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 51 | 53 | 57 | 50 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Tourism Development Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Extremely important* | *Very important* | *Fairly important* | *Not that important* | *Not at all important* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 16 | 32 | 35 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| 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 | 8 | 23 | 37 | 26 | 5 | 2 |
| Regional Centres | 26 | 37 | 29 | 6 | 1 | \* |
| Large Rural | 15 | 33 | 36 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| Men | 15 | 30 | 35 | 15 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 16 | 35 | 34 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 31 | 35 | 18 | 3 | - |
| 35-49 | 18 | 32 | 34 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 19 | 33 | 34 | 11 | 3 | \* |
| 65+ | 14 | 34 | 36 | 11 | 3 | 2 |

**2018 Tourism Development Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Small Rural | 67 | 67 | 64 | 63 | 66 | n/a | n/a |
| 18-34 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| Women | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 66 | n/a | n/a |
| 65+ | 64 | 63 | 62 | 65 | 66 | n/a | n/a |
| Regional Centres | 64 | 65 | 71 | 67 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Overall | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| 35-49 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 61 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| Men | 61 | 61 | 62 | 62 | 62 | n/a | n/a |
| Large Rural | 61 | 65 | 64 | 66 | 65 | n/a | n/a |
| Interface | 61 | 56 | 56 | 53 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 50-64 | 60 | 61 | 60 | 62 | 64 | n/a | n/a |
| Small Rural | 67 | 67 | 64 | 63 | 66 | n/a | n/a |

**2018 Tourism Development Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Very good* | *Good* | *Average* | *Poor* | *Very poor* | *Can't say* |
| 2018 Overall | 12 | 37 | 26 | 11 | 3 | 11 |
| 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 |
| Interface | 7 | 38 | 26 | 11 | 2 | 15 |
| Regional Centres | 14 | 40 | 28 | 11 | 2 | 5 |
| Large Rural | 11 | 35 | 28 | 11 | 3 | 12 |
| Small Rural | 20 | 38 | 23 | 9 | 3 | 7 |
| Men | 12 | 35 | 27 | 12 | 3 | 10 |
| Women | 13 | 39 | 25 | 9 | 3 | 11 |
| 18-34 | 14 | 42 | 24 | 12 | 2 | 7 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 36 | 27 | 11 | 3 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 33 | 28 | 12 | 5 | 11 |
| 65+ | 12 | 36 | 27 | 9 | 2 | 14 |

**DETAILED DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Gender Split**

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

**Age Split**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18-24 | 7% |
| 25-34 | 19% |
| 35-49 | 24% |
| 50-64 | 22% |
| 65+ | 28% |

*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.*

**2018 Household Structure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| Single person living alone | 13 |
| Single living with friends or housemates | 9 |
| 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 | 22 |
| 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 | 20 |
| Do not wish to answer | 3 |

**2018 Years Lived in Area**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0-5 years | 5-10 years | 10+ years | Can't say |
| 2018 Overall | 12 | 15 | 73 | \* |
| 2017 Overall | 14 | 17 | 69 | \* |
| 2016 Overall | 15 | 16 | 69 | \* |
| 2015 Overall | 13 | 14 | 73 | \* |
| 2014 Overall | 14 | 14 | 71 | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 14 | 14 | 72 |  |
| 2012 Overall | 15 | 16 | 68 | \* |

**2018 Years Lived in Area**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0-5 years | 5-10 years | 10-20 years | 20-30 years | 30+ years | Can't say |
| 2018 Overall | 12 | 15 | 23 | 21 | 29 | \* |
| 2017 Overall | 14 | 17 | 24 | 18 | 28 | \* |
| 2016 Overall | 15 | 16 | 25 | 17 | 27 | \* |
| Metropolitan | 15 | 15 | 23 | 22 | 26 | - |
| Interface | 20 | 22 | 28 | 14 | 16 | - |
| Regional Centres | 17 | 10 | 23 | 22 | 27 | \* |
| Large Rural | 9 | 14 | 22 | 22 | 34 | \* |
| Small Rural | 11 | 15 | 21 | 16 | 35 | - |
| Men | 13 | 15 | 21 | 21 | 30 | \* |
| Women | 12 | 15 | 24 | 21 | 28 | - |
| 18-34 | 23 | 18 | 21 | 31 | 8 | - |
| 35-49 | 14 | 22 | 31 | 14 | 19 | - |
| 50-64 | 6 | 9 | 23 | 22 | 39 | - |
| 65+ | 6 | 9 | 17 | 16 | 53 | \* |

**2018 Home Ownership**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Own | Rent |
| 2018 Overall | 92 | 7 |
| 2017 Overall | 83 | 15 |
| 2016 Overall | 79 | 20 |
| 2015 Overall | 82 | 17 |
| 2014 Overall | 83 | 16 |
| 2013 Overall | 83 | 16 |
| 2012 Overall | 81 | 18 |
| Small Rural | 92 | 7 |
| Men | 93 | 6 |
| Women | 91 | 9 |
| 18-34 | 92 | 8 |
| 35-49 | 85 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 95 | 5 |
| 65+ | 95 | 4 |

**2018 Languages Spoken at Home**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| English only | 60 |
| Languages other than English | 39 |
| Chinese | 8 |
| Greek | 4 |
| Vietnamese | 4 |
| Italian | 3 |
| Arabic | 2 |
| Hindi | 2 |
| Croatian | 1 |
| French | 1 |
| German | 1 |
| Spanish | 1 |
| Other | 14 |

**2018 Countries of Birth**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| Australia | 63 |
| Countries other than Australia | 37 |
| China | 4 |
| India | 4 |
| United Kingdom | 4 |
| Other Asian | 3 |
| Greece | 1 |
| Other European | 1 |
| New Zealand | 1 |
| Other | 18 |

**2018 Personal and Household Use and Experience of Council Services Percentage Results**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Personal use (%) | Total household use (%) |
| Waste management | 86 | 89 |
| Appearance of public areas | 82 | 84 |
| Parking facilities | 78 | 81 |
| Local streets & footpaths | 77 | 78 |
| Recreational facilities | 66 | 71 |
| Sealed local roads | 70 | 71 |
| Art centres & libraries | 53 | 59 |
| Informing the community | 47 | 51 |
| Unsealed roads | 48 | 48 |
| Traffic management | 44 | 46 |
| Community & cultural | 38 | 42 |
| Slashing & weed control | 40 | 41 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 24 | 26 |
| Environmental sustainability | 24 | 25 |
| Community decisions | 20 | 21 |
| Consultation & engagement | 18 | 20 |
| Business & community dev. | 17 | 20 |
| Planning & building permits | 16 | 19 |
| Population growth | 18 | 18 |
| Town planning policy | 16 | 17 |
| Bus/community dev./tourism | 13 | 16 |
| Family support services | 11 | 14 |
| Emergency & disaster mngt | 11 | 13 |
| Elderly support services | 8 | 12 |
| Lobbying | 8 | 9 |
| Disadvantaged support serv. | 6 | 8 |
| Tourism development | 8 | 8 |

**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 2012-2018 have been made throughout this report as appropriate.**

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

The sample size for the 2018 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey for Overall was 26814. 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 26814 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 3,471,000 people aged 18 years or over for Overall, according to ABS estimates.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Demographic | Actual survey sample size | Weighted base | Maximum margin of error at 95% confidence interval |
| Overall | 26814 | 25600 | +/-0.6 |
| Men | 12196 | 12636 | +/-0.9 |
| Women | 14618 | 12964 | +/-0.8 |
| Metropolitan | 6212 | 5600 | +/-1.2 |
| Interface | 2500 | 2400 | +/-2.0 |
| Regional Centres | 3201 | 3200 | +/-1.7 |
| Large Rural | 7701 | 7200 | +/-1.1 |
| Small Rural | 7200 | 7200 | +/-1.2 |
| 18-34 years | 3118 | 6570 | +/-1.8 |
| 35-49 years | 4999 | 6066 | +/-1.4 |
| 50-64 years | 8335 | 5747 | +/-1.1 |
| 65+ years | 10362 | 7217 | +/-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 |
| Boroondara | Casey | Greater Geelong | Baw Baw | Ararat |
| Brimbank | Melton | Horsham | Campaspe | Benalla |
| Frankston | Mornington Peninsula | Latrobe | Colac Otway | Buloke |
| Glen Eira | Whittlesea | Mildura | Corangamite | Central Goldfields |
| Greater Dandenong | Yarra Ranges | Wangaratta | East Gippsland | Gannawarra |
| Kingston |  | Warrnambool | Glenelg | Hepburn |
| Knox |  | Wodonga | Golden Plains | Hindmarsh |
| Manningham |  |  | Macedon Ranges | Indigo |
| Maroondah |  |  | Mitchell | Mansfield |
| Melbourne |  |  | Moira | Murrindindi |
| Port Phillip |  |  | Moorabool | Northern Grampians |
| Stonnington |  |  | Mount Alexander | Pyrenees |
| Whitehorse |  |  | Moyne | Queenscliffe |
|  |  |  | Southern Grampians | Strathbogie |
|  |  |  | Surf Coast | Towong |
|  |  |  | Swan Hill | West Wimmera |
|  |  |  | Wellington | Yarriambiack |

Non-participating councils: Ballarat, Bayside, Darebin, Greater Shepparton, Hobsons Bay, Hume, Loddon, Maribyrnong, Monash, Moonee Valley, Moreland, Nillumbik, South Gippsland, 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 2018 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 2018 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 2018 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:

<http://www.delwp.vic.gov.au/local-government/strengthening-councils/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**: 2018 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