**Waikato Projections Working Group**

**Meeting Notes**

Friday 22 September 2017, 2.30 – 4.30pm

Waikato Regional Council, Waikato Room

**Objective**

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss issues and options to meet your needs, and to agree on what the Working Group can/will do jointly (as opposed to individual councils/agencies).

**Attendants**

Beat Huser (WRC- Chair), Nathan Dalgety (HCC), Anton Marais (WDC), David Totman (Waipa DC), Alan Moss (SWDC), Janet Amey (WRC), Dawn Inglis (RATA – WRTM Project Manager), Te Hao Apaapa-Timu (SWDC), Esmae McKenzie-Norton (WDHB), Regan Webb (WDHB), Adam Wardle, Derek Phyn (WRC), Craig Briggs (WRC), Tony Fenton (Alchemists Ltd).

**Apologies**

Greg Carstens (HCC), Donna Tracey (Waikato DC), Vishal Ramduny (Waikato DC), Gary Knighton (Waipa DC), Nick Carroll (TDC), Hadley Tattle (TDC), Sue Mavor (Taupo DC), Michelle Staines-Hawthorne (MPDC), Charan Mischewski (HDC), Niall Baker ((MPDC), Jenni Vernon (Waikato DC), Greg Morton (WRC), Joanne Gread (Waitomo DC), Scott Summerfield (TCDC), Cathy O’Callaghan (Waitomo DC), Susan Henderson (HCC), Michelle White (HCC/FP), Hanna Berndt (WDHB), James Bevan (NZTA), Ken Tremaine (FP/Waikato Plan), Garry McDonald (Market Economics).

**Issues and Option for 2018 census based projections** (refer to pre-circulated paper)

### Issue 1: Timeframes for Data needs

After initial discussions with Stats NZ about release dates for required data the proposed option is doing a “Specific Data Request” for the required Waikato data. If this can be delivered in October 2019 this would allow for single model run for all projections to provide the final data by February 2020 (see last page for revised timeline). The cost of a “Specific Data Request” would be off-set by not having to do a rerun of projections data as was previously proposed.

Projected data (time steps 2018, 2025, 2035, 2045, 2055, 2065) to be delivered by February 2020:

* **By Territorial Authority Boundary:**
	+ Land Use (by WISE land use class)
	+ Population (by gender/age cohorts)
	+ Households (by household type)
	+ Labour force
	+ Employment (as Modified Employee Counts, MEC’s)
	+ Value Added ($m)
* **By SA2 (new Census Area Units) boundary**:
	+ Land Use (by WISE land use class)
	+ Population (total)
	+ Households (total)
	+ Labour force
	+ Employment (as MEC’s)
	+ Value Added ($m)

Data by settlement/urban areas for these projected parameters could be derived by simple summation of appropriate SA2 units (see Issue 4).

**Actions:**

* Beat to seek further information from Stats NZ about the cost of a “Specific Data Request” and to confirm delivery of the required Waikato data by October 2019.

### Issue 2: updating of WISE to 2018 start date

The options for updating WISE to a 2018 start date and updating base data sets were outlined. Without this minimal update any projections would need to be undertaken using existing version of WISE land use, zoning and other data with a 2013 start date.

**Actions:**

* Beat to develop the business case for supporting the WISE update and Waikato Projections work in WRC’s 2018-2028 LTP.
* Members of the Projections Working Group should provide support for this update to strengthen the business case (through the LTP 2018-2028 submission process).

### Issue 3: AdditionAl improvements to WISE

Several improvements to the WISE model have been identified during the previous projections work. It is recommended that these be included in addition to the ‘base’ update outlined in Issue 2 above.

It was highlighted that the inclusion of these additional improvements would improve projections but would not completely solve some of the modelling limitations that have been experienced in previous projections. This is primarily an issue in dense fast growing urban areas (mainly HCC). Further discussion is required to ensure expectations are managed.

**Actions:**

* Same actions as Issue 2
* Continue discussions with HCC, (and WDC and Waipa DC) to understand the details of their data requirements and expectations for different data types.

### Issue 4: data outputs – Spatial grouping and presentation

The review of Census spatial boundaries is likely to improve the ability to use the projections data at settlement or urban areas level. An initial look at HDC and WDC areas shows a good match of new SA2 boundaries with settlement areas. This would mean that any SA2 projections data could simply be amalgamated for any settlement area analysis.

There is interest in having more details reporting of projections by TA, although the level of interest does vary depending on size/resources of TA. The aim is to provide an improved outcomes on previous projections but a balance will need to be struck between varying expectations and cost of provision.

**Actions:**

* Source the latest proposed SA2 boundaries and compare them against key settlement/urban areas that TAs might want to use projections data for.
* Investigate further web-based options for supplying data to users and to allow them to sort/analyse data for their requirements.
* Seek some cost options to provide increase reporting details to support projections data.

### Issue 5: Additional Parameters to Previous Projections Otuputs

The key additional parameters of interest were Rating units and dwellings by CAU/SA2.

There was mixed interest across TA’s in doing this approach based on a common set of assumptions. Also not all TA’s responded to this question prior to meeting and /or attend, so their needs / views are not fully understood. However the common theme from feedback was that most TA’s like to use specific assumptions to suit their area for such projections and to meet legislative requirements (Local Government (Rating) Act 2002). Several TA’s said they would probably undertake these calculations in-house.

If TA’s did decide to use their own specific assumptions for projecting any additional outputs such as rating units and dwellings, it is expected that they all use the population projections from this Working Group as their baseline data to support any further analysis.

**Actions:**

* Contact those who didn’t provide feedback to get full picture on these parameters and make recommendation to next meeting.

