



**WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL
MEETING OF THE INCHBONNIE RATING DISTRICT
ON
Wednesday, 22 January 2025
1:00 PM
At the Rotomanu Hall**

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome**
- 2. Apologies**
- 3. Minutes of last meeting**
- 4. Matters Arising**
- 5. Election of the Committee**
- 6. Signing of the Rating District Agreement**
- 7. Reports**
 - a. Insurance Report
 - b. Survey Report
 - c. Finance Report
 - d. Annual Works Report
- 8. General Business**

Please let WCRC know if there is anything you would like discussed at this meeting that is not on the agenda by Friday, 17 January 2025

Please contact Lillian Crozier (lillian.crozier@wrc.govt.nz) or Shanti Morgan (shanti.morgan@wrc.govt.nz) with your queries.



Inchbonnie Rating District Agreement

Proposed – April 2024

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Reason for Submission	Revision Number	Revision Date	Approval
New Document		02 April 2024	
Version 2	2	11 July 2024	D.L (revision of use of funds outside of scheduled maintenance works)
Version 3	3	9 October 2024	

Rating District Committee Agreement

BACKGROUND

- A. The WCRC is empowered by Section 126 of the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act 1941 to take such steps as are necessary for the prevention of damage by floods; and
- B. Is empowered by the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to raise the funds necessary to carry out their respective function.
- C. Any flood protection structure built because of this agreement is owned by the WCRC. The land the flood defense assets are on is under various ownership.

STRUCTURE AND OPERATION OF THE RATING DISTRICT (RD) COMMITTEE

1. Once each triennium immediately following the election of the West Coast Regional Council councilors the RD Committee shall be formed including the appointment of a spokesperson/chairperson, by the ratepayers within the district. The number of committee members representing the rating district shall be decided by the ratepayers within the district.
2. The quorum of the Committee members required for decision making and meetings shall be decided by the RD committee and confirmed during its formation triennially.
3. Meetings shall be held annually or as otherwise agreed by the Rating District Committee.
4. Notification of meetings and the publication of agendas and reports shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of Part 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and will be undertaken by the secretariat who is employed by the WCRC.
5. Minutes of all RD Committee meetings shall be provided to the next meeting of the RD.

TERMS OF REFERENCE & DELEGATIONS

6. Each year the RD committee shall consider any staff and/or expert reports and ascertain what work and budget requirements will be for the coming financial year to inform the WCRCs Annual Plan and Long-Term Plans.
7. The RD Committee shall not have any funding or rate-setting authority. But advises the wrc on this matter at annual meetings.
8. WCRC as the Rating Body for the Rating District is the final decision maker on the annual work plan and setting the appropriate rate to fund the agreed works.
9. The RD committee must formally decide on whether they are a maintenance scheme, a capital scheme or both. This can be changed at any time with written consent of both parties.

10. The RD committee agrees to the endorsement for the use of RD funds, being the spokesperson and or deputy plus two others, via email or phone.
11. For significant decisions such as major scheme capital upgrades or maintenance and associated expenditure, dissolving the scheme, rating classification reviews etc., the spokesperson, committee or WCRC can call for a full voting procedure of all scheme ratepayers. A majority vote is set at a minimum of 75% of scheme ratepayers that have voted.
12. <Note 75% can be altered to a different majority percentage by each scheme but must be documented in the terms of reference>.
13. The WCRC shall administer an asset management system for all assets in the scheme and take this to the committee annually starting the 2025/2026 FY.
14. Any resource consents required for the scheme will be applied for, held and maintained by the WCRC, including adhering to conditions.
15. The RD committee's role is to review the annual work plan provided to it by the WCRC, receive and consider any independent expert advice, and make informed recommendations to WCRC for the final decision. The Committee may also make recommendations to the WCRC regarding:
 - Commissioning independent expert reports; and
 - Undertaking public consultation on rating classification classes, major capital works and other areas of significant public interest.

WCRC will consider any recommendations of the RD committee in making any decisions on the above.

16. The WCRC has constituted a "Rating District" for the scheme and reserves the right to raise such funds as it may need to carry out its functions.

Variation of this Agreement

17. This agreement may be amended at any time, at the request of either the WCRC or the rating district committee, but such amendment will only take effect once both have formally received and adopted those changes sought.



SIGNATURES

SIGNED by

RATING DISTRICT SPOKESPERSON

In the presence of:

by its authorised signatory

Witness signature

Witness name

Witness Occupation

Witness Town of Residence

SIGNED by

**WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL
CHAIRPERSON**

In the presence of:

by its authorised signatory

Witness signature

Witness name

Witness Occupation

Witness Town of Residence



WEST COAST
REGIONAL COUNCIL

WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE INCHBONNIE RATING DISTRICT MEETING HELD AT THE ROTOMANU HALL ON THE 2nd MAY 2024, COMMENCING AT 1:00PM

PRESENT (Rating District Members)

GDC Cr A. Gibson, R. Mallison (Councillor's) P. Blanchfield, (Staff)
D. Winter, M. Adams, S&R Shaffrey.

IN ATTENDANCE (Staff)

Cr A. Birchfield, Cr P. Ewen, Cr B. Cummings (Councillor's)
S. Morgan, L Crozier (Staff)

APOLOGIES

A Haymes, (GDC) K. Jacobsen (WCRC) D. Walton.

WELCOME AND MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Cr Cummings opened the meeting and welcomed those present.

Moved: *"That the minutes of the previous Annual Meeting held on 27th March 2023, be adopted as a true and correct record of that meeting."*

Moved-D. Shaffrey/R. Shaffrey-carried.

FINANCIAL REPORT

S. Morgan spoke on the financial report for the period of 1st July 2022 to 30th June 2023. She advised that the Inchbonnie Rating District had an opening balance of \$44,143.83 with a total revenue of \$35,774.62 less expenses of \$11,337.00 for a closing balance of \$68,581.45.

A question was asked about staff time, this is balanced over all the rating districts.

Cr A. Gibson from the GDC complimented WCRC on the presentation of finances, which was easy to understand.

Moved-D. Shaffrey/R. Shaffrey-carried.

A question was raised regarding the Grey District Council's contribution. This has been invoiced but not shown in financials; this will be shown in the next finance report. WCRC will invoice GDC again this week for their contribution.

The committee inquired if they would pay a tonnage rate on the stockpile of material, they don't want to shift it twice. Cr B. Cummings explained this was included in part of prudent reserve not an extra cost sitting on the quarry floor, only paying extraction cost and shifting it after is extra, chose to stockpile at cheaper price, quick access to it when required, Cr A. Birchfield added that the stockpile ready to be used in an emergency.

Moved-J. Kearny/D. Shaffrey-carried.

Note: GDC contribution.

RATES 2024/2025

S. Morgan advised that the balance of the rating district at the beginning of the 2024-2025 financial year was likely to be approximately \$70,000.00.

She proposed rates strike of \$35,789.00 which included \$27,261.00 of rates maintenance, \$4,703.00 of infrastructure insurance, and \$3,826.00 of engineering cost recovery.

Moved: *"That the rate strike for the Inchbonnie Rating District is \$35,789.00 excl GST for the 2024-2025 financial year.*

Moved-D. Shaffrey/D. Winter-carried.

Cr A. Gibson enquired as to how many people pay into the scheme.
(approximately 41).

S. Morgan explained that the analysis is based on the level of asset protection. She also noted that the contractor and consultant fees were combined due to an accounting error, which will be corrected moving forward.

There was a discussion about qualifying for subsidies, which are only received once the work has been completed and invoiced to the GDC.

D. Shaffrey suggested verifying with contractors that the stockpile is not obstructing operations at the quarry and emphasized the importance of everybody deciding on the rates strike.

S. Morgan reminded that the general rate is separate from the targeted rate.

If the funds are not spent, they will be added to the prudent reserve, which is currently quite low. It is recommended to continue rating at the current level. The

committee also discussed how interest is managed, and S. Morgan took an action to determine the exact percentages.

D. Shaffrey noted that the river is currently away from the slip bank, presenting a good opportunity to build it up. When the wall was constructed in 2010, it endured three significant events and can handle 400ml at the top again. The swamp area has two culverts, each with floodgates on the river side. These floodgates obstruct water drainage during a major flood and relieve the water once the flood has receded. The 2010 height increase, now 2.5 meters higher, affects access to homes. The risk for the area is lower, not higher. Cr B. Cummings added that the Taramakau River has lowered due to gravel movement downstream.

ANNUAL WORKS REPORT

S. Morgan spoke to this, total maintenance works carried out during 1st July 2022 to 30 June 2023 \$3,412.00, no capital works carried out, administration and other expenditure of \$7,997.00, maintenance works carried out during this financial year to date (purchase of rock from Inchbonnie quarry), \$54,000.00, estimated maintenance works of \$20,000, no capital works carried out during this financial year to date.

The resource consent is currently under review as it approaches its end of life. The prudent reserve and stockpile at Inchbonnie quarry were discussed. Rating districts were asked to provide drone footage or inform the committee if they need assistance in obtaining it. D. Winter mentioned he would contact someone he knows who has relevant images.

Cr P. Ewen noted that today's rates strike brings the total over \$100,000. With the GDC still to contribute, the total could reach up to \$130,000. Additionally, \$30,000 worth of rock is already stockpiled, bringing the total to a substantial amount. Cr A. Birchfield added that, once all contributions are accounted for, the total will be well over \$100,000.

S. Morgan inquired about the progress of vegetation maintenance. D. Shaffrey reported on the current state and noted that it is time for a spray.

S. Morgan announced that the rating district meetings will be held in five months to get back on track. The rating district suggested October as a suitable time for the next meeting due to calving. It was agreed to hold the meeting in late October

or November, with a proposal for December spraying to be presented at the next meeting.

S. Morgan discussed the topic of depreciation, noting that there are four culverts in this scheme. This issue has not been addressed in the past, and a clearer understanding will be presented at the next meeting. Consultation with the finance team is needed to determine how depreciation will be managed and its benefits for the rating district.

GDC's R. Mallison discussed the current value of the culvert and the flood gate (from AMP), which is available on the website. Flaps, pipes, and installation were also discussed. Cr A. Gibson emphasized that depreciation needs to be funded from somewhere, and maintenance of pipes is essential. Inspection schedules will be reviewed (action point).

It was noted that the top of MacArthur Road was graded down to the base last time and requires material to be added. D. Winter highlighted the need to build it up to prevent spills from the swamp into the river. P. Blanchfield mentioned plans to coordinate with Westroads to make the process cost-effective and will obtain details. Typically, the road is graded every season. P. Blanchfield will follow up with D. Winter after the meeting.

Cross sections were discussed. S. Morgan asked if the rating district would like to have a cross section done for their scheme. D. Shaffrey mentioned that this has been done before at a cost of approximately \$10,000. D. Winter suggested it might not be necessary. Cr B. Cummings noted that LiDAR has already been flown. S. Morgan advised that if the rating district does not feel it is needed for their level of service, they do not have to invest in it.

Railways rock supply discussed, WCRC didn't win tender for rock to sell.

Cr P. Ewen advised year on year, your rock valuation goes up.

D. Shaffrey suggested maybe bring up to 200 tons each year.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEE

All rating district members are on the committee, it was agreed that the status quo would remain.

Moved: ***"That D. Shaffrey is re-elected as Spokesperson, J Keeney as deputy Spokesperson for the 2024-2025 financial year."***

RATING DISTRICT AGREEMENT

S. Morgan – discussed the using funds of the prudent reserve, how do you want to endorse this, D. Shaffrey suggested an emergency meeting, S. Morgan said emergency works needs to happen quickly, suggesting four people.

It was decided Spokesperson, Deputy and two others, via email/phone call.

S. Morgan advised we are empowered by Section 126 of the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act 1941 to take such steps as are necessary for the prevention of damage by floods. We will always consult with the rating district first but if risk to life, property etc., we are empowered to go ahead, we have not done this before.

Up to \$27,000 that GDC will contribute, this goes back to 1940's if it blows out it impacts Greymouth. D. Winter advised the GDC put in the original flood protection.

Cr P. Ewen advised 1947. Quite critical.

MANAGERS UPDATE

S. Morgan discussed the realignment and changes within the team, aiming to reduce reliance on consultants. She also noted the importance of communication and encouraged attendees to list their details on the provided sheet and put a star beside their name if they prefer not to receive posted mail, which will help save the Rating District on admin fees.

Regarding qualified contractors, attendees were asked to inform the team if they know anyone interested in working in the area.

The discussion on volunteers highlighted the need for maintaining assets and keeping engineers informed of any changes to the scheme. Volunteers were advised not to go topping up on their own.

In regard to the proposed terms of reference, efforts are being made to establish agreements with all Rating Districts on consultation processes. Attendees were invited to share any additional thoughts or suggestions.

IMPAIRMENT

S. Morgan spoke to this, advised that the Impairment paper is on back of the agenda, spoke to this summary of points, *Impairment is unexpected damage to the asset*, you have an AMP which has a level of service, it is our responsibility to maintain those assets, impacts on insurance etc.

Cr A. Gibson enquired about regular inspections, S. Morgan said we are investing into our Asset management system at the moment so we will have a more regular inspection programme, it is currently ad hock or after an event, Cr B. Cummings advised moving forward as part of our insurance we need to be having regular inspections, we haven't done regular inspections of every asset the AMP may point out some need to be looked at more often (R. Mallison advised looking for impairment), Cr A. Birchfield advised we are still looking at the scheme keeping an eye on it.

S. Morgan noted it is complicated to do it for every meter of the scheme.

Cr A. Gibson (GDC) emphasized the importance of maintenance and preventative measures. S. Morgan agreed, stating that this is the approach they aim to take. D. Shaffrey requested that the engineer contact the committee during visits, as they might notice issues the committee has overlooked.

D. Winter commented on the advantage of having a quarry available for resources. There was a discussion about the quarry being gazetted to the WCRC. R. Mallison explained that this arrangement dates back to the old catchment board era.

GENERAL BUSINESS

An action was noted to get K. Jacobsen out to the scheme. D. Shaffrey mentioned that he had met with J. Bell before the end of June, and there were no concerns as the river has been away from it.

J. Kearney noted that there haven't been any significant floods for years, and only vegetation needs to be addressed. Cr B. Cummings advised that land-based spraying is cheaper than aerial spraying, and West Coast AG was discussed as a good spraying contractor.

The meeting closed at 2pm.

ACTIONS:



WEST COAST
REGIONAL COUNCIL

Find out how interest is managed (enquire with finance team).

Depreciation recovery, comes back to maintenance, can we check inspection schedules, plus proposal/benefits to Rating District.

Area engineer to look at vegetation with the spokesperson and discuss any areas of concern.

Top of MacArthur Rd requires material. Area engineer to look into this.

DRAFT/UNCONFIRMED

Insurance Update

Author	Shanti Morgan, Group Manager Environmental Science and Chantel Mills, Project Accountant
Authorizer	Darryl Lew, Chief Executive

Report Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide the Rating Districts with an update on Councils insurances including:

1. Clarification of WCRC's deductibles (i.e. excesses) under the infrastructure insurance policy
2. An **indication** of the 2024/25 insurance premium split across rating districts, and **estimated** 2025/26 insurance premium including **estimated** premium split across rating districts for budgeting purposes.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee resolves to:

1. *Receive the report and note the attachment.*
2. *Provide feedback on insurance premiums and excesses as related to the Rating District scheme.*

Issues and Discussion

Background

Council has a range of insurance policies covering operational risks. AON is Council's insurance broker. Council is part of a shared insurance procurement collective with other South Island Councils called the South Island Council Collective (SICC).

Current situation

1. WCRC's **2024/25 Infrastructure Insurance was renewed** at 4pm on 1 November 2024 for a further one-year term (expiring 4pm 1 November 2025).

A summary of 2024/25 Infrastructure Assets Listing is provided in **attachment 1**.

2. The writer would like to take this opportunity to clarify Council's **Deductibles under the infrastructure insurance policy**. WCRC have two possible deductibles (i.e. excesses) under the policy pertaining to direct physical loss suffered and depending on the peril that caused the damage / loss.
 - i. Where the damage / loss is suffered due to Earthquake, Natural Landslip, Tsunami, Tornado, Volcanic Eruption, Hydrothermal & Geothermal activity, and Subterranean Fire, WCRC's deductible (i.e. excess) is **NZD\$250,000 for each and every loss (eel), or**
 - ii. Where the damage / loss is suffered due to Flood and Windstorm (including Storm Surge), WCRC's deductible (i.e. excess) is **NZD\$1,000,000 eel**.

Any deductible under the infrastructure policy applies to 100% of the loss or damage arising out of any one event to the property or asset.

3. Council is asking for feedback from Rating Districts on the current insurance excesses, which are being clarified in this paper for the Rating Districts. The Council will receive and consider Rating District feedback when undertaking the 2025/26 insurance renewal cycle.

Considerations

Implications/Risks

1. Deductibles and the Financial Impact on Rating Scheme Coverage

Current Deductibles (excesses):

- \$250,000 per event for damages / losses caused by events like earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, and subterranean fires.
- \$1,000,000 per event for damages / losses due to flood, windstorm, and storm surge.

Implications:

- WCRC has 23 Rating Districts Schemes, two of which have declared asset values which are less than both deductibles (*i.e. 2024/25 Neils Beach \$36,894, and Matainui Creek \$116,560*). Several Rating schemes also have damage exposure values that are less than both deductibles
- Rating Schemes with lower-value assets and lower-damage exposure values are highly unlikely to ever make damage or loss claims for isolated events due to the level of the deductible(s).
- Rating Schemes with lower value assets and/or lower damage exposure values would be more likely to make an insurance claim if assets were damaged / lost in an event affecting multiple rating districts and multiple assets as a result of a single catastrophic event.
- For a summary of the declared asset values for the 2024/25 renewal sorted by value from highest to lowest please see **attachment 1**.
- The trade-off between lowering the deductible(s) is higher premiums across all 23 rating districts.
- Parts of the Coast experienced notable weather events in April 2024 and October / November 2024. These events have not resulted in any insurance claims as yet. WCRC staff have been assessing damage and the general view at this stage is that any damage suffered in the event were estimated to be well below the \$1,000,000 flooding event deductible for each event.
- Therefore, any damage from the April 2024 and October / November 2024 events to date are being repaired by Council on behalf of the Rating Districts as repairs & maintenance or through funds within each rating district prudent reserve.

2. **Financial Risk of Not Insuring**

- **Potential Cost of Damage:** When infrastructure assets suffer damage or loss the repair and replacement costs can escalate quickly. For example, If we consider an event affecting (5-20% of asset value) the reinstatement costs across the infrastructure assets could range between \$2,000 (Neils Beach) and \$7,925,863 (Wanganui).
- **Ratepayer Responsibility:** Without infrastructure insurance, all repair and replacement costs would need to be covered by respective Rating District reserves or through increased rates to service a loan, particularly for high-cost events.

- **Risk Tolerance:** Each Rating District will have a different risk tolerance and will need to carefully consider their respective financial capacities to finance major repairs / asset replacements independently should an event occur. How would the Rating District fund repair / replacement costs if no insurance is in place? Is Rating District willing to take the risk of not insuring it's community's flood protection assets?

3. **Benefits and Limitations of Insuring**

Advantages of Insurance:

- **Catastrophic Event Protection:** Insurance can protect against significant financial losses in large-scale events that exceed the deductible amount.
- **Risk Management:** Insurance may reduce the financial burden on the district in severe events which are predicted to increase with climate change.

Limitations:

- **High Deductible Costs:** Understandably, no insurance claims are made when the repair / replacement costs are under the \$250,000 or \$1,000,000 excesses. This results in a burden of cost to rating district to fund necessary repair / replacement works on damaged or lost assets up to the deductible amounts.
- **Cost-Effectiveness:** For assets with lower damage exposure or value, the insurance premium may outweigh the potential benefits due to the deductible threshold.

4. **Considerations for Providing Feedback**

- **Risk and Financial Impact:** Consider the likelihood and potential cost of damage for your scheme and whether your Rating District can feasibly cover these costs without insurance.
- **Priorities and Preferences:** Feedback should reflect your district's priorities—whether you value protection against catastrophic loss or prefer to self-manage smaller damages and risks.
- **Alternative Preparedness:** If opting out of insurance, think about alternative strategies (like building reserves or implementing preventive measures) to address future damage or loss.

We welcome your feedback to help Councillors decide the best approach for insurance of scheme assets for the upcoming 2025/26 financial year.

Other Funding Risks to consider

National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) funding may be accessed for up to 60% of eligible rebuild costs **provided key criteria are met.**

Government assistance will not normally be available for assets which receive a subsidy from any other source, unless:

- the local authority has adequately protected itself through asset and risk management including mitigation, where appropriate, and the proper maintenance of infrastructure assets, or
- the local authority has made sound financial provisions (such as the provision of reserve funds, effective insurance or participation in a mutual assistance scheme with other local authorities) to a level sufficient to ensure that the local authority could reasonably be expected to meet its obligation to provide for its own recovery.

Significance and Engagement Policy Assessment

There are no issues within this report which trigger matters in this policy.

Tangata whenua views

Staff are not aware of any issues within this report which would impact tangata whenua.

Views of affected parties

Views of affected parties are being collated during rating district meetings and will be presented back to council on insurance needs for each scheme with an associated risk profile.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Summary of 2024/25 Infrastructure Insurance renewal declared values, 2024/25 Insurance premium rating district indicative split, and 2025/26 Estimated insurance including rating scheme premium split.

Summary of 2024/25 Infrastructure Insurance renewal declared values, 2024/25 Insurance premium rating district **indicative split**, and **2025/26 Estimated** insurance including rating scheme premium split.

Infrastructure Assets	Declared Value (2024/25)	2024/25 Premium Indication	Estimated 2025/26 Premium
Wanganui	39,629,315	35,770	37,630
Greymouth Floodwall	24,561,725	22,170	23,323
Franz Josef Combined	24,254,514	21,893	23,031
Taramakau	23,910,670	21,582	22,704
Karamea	11,414,646	10,303	10,839
Kowhitirangi	10,372,605	9,363	9,849
Hokitka Seawall Combined	8,554,347	7,721	8,123
Inchbonnie	7,802,261	7,042	7,409
Waitangi-Taona	7,391,652	6,672	7,019
Nelson Creek	6,938,935	6,263	6,589
Punakaiki	5,422,853	4,895	5,149
Vine Creek	5,159,546	4,657	4,899
Mokihinui	3,202,472	2,891	3,041
Westport	2,406,483	2,172	2,285
Kongahu *	2,214,694	-	-
Redjacks Creek	1,805,336	1,630	1,714
Okuru	1,404,921	1,268	1,334
Whataroa	1,360,799	1,228	1,292
Raft Creek	1,262,372	1,139	1,199
Hokitka Southside	1,165,987	1,052	1,107
Matainui Creek	116,560	105	111
Neils Beach **	36,894	-	-
Rating District Administration ***		73,650	77,479
General Rate - Kongahu *		1,999	2,103
General Rate - Neils Beach **		33	35
Grand Total	190,389,588	245,499	258,265

* Per 2021-31 LTP Kongahu is a drainage scheme and should be excluded from the insurance policy.

** Neils Beach is a 'sacrificial bund'. The insurance premium is under \$40 per year and covered by General Rate.

*** Per 2021-31 LTP 70% of infrastructure insurance premium is paid by the Target Rate to respective Rating District(s) and 30% is funded by General Rate.

Report on Riverbed Level Survey Programme

Author	Max Dickens, Policy Manager, Paulette Birchfield, Area Engineer Catchment Management, Jordan Mandery, Construction Engineer.
Authoriser	Shanti Morgan, Group Manager Environmental Science

Report Purpose

To update rating districts on the proposed West Coast Regional Council 10-Year River and Coastal Survey Strategy.

Report Summary

The WCRC has had a ten-year strategy in place for riverbed survey since 2014. This strategy is due for renewal and a new strategy has been proposed for adoption by the regional council (Attachment 1).

This report outlines the importance of riverbed and coastal surveys for the purpose of flood and coastal hazard protection.

Council have also been put forward a proposal to change the current funding model of survey work which is currently 50% funded by the relevant rating district, and 50% by the General Rate, to a 100% funding through the income council receives as a result of gravel royalties. The outcome of this proposal will be provided verbally to RDs during meetings.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee resolve to:

- 1. Receive this report.*
- 2. Notes the 10-year river and coastal survey strategy*

Issues and Discussion

Background

Rating District Survey update

The WCRC have had a 10-year river cross-section survey strategy in place since 2014. Historically these surveys have been funded 50% by the relevant rating district, and 50% by the General Rate. Out of the 23 West Coast Regional Council rating districts, 16 have regular cross-section surveys. The absence of regular surveys has resulted in a variation in the understanding of each scheme and the protection they provide. With some schemes having a well understood level of service where surveys have been undertaken and others a general understanding relating to historic flood levels which do not account for changing climatic conditions or changes in the physical environment.

Current situation

The current 10-year strategy concludes this year. The Catchment Management group have drafted a new 10-year strategy (ref. Attachment 1) to conduct surveys across selected schemes to support and maintain the understanding of the level of service provided by the schemes maintained by the WCRC. This work will include, but is not limited to:

- bed and crest level surveys, with an increase in frequency/scope and scale in areas where gravel extraction is taking place,
- areas where additional monitoring or surveys may be needed depending on the nature of the gravel extraction application.
- other areas where surveying is considered necessary.

The new program aims to ensure compliance with regulatory consent conditions, improve infrastructure management, enhance flood prevention efforts, and provide valuable data for long-term planning and informed decision-making with regards to the effects of gravel extraction on the region's rivers and coastlines. This strategy provided a schedule for surveys of the rating districts where surveys were required.

This programme will build on the regular program of established surveys with additional cross section surveys and Mean Bed Level (MBL) analysis funded via the use of gravel royalties. This will provide high level data for flooding and infrastructure needs, as well as ensuring that an appropriate amount of gravel is being taken.

The new bed level survey programme will vary from 6 monthly to a 5-year return period¹ depending on the river in question. The programme will be developed considering what is achievable from both a budgetary and practical perspective. It may also include measuring coastal data if this is considered relevant.

¹ Please note that following major events officers will likely need to re-survey affected schemes over and above the regular programme.

Rating District Survey update

The programme will be designed specifically to ensure that it will be covered by a varying percentage of the gravel royalties. It will be flexible to ensure capacity for adjustments based on priority, funding availability, and emergent needs.

A proposal to fund this work program has been put forward to the WCRC which would result in a change to the current 50% by the relevant rating district, and 50% by the General Rate to a 100% funding through the income council receives as a result of gravel royalties. The outcome of this proposal will be provided verbally to RDs during meetings.

Considerations

Implications/Risks

There are safety and infrastructure management risks associated with not improving our data around rivers.


Significance and Engagement Policy Assessment

This policy does not trigger the significance and engagement policy.

Attachments

Attachment 1: West Coast Regional Council 10-Year River and Coastal Survey Strategy -To be supplied at the meeting

West Coast Regional Council			
Inchbonnie Rating District Financial Accounts			
For the 12 Months to 30 June 2024			
	2023/24	2023/24	2022/23
	ACTUAL	BUDGET	ACTUAL
RESERVES OPENING BALANCE 1 July 2023	68,581.45		44,143.83
REVENUE			
Grey DC - Other Grants & Subsidies	27,000.00		
Insurance Excess Credited	-		
Insurance Recoveries	-		
Internal Interest Earned	1,696.29		813.58
Rates	35,121.16	35,580.00	34,961.04
TOTAL REVENUE	63,817.45	35,580.00	35,774.62
EXPENDITURE			
Advertising	230.40		(36.00)
Aircraft Hire	-		
Capital Expenditure	-		
Contractors	54,000.00	27,264.00	3,412.00
Consultants	-		
Insurance	5,524.50	4,128.00	4,125.00
Infrastructure Depreciation	-		
Loan Interest	-		
Loan Principal	-		
Other Consultants	-		
Administration Fees	-		
Other Expenses	-		
Protective Clothes and Equip.	-		
Rates	-		
Resource Consents	-		
Staff Time	3,826.00	3,828.00	3,836.00
Surveyors	-		
Venue Hire	-	-	-
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	63,580.90	35,220.00	11,337.00
NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	236.55	360.00	24,437.62
Capital Expenditure			
RESERVE CLOSING BALANCE 30 JUNE 2024	68,818.00		68,581.45


 5/12/2024

West Coast Regional Council –Inchbonnie Rating District

Annual Works Report on Rating District Assets

1. Executive summary

This report outlines a summary of work undertaken as part of the Inchbonnie Rating Districts annual works program for the 2023/2024 financial year including any maintenance, capital works and surveys undertaken. Additionally, this report details scheduled work for the 2024/2025 FY and proposes work required for the 2025/2026 Financial year which includes consultation of the 2025/2026 maintenance rate, insurance premiums and engineer cost recovery.

2. Maintenance works summary 2023/2024 FY

	
Total	\$54,000

3. Administration (other expenditure)

Advertising/Mail outs	\$230.40
Total	230.40

4. Scheduled maintenance 2024/2025 FY

	
Total	\$10,000.00

5. Inchbonnie Rating District financial balance

The balance in the rating district account at the beginning of the 2025 / 2026 financial year is likely to be approximately \$77,000.

This target balance for the 'prudent reserve' for this rating district is \$550,000

This prudent reserve does not meet the target balance, however the funds that exist are immediately accessible for urgent emergency works that may be required following a major flood event.

6. Proposed rates for the 2025 / 2026 financial year

Rates Maintenance	\$40,000
Engineers Cost Recovery*	\$4,440.00
Infrastructure Insurance	\$ 4,899.00
Total:	\$49,339.00

Council recommends a total rate strike of \$49,339 excluding GST.

**The Engineer cost recovery budget has been calculated based on expected engineering contribution to the Rating district of 24 hours*

7. General Business.

Weed spraying

Co-funding agreement with GDC