



WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

**WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL
MEETING OF THE MOKIHINUI RATING DISTRICT
ON
Wednesday, 11 December 2024
4:30 PM
At the Mokihinui Campground 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, 6 December 2024

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

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
MOKIHINUI RATING DISTRICT
HELD AT THE MOKIHINUI CAMPGROUND HALL
ON 16TH April 2024, COMMENCING AT 4:00PM.**

PRESENT (Rating District Members)

J. Climo, F&M Spillane, J&C Woodward, B. Lynch, R. Mulholland, G. Weston, P. Grafton, B. Morgan, J. Clarke, B. Lynch.

IN ATTENDANCE (Staff)

Cr B. Cummings, Cr M. McIntyre, (Councillors)
S. Morgan, P. Birchfield, B. Murphy, L. Crozier (Staff)

APOLOGIES.

(WCRC) Cr F. Dooley, (BDC) Cr T. O'Keefe, Shirley Gardner, M&A Aitcheson, R, Taggart, S. Gardner, M. Adams, C&R Tihema

Moved-J. Climo/M. Spillane-carried.

WELCOME AND MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Cr B. Cummings opened the meeting and welcomed those present. He introduced himself and council staff.

Moved: ***"That the minutes of the previous Annual Meeting held on 16th May 2023, be adopted as a true and correct record of that meeting."***

Moved-J. Climo/M. Spillane-carried.

MATTERS ARISING

Responsibility of spraying in the bay, to follow up with BDC, eastern end of bay full of bamboo and it is a hazard, WCRC banks we can remove as part of the maintenance, MBC did some spraying in past as part funding, P. Birchfield asked what is on there as there should be no vegetation apart from grass, discussions about planting natives but WCRC advised to maintain integrity of a stopbank they can only be covered in grass, S. Morgan advised we could bring a proposal for weeding and maintenance across the rating district? Action to get a price, B. Morgan and P. Birchfield to walk over with committee first.

Culverts were an integrity inspection of BDC assets, Mokihinui committee decided to discuss culverts later, so it does not interfere with the meeting to discuss the flood mitigation,

FINANCIAL REPORT

S. Morgan spoke on the financial report for the period of 1st July 2022 to 30th June 2023. She advised that the Mokihinui Rating District had an opening balance of \$53,516.73 with a total revenue of \$17,363.20 less expenses of \$5,188.67 for a closing balance of \$65,691.26.

Moved-F. Spillane/M. Spillane-carried.

WORKS REPORT

P. Birchfield spoke to annual works report, maintenance works carried out from 1st July 2022-2023 repair of the sacrificial seawall wall by SM Lowe for a total of \$1,565.00, discussion around spurs, P. Birchfield discussed how it is supposed to be sacrificial, P. Birchfield said in theory we would have to do a variation to the consent, administrations costs of \$234.67 for 1 July 2022- 30th June 2023, future works discussed. S. Morgan said this rates strike does not allow for capital do we want to allow for this? It was decided it was not relevant in this current budget.

RATES 2024/ 2025

Moved: *"That rate strike for Mokihinui Rating District is \$16,347.00 Excl GST for the 2024-2025 financial year."*

Movers -G. Woodward/ M. Spillane all in favour- Carried.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Moved: *"That B. Morgan, J. Woodward, F. Spillane, M. Spillane, T. McNabb, M. Adams, B&E Lynch be retained as the committee for the 2024/2025 financial year".*

Moved: *"That M. Adams & M. Spillane elected as Co-Spokespersons, for the 2024-2025 financial year."*

Movers- B. Morgan/M. Spillane Carried.

GENERAL BUSINESS

S. Morgan confirmed the Rating District were supportive of still spraying the banks, G. Woodward, has been doing this, comes out of camp funds not out of rate payers, group decided to keep carrying on the way they are, BDC subcommittee used to run the campground.

P. Birchfield spoke to the flood report from Mike Allis, *please see attached NIWA, covering report to council and Annual Works Report section 6. General Business B.

Survey of crest levels, no design height to determine what these will be, no way to assess the height as they have never been surveyed, P. Birchfield recommends we get this done, council needs to get these to know we are meeting the level of service, this also supports application to government for funding, have applied for \$500,00 that includes P. Birchfield estimated to potentially bring up stop banks to level of service, plus hydrological modelling, cross surveys in other catchments as well, before the deluge funding, contributions from BDC and percentage from Rating District, this would also benefit Seddonville and wider than the boundary of this Rating District.

Before the deluge funding is only for coastal can only be used for river works, discussion around Chatterbox Creek, G. Woodward said in report there is nothing stating about Chatterbox this way, P. Birchfield said you would have to change the boundary and Asset Management Plan. P. Birchfield advised about classification; a group member discussed offering his digger to use.

Page 7 of the report shows the boundary aerial, S. Morgan said our CEO prioritised Mokihinui as being one of the districts for the before the deluge, looking at \$500,000 impact for the Rating District, multi generation approach, group asked about being excluded from the Buller twenty million, discussion around who supports civil defence, general rate take, Cr B. Cummings showed G. Woodward the scheme map, S. Morgan explained to access, we need a consensus the Rating District are happy to undertake this work (river wall), G. Woodward thinks ocean is more of a threat to life, discussed 2011 flood they would have only looked at the wall survey itself not the town.

Discussion around pumps again, it is not feasible for that volume of water was not recommended.

It was decided that the \$12,000 motion, (hydrological modelling in conjunction with survey too assess what the current level of service that the stop banks provide, is to go into general business meeting for the Mokihinui rate payers meeting tonight,

Discussed not letting the before the deluge money slide, need cross section surveys so we can maintain to a level of service , P. Birchfield said we could possible get 50% from general rates to pay for this, \$12,000 is halved with using the 50% input, will reduce the prudent reserve from the \$6,000 we are rating you for unforeseen maintenance but may not use this again, different action is the south west catchment, if we don't get the deluge money we may have to come back to the scheme for this, the before the deluge money wants physical things, Action to change the classification/boundary, modelling that area (look at what that may cost).

Movers-M. Spillane/B. Morgan-Carried.

MANAGERS REPORT

Discussed engineering staff, Operations Team now call Catchment, new manager for Catchment Tom Hopkins starting 20th May, we now have a chief engineer Peter Blackwood and construction engineer Jordan Mandary, overhaul of finance systems and project accountants, (in house expertise), communication protocols, can opt out of mail out costs by email, Health and Safety protocols for contractors please notify any you know in your area to get in touch with us to be prequalified.

RATING DISTRICT AGREEMENTS

Discussed the drafted Rating District agreements, this should be tri-annually, we will pass in August, S. Morgan asked do you want the whole committee to agree to the works plan can it be spokesperson, quorum or whole committee? Four of the committee are residents, that would work.

It was moved that quorum of four residents to agree to the works plan.

Movers- *M. Spillane/B. Morgan Carried.*

S. Morgan advised if we have to, WCRC is empowered by Section 126 of the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act 1941 for an immediate threat, which can supersede in the event of a threat WCRC has the liability, e.g. bank compromised. WCRC aims to consult with the RD first but is also empowered by the Local government (Rating) Act 2002 to raise the funds necessary to carry out their respective functions.

Classification/Review was discussed earlier.

Impairment of the Rating District Infrastructure assets and the associated implications for the community, rating districts and Region Council was discussed.

Flood protection Management Bylaws, these are being reviewed by our planning/engineering team we will come back to the Mokihiui Rating District with this in August.

G. Woodward said Rating District association will meet in a months' time will have a subcommittee for flood mitigation, Cr B. Cummings asked group to email S. Morgan or L. Crozier first with questions, G. Woodward thanked P. Birchfield for the report, and taking

the initiative to do this, P. Birchfield said Mike Allis took a while to get report out as there was no second answer.

ACTION POINTS

Chatterbox Creek area -To change the boundary/classification and AMP, modelling that area and looking at what that may cost.

XS Survey

Area engineers to walk over banks with spokesperson (bamboo areas) pricing to remove.

Meeting Closed 5:15pm.

***Attachments to be supplied at meeting**

Flood report from NIWA.

Covering Mokihinui report to Council

Extract Annual Works Report section 6. General Business B.

DRAFT



Mokihinui 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	16 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 a quorum of 4 scheme residents endorse the annual work plan.
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



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

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.

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 I:
to be supplied
at the meeting.

West Coast Regional Council			
Mokihinui 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	65,691.26		53,516.73
REVENUE			
Internal Interest Earned	1,768.71		1,094.08
Other Income - Reimbursement	-		
Rates	16,347.24	16,344.00	16,269.12
TOTAL REVENUE	18,115.95	16,344.00	17,363.20
EXPENDITURE			
Advertising	-		
Aircraft Hire	-		
Contractors	2,442.80	12,876.00	1,565.00
Consultants	-		
Insurance	2,482.45	2,160.00	2,110.00
Infrastructure Depreciation	-		
Administration Fees	-		
Other Expenses	-		234.67
Rates	-		
Resource Consents	-		
Staff Time	1,308.00	1,308.00	1,279.00
Surveyors	-		
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	6,233.25	16,344.00	5,188.67
NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	11,882.70	-	12,174.53
Capital Expenditure			
RESERVE CLOSING BALANCE 30 JUNE 2024	77,573.96		65,691.26


Peter Miller

West Coast Regional Council – Mokihiui Rating District

Annual Works Report on Maintaining Existing Rating District Assets 2023/2024 FY

1. Executive summary

This report outlines a summary of work undertaken as part of the Mokihiui 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

Maintenance work undertaken during the 2023/2024 included repair of the sacrificial seawall (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Sacrificial seawall post repair August 2023

Expenditure summary:

██████████ Seawall Repair-August 2023	\$2242.80
Total Works for the 2023 / 2024 Financial Year:	\$2442.80

3. Scheduled maintenance works for the 2024/2025 FY

As a result of an inspection carried out during August 2024, no maintenance works were identified.

A. Allow for unforeseen maintenance	\$5,000.00
B. Periodic repair of sacrificial seawall	\$5,000.00

Total estimated expenditure for the 2024/ 2025 financial year	\$10,000.00
----------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------

4. Future Capital Works

(see attached survey on coastal spurs)

5. Mokihinui 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 \$ 80,000.00.

This target balance for the 'prudent reserve' for this rating district is suggested to be \$35,000.00. This prudent reserve is immediately available for urgent emergency works that may be required following a major event.

It is likely the current reserve will only cover a portion of the actual cost of the potential damage that could occur.

6. Proposed maintenance rates for the 2025 / 2026 financial year

The 2025/2026 FY rates allow for twenty-four hours of engineering staff time at the council's user fees and charges rate set within the user fees and charges policy. This time includes asset inspections and database management, report writing, work planning and project coordination.

7. Rates Maintenance	\$ 12,880.00
Engineers Cost Recovery	\$4,440.00
Infrastructure Insurance	\$3,041.00
Total	\$20,361.00

The Council recommends a maintenance rate strike of \$ 20,361.00 excluding GST.

8. General Business

1. Mokihinui bamboo removal proposal (see attached report)
2. Opinion survey: Construction of new coastal spurs
3. Cross section survey.
4. Reclassification and modelling.
5. Chatterbox Creek
6. Insurance costs.

Below are the key criteria that needs to be met to access the NEMA funding, which can cover up to 60% of eligible rebuild costs

The provisions for government financial support to local authorities apply whether or not a state of emergency is, or has been, in force

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

Threshold

Threshold for reimbursement; As with other response claims, Government policy is to reimburse 60 percent of the combined eligible costs (response and essential infrastructure costs), above the following thresholds:

- *0.0075 percent of the net capital value of the city council, district council or unitary authority involved*
- *0.002 percent of the net capital value of unitary authorities where the assets in question are of a type that ordinarily are managed by regional councils, or*
- *0.002 percent of net capital value in the case of regional councils*



WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Opinion Survey: Mokihinui Rating District – construction of additional spur groynes, 2024.

The Mokihinui Rating District have proposed to construct an additional two coastal spurs fronting the Mokihinui Domain (shown in Figure 1 below). The four existing coastal spurs fronting the sacrificial seawall were placed in 2018 (4 spurs) and 2022 (1 spur). There is a current resource consent that permits the construction of a total of twelve spurs. Historically, Mokihinui Rating District members have agreed to complete the construction of the remaining coastal spurs only by utilizing any reserve fund balance over their prudent reserve balance.

The cost of the spurs is likely to be in the range of \$25,000 - \$29,000. The current prudent account balance held by the Mokihinui Rating District is approximately \$80,000. The target balance for the rating district is \$35,000 which means the total funding available over prudent reserve is approximately \$45,000.

As this work is capital work and not maintenance of existing structures, approval by rating district members is required. The construction of the two new spur groynes will proceed if a majority of the responses to the opinion survey are in support of the proposal.

You can email your response to pauletteb@wrc.govt.nz or hard copies will be available at the 2024 Mokihinui Rating District annual meeting. Responses will be accepted until 20 December 2024.

Options	Please tick one box only
1. Proceed with the proposed works as outlined.	
2. Do not proceed with the proposed works.	

Signature _____

Name _____
(Please Print Clearly)

Address _____



Figure 1: Location of proposed spurs.



WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

Mokihinui township bamboo removal. June 2024

Introduction

Bamboo is a fast-growing plant historically used for wind protection, erosion protection, and screening, but its spreading nature and root system can impact stopbank integrity, and can create a fire risk in dry weather.

At Mokihinui there is an estimated 2580m² of bamboo growing in thickets, in addition to some isolated smaller patches. West Coast Regional Council have been approached by some members of the Rating District to provide a quote and proposal for removal of the bamboo. The quote and proposal would then be put to all members of the Mokihinui Rating District for approval to use scheme funds. Should the work be approved, Council would arrange the contract work to be undertaken.

Removal options and costs

1. *Mechanical removal*: this method involves uprooting or cutting down the bamboo either by hand or using an excavator. This work is only temporary as the bamboo will regrow. The vegetative material would not be removed but instead be retained onsite; and if using an excavator, would be crushed and buried insitu.
 - *Crushing with excavator – 2-3 hours plus transport: \$700*
 - *Hand cutting the stems: \$1,000*
2. *Chemical control*: Herbicides can be used to control bamboo by application to the plant or roots. In most situations a series of herbicide applications are required to be effective. Chemical control done in isolation will kill off the bamboo, but leaves behind dry vegetation that can potentially increase fire-risk.
 - *Spray – 3 sprays in the first season and 2 in the second season. At \$800 per spray: \$4,000.*
3. *Mixed method*: Excavator used to crush and bury vegetative material, and herbicide used to spray the reshoots.
 - *Excavator and spray: \$700 for crushing, plus \$600 per spray: \$3,700.*

Feedback on the proposal can be sent to Paulette Birchfield at pauletteb@wrc.govt.nz or Lillian Crozier at Lillian.crozier@wrc.govt.nz

The final decision on the removal of bamboo will be made at the 2024 annual meeting of the Mokihinui Rating District.

A community meeting prior to this date may be held if there is sufficient interest in doing so.

More information on bamboo removal is available here:

<https://www.weedbusters.org.nz/what-are-weeds/weed-list/arrow-bamboo/>

