



**WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL
MEETING OF THE NEILS BEACH RATING DISTRICT
ON
Tuesday, 28 January 2025
2:00 PM
At the Hanger Neils Beach Air Strip**

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, 24 January 2025

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



WEST COAST
REGIONAL COUNCIL

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
NEILS BEACH RATING DISTRICT
HELD AT THE HANGER BEACH ROAD
NEILS BEACH
ON 29TH MAY 2024, COMMENCING AT 2PM

PRESENT (Rating District Members)

J. Sutton, G. Mead, M. Hughes, A. MacMillan, K. Jones, D. Meyer, J. Davidson, T. Anderson, G. Davison, J. Dibben, L. Dibben, J. Davidson, M. Petrie, J. Murray, M. Wenden, A. Sutton, M. Deans, G. Dowie, S. Campbell, P. Turvey.

IN ATTENDANCE (Staff)

Cr B. Cummings, Cr A. Campbell (Councillors)
S. Morgan, T. Hopkins, K. Jacobsen, L. Crozier (Staff)

APOLOGIES

Cr P. Haddock, M. Gibson, L. Terpstra, G. Wright, K. Pirivano, G. Robson, A. Robson, M. Thompson, S. Thompson, P. Scott, P. Maynard, R. Stanfield, N. Kagan.

WELCOME AND MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

J. Sutton and Cr B. Cummings opened the meeting, introduced themselves, the committee and the council staff.

Moved: ***"That the minutes of the previous Annual Meeting held on 18th April 2023, be adopted as a true and correct record of that meeting."***

Moved- G. Dowie/J. Murray-carried

MATTERS ARISING

Working on getting minutes out earlier, but also publicly. The Rating District will also send an update to WCRC with a scheme database.

K. Jacobsen-River mouth Resource Consent has gone out, half with Okuru, does not include cultural and ecological report, will try and ascertain before next



meeting, maybe about \$12,000 plus external consultancy cost, cannot do this inhouse can check market for prices, last cost insignificant if we need to use that consent.

J. Sutton commented that obtaining a consent alone can take up to four or five years and use all our prudent reserve which is only squired at 5k per year, emphasising its importance for village preservation. S. Morgan acknowledged the feedback, noting the application's potential impact on the prudent reserve. The CEO has chosen to do this across the region, we do think it is important to have this consent in place. Options will be presented in August.

S. Morgan advised we can take that feed back to the senior leadership team, consent application would exhaust prudent reserve, but our CEO has chosen to do this across the region, to make sure that we are providing the correct information, we do think this is important that you have this consent in place, can come back with options in August.

K. Jacobsen noted that if managed internally, the review cannot remain in-house. S. Morgan discussed recent actions with the Okuru Rating District and the potential for emergency work under section 330 in flood-risk scenarios, requiring application within twenty days under emergency provisions to safeguard communities

J. Sutton expressed concerns that this is of no help to us, gradual loss of our rebuilt beach and dunes will never be considered as an emergency until it is too late, as predicted by NIWA, advocating for pre-emptive mechanical intervention. Cr B. Cummings agreed on the consent's relevance but cautioned against unilateral action.

S. Morgan advised threat to land or people to invoke section 330, erosion over time should be managed over what we will go over today.

G Dowie expressed that the committee wants to have the consent set up so we can go ahead and do the work.



S. Morgan took an action to go back to consultant, then to spokesperson then committee for work outside prudent reserve, S. Morgan advised we will discuss that later during the Rating District agreement discussions.

A discussion took place around money coming out of general rates rather than the special rating district, district rates e.g. WDC rates go to Franz Josef Rating District versus regional rates.

Could we ask our council to speed Neils Beach Resource Consent up.

Funding for planting - discussed community to come in and help as well, a little bit of planting contributes to quite a lot. Rating District happy to do a working bee, K. Jacobsen advised we don't have money to fund these projects, have spoken to DOC they have suggested you get in touch with the Okuru nursery subsidized costs, there is a grass, golden yellow spiralized -could look into this if a regional plant, K. Jacobsen discussed another salt resistant plant it is an exotic, (there will be rules on introduced plants), S. Morgan discussed best not to use introduced species, action to give a list of plants to committee.

While vegetation on assets is typically not supported, K. Jacobsen indicated this approach might be suitable for a sacrificial bund and offered to assess its feasibility.

The Rating District discussed the leeward side planting working, seaside would be the ideal side, protection in front of bund have meter that they didn't have, Cr B. Cummings expressed he supports nature-based solutions, S. Morgan will action to explore options with the WCRC biosecurity team.

Removal of driftwood, K. Jacobsen noted we prefer it to stay there to help with protection, J. Sutton discussed legality of taking driftwood, was advised by WCRC not by mechanical means, J. Sutton said he tried to get a solution for both parties, promoted 2020 to collect from certain areas only to leave alone the rest, signs etc. got vandalized straight away.

Cr B. Cummings suggested WCRC will take an action to clarify the rules and report back to J. Sutton, it was recalled that in 2020 an abatement notice was issued to not remove firewood, R. Beal advised to talk to Makaawhio, the Rating



District feels it has improved a lot since J. Sutton mentioned it, J. Sutton emphasized the need for clear publication of rulings. K. Jacobsen suggested installing a sign explaining that it is left for erosion protection, J. Sutton explained how the signs had been vandalized, J. Sutton said at the moment tons which is great sometimes we go away and come back, and it is all gone.

Furthermore \$10,000 from WDC was allocated to help build a sacrificial bund, point needs to go across without upsetting people.

A Rating District member observed non-local individuals removing trailer loads of logs from the beach. S. Morgan proposed taking an educational approach. The Rating District emphasized the ease of access to the beach for such activities and suggested enforcing rules with signage.

K. Jacobsen suggested incorporating both WDC and WCRC logos on signs, clearly stating the reasons why beach wood should not be removed.

S. Morgan mentioned that WCRC are undergoing review of the coastal plan; we can advocate but the WDC develop those bylaws.

FINANCE REPORT

S. Morgan spoke to this, please note we are late having these meetings, we will look into the reverse noted on these finances, period of 1st July 2022 to 30th June 2023, she advised that the Neils Beach Rating District had an opening balance of \$19,878.44 with a total revenue of \$5,660.48 less expenses of \$314.00 for a closing balance of \$24,694.95.

ANNUAL WORKS REPORT

K. Jacobsen spoke to the Annual Works Report, no maintenance or capital works carried out from the 1 July 2022 to the 30 June 2023 period.

No future works scheduled have allowed for unforeseen maintenance of sacrificial bund.

RATES 2024/2025

K. Jacobsen advised that the balance of the rating district account at the beginning of the 2024-2025 financial year was likely to be \$30,200.

He proposed a rates strike of \$5,262.00 which included \$5,000 of rates maintenance and \$262.00 of engineering cost recovery.

Moved: ***“That the rate strike for Neils Beach Rating District is \$5,262.00 excl GST for the 2024/2025 financial year.”***

Moved-G. Downie/J. Sutton-carried.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEE

Moved: ***“That the committee, be namely:***

A. Piercy

G. Robson

S. Metcalf

J. Sutton

G. Dowie

M. Petrie and

P. Turvey remain as the committee for the 2024/2025 financial year.”

Moved: ***“That J. Sutton is re-elected as Spokesperson and M. Petrie to be Deputy for the 2024-2025 financial year.***

All in favour.

MANAGERS UPDATE

S. Morgan spoke to this, realignment of catchment team, more resources in-house, chief engineer and construction engineer, to stop reliance on consultants apart from where it is required as discussed earlier in the consents space.

S. Morgan discussed health and safety prequalification's for contractors and how everyone is involved, we can assist you with becoming prequalified, allowances for emergency circumstances but under supervision.

RATING DISTRICT AGREEMENT



WEST COAST
REGIONAL COUNCIL

Funds on prudent reserve (S. Morgan spoke to this), the Rating District Committee must decide who endorses the use of RD funds, for example when they needed to do this in the past with the bund.

It was decided to use email to contact the committee to use the prudent reserve, happy for quorum of half of the committee.

Moved-E. Dibben/M. Petrie-carried.

All in favour.

GENERAL BUSINESS

K. Jacobsen discussed what the prudent reserve is there for and that you establish one for this Rating District, lock in \$30,000 as your prudent reserve.

Prudent reserve is outside you maintenance spend will talk later in meeting how we access this, S. Morgan said this sacrificial bund is a low scheme, discussed having a prudent reserve gives the Rating District an expectation, J. Sutton advised it was cheaper last time there was an issue as machinery was already here.

A motion was made to lock in the prudent reserve at \$30,000.

Moved-G. Dowie/P. Turvey-carried.

All in favour.

Bund drainage-not a lot of water retention at the moment, nothing significant, didn't pond like past years. Rating District to keep an eye on it and raise if needed.

Coastal rezoning-J. Sutton would like us to go away with Rating Districts feelings on the matter, whole village has been written off, banks won't be interested in lending money, town will wilt with extra cost, 100-year plan, Cr B. Cummings noted that the TTPP was a government directive we can go back and submit.

J. Sutton noted that they don't face the sea all the time they are sheltered from it, Cr B. Cummings raised concerns about sea level rise.



The Rating District expressed dissatisfaction with WCRC's understanding of the red zone concept and criticized poor notification practices. They highlighted low attendance, with only two people present on the Zoom call (TTPP). The Neils Beach Rating District had provided their entire database to the TTPP representative.

J. Sutton expressed the need for a zoning plan that the community can accept. G Dowie mentioned that submissions have been made. S. Morgan acknowledged the desire for more information but indicated that answers are not available today. Cr B. Cummings committed to bringing up the issue at the council meeting.

The Rating District clarified that the TTPP prohibits the construction of habitable dwellings in the area. Once this rule is incorporated into the plan, it will be enforced by insurance companies.

P. Turvey expressed gratitude for any scientific advice. He suggested allowing individuals to opt out based on their own risk assessments. Should we advocate for this approach instead? Cr B. Cummings committed to seeking clarification on this matter.

A Rating District member mentioned its inclusion in the Paper variation plan. Lois from WCRC presented a paper to the planning committee, explaining the reasons behind the proposed variation. L. Crozier, on behalf of the TTPP team, circulated a paper that was considered one of the better explanations from planning personnel in recent times.

Cr B. Cummings will bring to the council's attention that the entire town was not informed about the hazard plan, etc.

BYLAWS

S. Morgan advised that these are being revised and will be brought back to all the Rating Districts in the next series of meetings.

ACTIONS:

Resource Consent go back to the consultant.

GM to ask our council to speed up the Resource Consent.



S. Morgan, list of suitable plants emailed to committee, BIO security team.

Beach wood removal rules take back to the committee, follow up with sign, joint WDC and WCRC logos.

Publication of beach wood removal rules (sits with WDC) website.

Reversal noted on finances come back to Rating District.

Bund drainage Rating District to keep an eye on it and raise.

Hazard plan no one informed the RD, Cr B. Cummings to take back to council.



Neils Beach 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	11 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 wcrc 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 members to endorse the use of RD funds, via email communication.
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 I**.

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 1: To be provided at the meeting

**West Coast Regional Council
Neils Beach District Financial Accounts
For the 12 Months to 30 June 2024**

	2023/2024 ACTUAL	2023/24 BUDGET	2022/23 ACTUAL
RESERVES OPENING BALANCE 1 JULY 2023			19,878.44
2021/22 Internal Interest transferred to Hokitika Loan RD			(529.97)
RESERVES OPENING BALANCE 1 JULY 2023	<u>24,694.95</u>		<u>19,348.47</u>
REVENUE			
Contributions - Agreed works	-		
Internal Interest Earned / (Paid)	684.30		406.40
Other Income	-		
Rates	5,709.93	5,268.00	5,254.08
TOTAL REVENUE	<u>6,394.23</u>	<u>5,268.00</u>	<u>5,660.48</u>
EXPENDITURE			
Advertising	93.91		58.00
Aircraft Hire	-		
Contractors	-	5,004.00	
Consultants	-		
Insurance	-		
Other Sundry Expenditure	-		
Rates	-		
Resource Consents	-		
Staff Time	262.00	264.00	256.00
Surveyors	-		
Venue Hire	-		
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	<u>355.91</u>	<u>5,268.00</u>	<u>314.00</u>
NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	<u>6,038.32</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>5,346.48</u>
Capital Expenditure			
RESERVE CLOSING BALANCE 30 JUNE 2024	<u>30,733.27</u>		<u>24,694.95</u>

Peter Miller

 06/01/2025

West Coast Regional Council –Neil’s Beach Rating District

Annual Works Report on Rating District Assets

1. Executive summary

This report outlines a summary of work undertaken as part of the Neil’s Beach 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

No works carried out

3. Scheduled Maintenance 2024/2025

Allow for unforeseen maintenance	\$5,000.00
Total	\$5,000.00

4. Neil’s Beach Rating District financial balance

The balance in the rating district account, at the beginning of the 2024 / 2025 financial year is likely to be approximately \$31,347.

This target balance for the ‘prudent reserve’ for this rating district is \$30,000 and based on the current balance this is available.

This prudent reserve is immediately accessible 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.

5. Proposed rates for the 2025 / 2026 financial year

Rates Maintenance	\$5,000.00
Engineers Cost Recovery	\$2,220.00
Infrastructure Insurance	none
Total:	\$7,220.00

Council recommends a total rate strike of \$7,220.00 excluding GST.

6. General Business.

Replanting (comments from Kent Jacobsen)

██████████ can offer Neils Beach rating district a ██████████ on bulk orders. They have said there may be more suitable species other than Pingao (*Desmoschoenus spiralis*; Golden Sand Sedge) available and have offered to check with their Landcare Trust assistant. For information on this species visit [Pingao \(or Pikao\) the Golden Sand Sedge \(doc.govt.nz\)](#).

Pingao costs as of July 2024 were:

- ██████████
i ██████████

Other options for planting in a West Coast coastal environment are shown in the attached report: **Planting in a coastal environment.**

To capture sand drift and to build sacrificial dunes consideration could be given to low-impact soft engineering systems. This should take place on the seaward side of the sacrificial bund. A resource consent may be required depending on the type of system. One example is an E-fence that effectively traps sand, see [Sand dune restoration as sustainable natural architectural design for coastal protection along seasonal storm-prone beach - ScienceDirect](#). Noting though that where the research was undertaken is a very different environment to New Zealand's West Coast.