



# WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

**WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL  
MEETING OF THE PUNAKAIKI RATING DISTRICT  
ON  
Thursday, 12 December 2024  
6PM  
At the Haddock Residence 3 Webb Street Punakaiki**

**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](mailto:lillian.crozier@wrc.govt.nz)) or Shanti Morgan ([shanti.morgan@wrc.govt.nz](mailto:shanti.morgan@wrc.govt.nz)) with your queries.

**THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE  
PUNAKAIKI RATING DISTRICT  
HELD AT THE HADDOCK RESIDENCE  
ON 18<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2024, COMMENCING AT 6:00PM.**

**PRESENT (Rating District Members)**

C. Findlay, Cr P. Haddock, H. Haddock, T. Daniels, K. Smith, S. Casey, D. Findlay, J. Findlay, G. Pulman, S. Smithies, R. Kargaar,

**IN ATTENDANCE (Staff)**

Cr B. Cummings, (Councillors)  
S. Morgan, P. Birchfield, L. Crozier, O. Rose (Staff)

**APOLOGIES**

Cr F. Dooley, Cr M. McIntyre, M&J Costello, H&G O'Day, P. Grant and M. Godfrey-Grant

***Movers**–C. Findlay/ Cr B. Cummings - Carried*

**WELCOME AND MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

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

**Moved:** ***“That the minutes of the previous Annual Meeting held on the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2023, be adopted as a true and correct record of that meeting.”***

***Movers**–C. Findlay/ Cr B. Cummings - Carried*

**MATTERS ARISING**

Cr P. Haddock raised the action point regarding the follow-up on the NZTA consent, P. Birchfield clarified that a councillor or staff member could not make the inquiry, but the spokesperson could do so. Moira from NZTA will make the inquiry on our behalf.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

S. Morgan spoke on the financial report for the period of 1<sup>st</sup> July 2022 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2023. She advised that the Punakaiki Rating District had an opening balance of \$109,342.88 with a total revenue of \$95,926.42, less expenses of \$21,218.38 for a closing balance of \$184,050.92.



S. Morgan spoke on the Punakaiki Seawall Loan Repayment Rating District Reserve Account for the 12 Months to 30 June 2023.

Representatives from Scenic Circle Company raised concerns about staff time charges and ensuring they are not billed twice. They inquired about two combined papers and discussed loan repayments, seeking an explanation for the high charges last year compared to previous years. They requested transparency on the loan details and its impact on the reserve accounts. It was noted that previously, excess funds were transferred to maintenance accounts (reserves), resulting in higher rates but benefiting the reserve account.

Scenic Circle Company contributes \$30,000 annually to the rating district and expressed a preference for keeping the funds within the business for cash flow purposes. They requested clarification on the use of their contributions. An action point was raised to have the loan details and its high costs from the previous year explained.

Accept the report as read but note the action.

**Movers**–S. Casey /Cr P. Haddock – Carried.

## **WORKS REPORT**

P. Birchfield spoke on this for the period of 1<sup>st</sup> July 2022 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2023, no maintenance works were completed, there was survey worked carried out only 50% of the costs were charged to the Rating District the other 50% was covered by the general rate for a total of \$1,455.70 for the financial year, there were also mail out fees for this period of \$234.68.

P. Birchfield discussed projected works to be carried out below from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2023 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2024.

Annual Survey and Report, the 2024 report has been circulated. Rock Top-Up, details will be included in the next works report. BDC Culvert Supply, the culvert provided by BDC was Alu flow, which is quite thin and deemed inappropriate for seawall use. Continued conversations with BDC are necessary. Seawall Repair discussed the repair work and the balance of the rating district. Target Balance and Maintenance Rates, another thousand tons of rock is likely needed. Proposed maintenance rates were discussed, with no contribution toward the prudent reserve noted. Cost-Effective Rock Supply, it was fortunate that the area engineer identified cheap rock from White Horse Quarry.

**Movers** Cr P. Haddock/S. Casey– Carried.

## **RATES 2024/ 2025**

Cr B. Cummings advised that the balance of the rating district maintenance account at the beginning of the 2024-2025 financial year was likely to be \$150,000.00.



He proposed rates strike of \$94,528 which included \$75,000 of rates, \$4,185.00 of infrastructure insurance and \$15,343.00 of Engineering Cost Recovery.

**Moved:** ***"That rate strike for the Punakaiki Rating District is \$94,528.00 Excl GST for the 2024-2025 financial year."***

**Movers-** Cr P. Haddock/S. Casey - Carried.

#### **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

**Moved:** ***"That the committee for the 2024/2025 financial year now consists of"***

**C. Findlay**  
**D. Findlay**  
**H. Haddock**  
**S. Casey**  
**T. Wilkins**  
**A. Beynon**  
**J. Findlay**

**Moved:** ***"That is C. Findlay is re-elected as Spokesperson, as deputy Spokesperson for the 2024-2025 financial year."***

**Movers** all in agreement - Carried.

#### **MANAGERS' UPDATE**

S. Morgan discussed the draft agreements for the rating district and advised that a motion should be moved today regarding the decision-making process for using funds outside of scheduled works. It was decided that a quorum would consist of three members: the spokesperson and two committee members. Additionally, the area engineer will be responsible for making phone calls instead of the spokesperson.

**Movers-**S. Casey/S. Smithies-Carried.

S. Morgan explained the laws in place to protect assets, specifically mentioning the powers granted by Section 126 of the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act 1941 in emergency situations. P. Birchfield emphasized the importance of being proactive, particularly if the sea poses a threat, and suggested setting a limit on expenditure. It was agreed that any work exceeding the maintenance budget of \$75,000 would be brought to the committee for approval.

S. Morgan informed the committee about recent organizational changes within the council, noting the renaming of the engineering team to the catchment management team. The council has hired several new staff members, including a chief engineer, a



construction engineer, and additional personnel in the finance team, to increase capacity and improve services.

S. Morgan discussed the concept of depreciation, specifically regarding culverts. She explained that while banks are not depreciating assets, the council is considering charging depreciation on culverts. This will likely be a minimal amount, with more details to be presented in August. S. Morgan also emphasized the importance of communication, inviting committee members to opt into email notifications by contacting L Crozier. She highlighted the need to adhere to the Local Government Act, which requires certain communications.

S. Morgan discussed health and safety prequalification requirements and asked the committee to encourage local contractors to contact us to undergo the prequalification process.

### **IMPAIRMENT**

S. Morgan provided an overview of *impairment*, explaining that it refers to unexpected damage to assets rather than regular wear and tear. This was provided in the attached memo, clarifying that every Rating District has an Asset Management Plan (AMP), and it is the council's responsibility to maintain the specified level of service in these plans.

S. Morgan discussed the insurance arrangements and excess clause, highlighting that in the event of a significant coastal event, costs are shared across schemes. Typically, NEMA (National Emergency Management Agency) covers 60% of the costs, with the scheme covering the remaining 40%. She noted that we have generally been successful in securing this.

### **CLASSIFICATION REVIEW**

P. Birchfield advised this scheme has had just one classification review recently done by John, this may be revisited or further discussed in the upcoming August meeting.

The committee discussed the importance of the wall preventing flooding of numerous properties.

An action point was raised to verify how many classifications are applicable for the Punakaiki scheme.

### **GENERAL BUSINESS**

It seems there are concerns about the maintenance and erosion of the wall. The issue of who maintains the top of the wall was raised, noting that BDC has blocked it off since it's no longer a road and is not being maintained. There's also discussion about the erosion caused by the sea on the ley side of the wall. P. Birchfield questioned the importance of aesthetics, noting that [REDACTED] it in good condition and improved its appearance. There



was a suggestion to consider adding protection to the crest to prevent waves from eroding it further. Additionally, in future plans, there's a proposal to add a nib on the ley side to accommodate trucks, although there's consideration that a larger ley side wall could restrict access for these assets.

Cr. P. Haddock suggested querying BDC about the possibility of cleaning up the inside batter of drains. The action aims to address concerns that BDC drains are becoming blocked when they perform rock work, typically involving a cleanup. Previously, quarry waste from Kiwi was used for this purpose, but access to it, particularly limestone-free material, is no longer available. The previous cleanup efforts had proven effective in the past but have since deteriorated over time.

Discussion about Petrels are now starting to come into nest.

Cr P. Haddock discussed the aluminium culvert, West Reef, have had a purchase order issued to remove the old aluminium culvert. There was initially no method to transport the material away, but Dylan has now included it in his schedule for removal.

The committee raised a question about engineering surveys, expressing a desire to be onsite during the survey process. They requested notifications through the committee and copies of the surveys for review and action.

S. Smithies raised concerns about noise levels in the hostel, she had spoken with an engineer on site explaining that it was not due to waves but rather the rocks further down rolling and creating noise. P. Birchfield clarified that future visits to the site would be conducted by her rather than the surveyor contractors.

S. Morgan noted that we update our works reports and present them to council monthly, which are accessible online for anyone to view. Additionally, she mentioned that notifications can be sent out via email for those interested in receiving updates.

S. Morgan, WCRC councilors and staff discussed Peter Blackwood's extensive engineering experience, as well as the appointment of Tom Hopkins, who is coming on board from the Department of Conservation to the role of catchment manager.

Bylaws, planner will bring those to council in June for public notification.

P. Birchfield discussed the "Before the Deluge" report, which was submitted to the government to propose various flood mitigation schemes across New Zealand, including Karamea and Mokihinui. Birchfield presented a proposal to extend the flood protection measures in Punakaiki, particularly around the beach camp area, to address flooding from the Pororari River. The proposal suggests that the government would contribute 60% of the funding, while the remaining 40% would need to be covered by the local rating district.



P. Birchfield read from the report she submitted regarding Punakaiki. A group of regional councils discussed a multi-tool approach to flood mitigation. The council needs to agree with Punakaiki members on funding the project. Currently, the Asset Management Plan (AMP) only addresses the bund.

P. Birchfield asked if there would be support for allocating funds to advance this proposal. She emphasized that other councils are preparing for government funding, while current schemes focus only on maintenance. A quote from a coastal engineer would be necessary, and our Chief Engineer, Peter Blackwood, along with Mike Alice, could peer review the proposal. P. Birchfield indicated that she could complete this before the deadline for tranche two. The Rivers Management Group will also provide their input.

A discussion took place regarding Wanganui's situation, where they missed out on funding and now have to finance the project themselves. Co-funding options, such as generational loans, were considered. P. Birchfield mentioned that they had applied for \$500,000. One complication is the regional plan that affects the area, requiring a 1/100 height consideration for flood defences. The balance between the desired height and practical implementation needs to be decided, starting with a consultation with Mike Alice on placement and height.

P. Birchfield queried if \$10,000-\$15,000 could be allocated immediately for this assessment. Scenic Circle supports the project, as they had endorsements removed from their insurance and would utilize natural features. P. Birchfield has also raised the issue with NZTA, suggesting they might need to replace some rocks that have been dislodged.

Given the high deprivation index of the area, there could be a higher contribution from the government, similar to tranche one.

S. Casey inquired about the possibility of reopening quarries, which would reduce the carbon footprint and be more efficient for contractors. P. Birchfield advised it is better if the councillors identify and want to initiate this.

It was discussed that the next meeting was to take place in August.

**ACTION POINTS FOR FOLLOW UP.**

Transparency - to have the loan explained, (explain the difference between the reserves 2022/2023)

How many classifications are for Punakaiki.

Send out notifications via email when work reports for Punakaiki will be in council papers/meetings.

Copies of surveys emailed to the group.

Approach BDC about drains being blocked.

**Meeting Closed 7:15pm.**

DRAFT





# **Punakaiki 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	15 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 that the spokesperson, and 2 committee members endorse the use of RD funds outside the scheduled work plan. Additionally, the area engineer is responsible to seek the endorsement from the aforementioned.
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

<b>Author</b>	Shanti Morgan, Group Manager Environmental Science and Chantel Mills, Project Accountant
<b>Authorizer</b>	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.

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

\* 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**

<b>Author</b>	Max Dickens, Policy Manager, Paulette Birchfield, Area Engineer Catchment Management, Jordan Mandery, Construction Engineer.
<b>Authoriser</b>	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 period<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 supplied at meeting



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

	2023/2024 YTD	2023/24 BUDGET	2022/23 YTD
Punakaiki Seawall District			109,342.88
<b>RESERVES OPENING BALANCE 1 JULY 2023</b>	<u>184,050.92</u>	<u></u>	<u>109,342.88</u>
<b>REVENUE</b>			
Internal Interest earned Loan account / (Paid)	2,145.11		1,398.42
Rates	94,979.00	94,980.00	94,528.00
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<u>97,124.11</u>	<u>94,980.00</u>	<u>95,926.42</u>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>			
Contractors	71,668.91	75,000.00	1,455.70
Consultants	73,129.50		
Insurance	4,797.56	4,284.00	4,185.00
Other Expenditure	-		234.68
Staff Time	15,698.00	15,696.00	15,343.00
Surveyors	1,198.90		
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<u>166,492.87</u>	<u>94,980.00</u>	<u>21,218.38</u>
<b>NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<u>(69,368.76)</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>74,708.04</u>
<b>RESERVE CLOSING BALANCE 30 JUNE 2024</b>	<u>114,682.16</u>	<u></u>	<u>184,050.92</u>

PUNAKAIKI LOAN ACCOUNT	2023/2024 Actual	2023/2024 Budget	2022/2023 Actual
<b>RESERVES OPENING BALANCE 1 JULY 2023</b>	<u>41,108.51</u>	<u></u>	<u>36,326.06</u>
<b>Income</b>			
Rates Income	34,505.03	34,716.00	35,525.31
Internal Interest earned / (Paid) - Loan	0.00		1,894.87
<b>Total Income</b>	<u>34,505.03</u>	<u>34,716.00</u>	<u>37,420.18</u>
<b>Expenditure</b>			
Loan Interest	5,718.12	4,716.00	2,637.73
Loan Principal	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<u>35,718.12</u>	<u>34,716.00</u>	<u>32,637.73</u>
<b>NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<u>(1,213.09)</u>	<u></u>	<u>4,782.45</u>
<b>RESERVES CLOSING BALANCE 30 JUNE 2024</b>	<u>39,895.42</u>	<u></u>	<u>41,108.51</u>
<b>Opening Loan Balance 1 July</b>	<b>110,000.00</b>		140,000.00
Loan Principal	(30,000.00)		(30,000.00)
<b>Closing Loan Balance 30 June</b>	<u>80,000.00</u>		<u>110,000.00</u>





# **West Coast Regional Council – Punakaiki Rating District**

## **Annual Works Report on Maintaining Existing Rating District Assets**

### **1. Executive summary**

This report outlines a summary of work undertaken as part of the Punakaiki 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 a top up of the seawall crest and loose rock recovery, repair of a stormwater culvert and removal of waste material and supply cart and place of rock for seawall repairs.



Image 1: [REDACTED] undertaking crest top up work (September 2023)





Image 2: [REDACTED] s undertaking crest top up (September 2023)

Expenditure summary:

September 2023 [REDACTED] Contractors Ltd

998 tonnes of rock

Top-up of seawall crest

Recover loose rock

\$73,129.50

January 2024 [REDACTED]

Repair of stormwater culvert through seawall

\$6,330.00

June 2024 [REDACTED]

Supply, cart and place 876 tonnes of rock 143 tonnes of rubble

\$65,032.00

June 2024 [REDACTED]

Clean up of material from culvert repair

\$306.91

Total maintenance works for the 2023/2024 FY

\$144,798.41

### 3. Survey work summary 2023/2024 FY

Survey work was undertaken to assess the current beach profile as per scheduled survey plans. The work was completed in February 2024. The general trend of reduction in beach height at the southern end of the Punakaiki Rating District seawall is still evident. A copy of the maintenance report by West Coast Regional Council Chief Engineer Peter Blackwood is attached.

Expenditure summary:

Beach profile survey	████████████████████	\$1,198.90 *
Total Survey Works for the 2023 / 2024 Financial Year:		<hr/> \$ 1198.90

\*This only represents 50% of actual survey costs as 50% of survey costs are currently covered by the general rate

### 4. Scheduled maintenance works for the 2024/2025 FY

As a result of an inspection carried out during August 2024, the following works were identified: A top-up of rock is required to repair slumped areas along the batter slope of the seawall, mainly at the southern extent of the wall. To place approximately 1000 tonnes of armour grade rock protection is estimated at \$75,000 - \$80,000

A. Allow for unforeseen maintenance over 2024 / 2025 period	\$ 20,000.00
B. Survey	\$ 2,000.00
C. Repair of seawall batter slope	\$80,000.00
Total proposed maintenance works for the 2024 / 2025 financial year	\$ 102,000.00

### 5. Punakaiki 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 \$90,000.

This target balance for the 'prudent reserve' for this rating district is \$200,000.

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 100 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, engineering design and project coordination.

Rates Maintenance	\$ 75,000.00
Engineers Cost Recovery	\$ 18,500.00
Infrastructure insurance	\$5,149.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$98,649.00</b>

## 7. General Business

*NZTA resource consent application and proposed mitigation*

### **Insurance**

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*