



**WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL**  
**MEETING OF THE TARAKAKAU RATING DISTRICT**  
**ON**  
**Wednesday, 22 January 2025**  
**10:30 AM**  
**At the Stevenson Residence 673 Taramakau Settlement Road**

**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. Asset Management system update
  - c. Finance Report
  - d. Annual Works Report
- 8. General Business**

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

Please contact Lillian Crozier ([lillian.crozier@wrc.govt.nz](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**  
**TARAMAKAU RATING DISTRICT**  
**HELD AT THE STEVENSON RESIDANCE**  
**ON 2<sup>ND</sup> MAY 2024, COMMENCING AT 10:30AM**

**PRESENT (Rating District Members)**

J. Stewart, D&E Groot, M. Stewart, P. Stevenson, S. Landridge.

**IN ATTENDANCE (Staff)**

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

**APOLOGIES**

R. McCarthy, K. Jacobsen (WCRC)

*Moved-P. Stevenson/S. Langdridge-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 27<sup>th</sup> March 2023 be adopted as a true and correct record of that meeting***

*Moved-M. Stewart/D. Groot-carried.*

**MATTERS ARISING**

Since 2008, sections have been raised, and it is essential to understand the current flood protection levels. The current estimate of 1/50 is based on outdated cross sections. Updated cross sections and flood flow analysis are necessary to accurately assess the level of service.

The Committee previously received reports on sections gaining gravel and the long-term advantages of lifting them. S. Morgan mentioned that the recent updated LiDAR data will provide better insights for these reports. The LiDAR data is currently undergoing quality control and will be backed up with cross sections.



The last cross section survey was conducted in 2011, and subsequent surveys were done with a jet boat around 8-9 years ago, possibly in 2010 or 2021.

New gravel has moved, and a meeting will be held in three months, possibly in October, for Taramakau due to calving. The cost of cross-section surveys varies depending on the river but is generally around \$10,000. It is crucial to understand the scheme and get value from it. The committee has been requesting bank heights to reinvest in lower spots but has not been receiving this information. They need to know if they are placing gravel in the right spots.

S. Morgan acknowledged that the team has been understaffed and apologized for the delay in providing the necessary information. The team will look into obtaining the information.

K. Jacobson will visit the sites to understand the scheme before October.

The process for emergency works was discussed. S. Morgan addressed impairment and emergency works, emphasizing that the Council is liable if these works are included in the Asset Management Plan. An engineer is required to ensure the work aligns with the asset management plan. There was also a discussion on how emergency works can deviate from established policies.

For record-keeping and audit purposes, the committee expressed interest in still having a dedicated contractor with a set price, though there was uncertainty about the amount of rock needed for each area. J. Bell had previously noted the lack of available funds.

S. Morgan -council policy – different agreement for Taramakau.

## **FINANCIAL REPORT**

S. Morgan spoke on the financial report for the period 1<sup>st</sup> July 2022 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2023, she advised that the Taramakau Rating District had a reserve opening balance of -\$67,039.28 with a total revenue of \$295,459.80 less expenses of \$216,101.96 for a closing balance of \$12,318.56. A discussion took place about NEMA insurance recovery and interest rates.

A discussion took place around contractors and consultants.

There was a further discussion around variance which S. Morgan would expect that the contractor cost was higher than expected.



The way the annual works reports have always been done is an indication of what should be there, but anything can happen.

*Moved-A. Stewart/M. Stewart-carried.*

### **ANNUAL WORKS REPORT**

S. Morgan spoke to the annual works report, during the 2022-2023 period, maintenance works by Henry Adams Contracting \$44,000 and capital works total of \$153,639.96, there was administrations/other expenditure of \$18,462.00 which included insurance and staff time. Under prudent reserve.

J. Bell was to review the situation regarding the gravel charges (Rating District being charged for filling a hole again) to determine if this was acceptable and needs to be clarified. Moving forward, it is essential to clarify this issue with the contractor. If there was a mistake, it is important to ensure that the contractor is paid for placing the rock, though it may be challenging to dispute an accepted invoice. To prevent similar issues in the future, engineers' procedures must be followed.

Additionally, the committee will review the scheme's tender process with Henry Adams. A copy of the contract will be brought to the October meeting for further discussion.

Proposed rates remain unchanged from last year. There was a discussion about insurance based on the scheme's revaluation and unidentified assets. P. Stevenson questioned why the council would consider certain items as assets. S. Morgan explained that if there is an Asset Management Plan (AMP) and a designated level of service, the council is responsible for maintaining those assets according to the regulations. Regardless of land ownership, the asset remains under the ownership and responsibility of the West Coast Regional Council (WCRC) if it is part of the AMP and provides a level of service.

WCRC has hired someone full-time for asset management, these issues are being addressed, landowner access discussion to maintain stop banks.

### **BYLAWS**

There was a discussion around river control bylaws which are coming out for consultation in July.



There was a discussion about access to stop banks and the engineering recovery costs, including how during property purchases this would be detailed on the rates. Cr P. Ewen addressed insurance matters, and Cr B. Cummings talked about flood warning systems.

S. Morgan discussed capital works 40% where you would have to raise a loan. 60/40 funding.

S. Landridge would like to see hydro flood flow monitoring.

The committee discussed the rates strike, particularly in relation to overdrafts, and decided to keep the rates the same as last year. There was also a discussion on the level of protection and the importance of maintaining low spots. The need for Cross Section LiDAR data was emphasized to accurately understand the current status, as information has been added to the system since 2008. S. Morgan informed the committee that B. Russ has been brought in to help locate this information.

### **RATES 2024/2025**

S. Morgan advised that the balance of the rating district account at the beginning of the 2024-2025 financial year was likely to be approximately \$95,119.40.

She proposed a rates maintenance strike of \$103,811.00 which included \$83,839.00 of rates maintenance, \$12,299.00 of infrastructure insurance and \$7,673.00 of engineering cost recovery.

**Moved:        *"That the rate strike for Taramakau Rating District is \$103,811.00 excl GST for the 2024-2025 financial year.***

*Moved-D. Groot/S. Landridge-carried.*

### **ELECTION OF COMMITTEE**

The election committee J. Stewart moved that this is to stay the same as last year. It was decided to re-elect P. Stevenson as Spokesperson and M. Stewart to be the deputy Spokesperson.

**Moved:        *"That the present Committee, namely:  
P. Stevenson***



**D. Groot**

**A. Stewart**

**M. Stewart**

**J. Stewart**

**S. Landridge**

***Be retained as the committee for the 2024/2025 financial year.”***

**Moved:** ***“That P. Stevenson is re-elected as Spokesperson, M Stewart as deputy Spokesperson for the 2024-2025 financial year.***

*Moved-D. Groot/S. Landridge-carried.*

*All in agreement.*

#### **RATING DISTRICT AGREEMENT**

S. Morgan discussed the terms of reference, endorsement of funds needs to be done by email to be traceable, only six emails, consult with whole committee if we go outside prudent reserve.

Spokesperson will send out six emails, scheme will have a site meeting all agree to it.

Terms of reference are still to be drawn up and signed in October for the Taramakau Rating District.

#### **MANAGERS UPDATE**

S. Morgan provided an update on staffing changes within the council, highlighting the recruitment of river engineers and the relocation of CDEM (Civil Defence Emergency Management) and quarries into new departments. She discussed the council's detailed quarry strategy and emphasized the importance of maintaining rock supplies for Rating Districts. Mention was made of the new chief engineer and construction engineer, as well as the area engineer all recruited from the Bay of Plenty.

The discussion also touched on depreciation of culverts within the scheme. It was noted that moving forward, depreciation would be recorded differently in the council's financial system and would be reflected in future financial reports. There was a query about how depreciation recovery would be managed if it starts partway through a financial year. An action point was assigned to A. Prendergast,



the acting Corporate Services Manager, to assess the benefits to the scheme in such scenarios.

The committee discussed communication protocols, emphasizing the option for members to opt out of receiving mail by signing today's registration form, which would help save administrative costs by using email instead.

Additionally, there was a mention of health and safety prequalifications. It was noted that there is an existing agreement with Henry Adams for contracting work, but members also have the option to undertake work themselves. The process for health and safety prequalification was highlighted, noting that it typically takes about three weeks for review and approval.

M. Stewart – raised question on the One Plan, a brief discussion took place.

### **BYLAWS**

It was emphasized that access to rock is crucial for this rating district. A question was raised regarding whether bylaws can override the TTPP.

The WCRC planning team is currently drafting new bylaws, which will be presented at the next meeting for further discussion and consideration.

### **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Everybody is liable in the act but if you are not the landowner you are not liable, if WCRC engage the contractor it is up to us to prequal and monitor the work.

Discussed voluntary work-WCRC would be liable because you are volunteering to maintain the asset, it would be WCRC responsibility as the asset owner, discussed sign at the gate showing hazards, an extensive health and safety process is part of tender contract.

### **CLASSIFICATION**

Initially classification discussions it was thought that no changes are needed for this scheme. The classification was reviewed based on the presence of the Hook Groyne, a man-made structure.

An action item was assigned to further examine the scheme's classification, taking into account risks associated with flooding and erosion. The discussion highlighted that treating the Hook Groyne separately, as a man-made rather than natural structure, could impact its classification. S. Morgan advised that the classifier would present options for consideration.



## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

The committee advised WCRC that the best thing they could do for the community is get the rock sources more accessible for rock, cartage milage discussed. Needs to be throughout the West Coast.

Meeting Closed 12:00

## **ACTIONS:**

Flood flow analysis to understand levels of service.

Area engineer to come out before October meeting to understand scheme.

Look at gravel charge (got charged to fill hole back up again) clarification to be bought back to next meeting.

Henry Adams Contract (L. Crozier has emailed to K. Jacobsen) review/expiry before October meeting.

Signed agreements/different to Rating District agreements proposed to all schemes.

Lidar information (have B. Russ look for this), bring back to next meeting.

Look at low spots/maintenance, discuss with spokesperson next scheme visit.

Depreciation recovery how would this benefit the scheme (enquire with finance team).

Can bylaws override TTPP (need quick access to rock) enquire with planning team?

Look at Taramakau classification based on risk to flooding and erosion.





# **Taramakau 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 spokesperson must call a site meeting of all committee members, to endorse works required that will financially exceed the prudent reserve.
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**



## Rating District Survey update

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

### **Current situation**

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

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

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

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

The new bed level survey programme will vary from 6 monthly to a 5-year return 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.

## Rating District Survey update

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

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

### **Considerations**

#### **Implications/Risks**

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

#### **Significance and Engagement Policy Assessment**

This policy does not trigger the significance and engagement policy.


#### **Attachments**

Attachment 1: to be supplied at the meeting



**West Coast Regional Council  
Taramakau Settlement Rating District Financial Accounts  
For the 12 Months to 30 June 2024**

	2023/2024 ACTUAL	2023/24 BUDGET	2022/23 ACTUAL
<b>RESERVES OPENING BALANCE 1 July 2023</b>	<b>12,318.56</b>		<b>(67,039.28)</b>
<b>REVENUE</b>			
Contributions - Agreed works	-		153,640.00
Internal Interest Earned	1,306.22		(526.42)
Rental Income	-		
NEMA Recoveries	-		42,346.03
Rates	102,301.11	102,300.00	100,000.19
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>103,607.33</b>	<b>102,300.00</b>	<b>295,459.80</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>			
Advertising	-		
Contractors	-	83,844.00	44,000.00
Consultants	-		
Insurance	14,767.74	10,788.00	10,789.00
Infrastructure Depreciation	-		
Other Expenditure	-		
Rates	-		
Resource Consents	-		
Staff Time	7,673.00	7,668.00	7,673.00
Surveyors	-		
Venue Hire	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>22,440.74</b>	<b>102,300.00</b>	<b>62,462.00</b>
<b>NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>81,166.59</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>232,997.80</b>
<b>Capital Expenditure</b>			<b>153,639.96</b>
<b>RESERVE CLOSING BALANCE 30 JUNE 2024</b>	<b>93,485.15</b>		<b>12,318.56</b>

  
Peter Miller  
5/12/2024

## West Coast Regional Council –Taramakau Rating District

### Annual Works Report on Rating District Assets

#### 1. Executive summary

This report outlines a summary of work undertaken as part of the Kowhitirangi 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 summary 2023/2024 FY

No works carried out	\$n/a
	<hr/>
<i>Total:</i>	<i>\$0.00</i>

#### 3. Administration (other expenditure)

Engineering Cost Recovery	\$7,668.00
Insurance	\$4,316.00
	<hr/>
<i>Total:</i>	<i>\$11,984.00</i>

#### 4. Scheduled maintenance 2024/2025 FY

None*	\$0.00
-------	--------

*\* There is currently no planned maintenance. The \$80,000.00 2024/2024 maintenance rate strike will build prudent reserve if unspent.*

#### 5. Taramakau 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 \$172,000 (assumption that the \$80,000 rated for asset maintenance remains unspent).

This target balance for the 'prudent reserve' for this rating district is \$500,000 and currently the balance is well below what is required. This prudent reserve is immediately accessible for urgent emergency works that may be required following a major flood event.

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

Rates Maintenance	\$80,000.00
-------------------	-------------



Engineers Cost Recovery*	\$4,440.00
Infrastructure Insurance	\$ 22,704.00
	<hr/>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$107,144</b>

Council recommends a total rate strike of \$107,144 excluding GST.

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

## 7. General Business.

Insurance

Vegetation management



### 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*

