

## COMBINED PORTFOLIOS COMMITTEE

### TO THE CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

#### MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

- Cr T K Burke – Chairperson
- Cr R A Budd – Chair, Air Quality/Energy Portfolio Committee
- Cr A S Carroll
- Cr E H Cunningham
- Cr R H M Johnston – Chair, Pests and Biosecurity Portfolio Committee
- Cr R M Kirk – Chair, Coastal Environment/Navigation Safety Portfolio Committee
- Cr R I R Little – Chair, Land, Biodiversity/Waste, Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Sites Portfolio Committee
- Cr A R McKay – Chair, Hazards/Emergency Management Portfolio Committee
- Cr A G Neill
- Cr M E Oldfield – Chair, Water Quality, Quantity & Ecosystems Portfolio Committee
- Cr J F Slee
- Cr N J Wagner – Chair, Public Passenger Transport Portfolio Committee
- Cr J M Waters – Chair, Regional Land Transport Portfolio Committee
- Cr W E Woods

A meeting of the Committee will be held on

**Thursday, 23 November 2006 at 10:00 a.m.**

**VENUE:** Council Chamber  
First Floor  
Pegasus Building  
58 Kilmore Street  
**CHRISTCHURCH**

**BUSINESS:** As per Order Paper attached

Dr Bryan Jenkins  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE TAKEN  
AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY COUNCIL**

58 Kilmore Street,  
PO Box 345,  
Christchurch,  
Telephone: (03) 365-3828,  
Fax: (03) 365-3194  
Website: [www.ecan.govt.nz](http://www.ecan.govt.nz)



## COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002 DECISION-MAKING REQUIREMENTS

Except as below, a statement of compliance and a completed decision checklist is required for any agenda item on a council committee or the council recommending that a decision be made. This will be the responsibility of the person signing off the agenda item.

### The compliance statement and checklist will not be used for:

- Recommendations that information be received or that the Council make a decision.
- Decisions taken under the Resource Management Act 1991 or the Biosecurity Act 1993 in relation to resource consents, decisions required when following the procedures set out in Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, other permissions, submissions on plans, or references to the Environment Court.
- Decisions taken to proceed with enforcement procedures under various primary or secondary legislation or regulations, including procedures under the Resource Management Act 1991, the Biosecurity Act 1993, the Local Government Act 2002, and Environment Canterbury Bylaws.
- Administrative and personnel decisions that are entirely internal to Environment Canterbury.
- Other decisions where the procedures to be followed are set out in Legislation.

### COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

The council committee (or the council) must formally certify that:

- (a) It is satisfied that it has sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being and the effects on community outcomes, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions.
- (b) It is satisfied that it knows enough about and has given adequate consideration to the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision.

### INFORMATION CHECKLIST

(a)	A Statement of the Proposed Decision
(b)	A Statement of the Objective of the Proposed Decision and the Issue or Problem being addressed
(c)	A list of all reasonably practicable options, (including doing nothing).
(d)	For each option in (c): An evaluation of the Benefits and Costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being.
(e)	For each option in (c): A statement of the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted or achieved in an integrated and efficient manner.
(f)	For each option in (c): A statement of the Impact, if any, on Environment Canterbury's capacity to undertake its statutory responsibilities
(g)	If the Proposed Decision is a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water, a statement of how Maori values have been taken into account
(h)	A Statement of significant inconsistencies, if any, with any Existing Policy, Plan or Legislation arising from the Proposed Decision.
(i)	A statement how the views and preferences of affected or interested persons have been given adequate consideration during the definition of the problem or issue, the objective, the assessment of options and the development of the proposed decision, including the particular contribution of Maori to the decision-making process.

### Notes:

The significance of proposals and decisions determines how much time, money and effort is put into exploring and evaluating options and obtaining the views of affected and interested parties. The significance of proposals and decisions is determined through reference to criteria contained in the policy on significance.

The policy on significance together with Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002 set out the Council's requirements in relation to decisions. Some decisions can only be made through the Long-Term Council Community Plan, or after the Special Consultative Procedures set out in the Act have been used, (refer to the policy on significance and the Act).

All decisions of Environment Canterbury are subject to the decision-making requirements of section 76 of the Act unless inconsistent with specific requirements of other legislation.

**ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY**  
**COMBINED PORTFOLIOS COMMITTEE**

**ORDER PAPER**

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 23 August 2006
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

**(a) All Portfolios**

**MATTER FOR COMMITTEE DECISION**

5. 2007/08 ANNUAL PLAN – REVIEW OF PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
6. NOTICES OF MOTION
7. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
8. QUESTIONS
9. NEXT MEETING – TBA

## **ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY**

### **COMBINED PORTFOLIOS COMMITTEE**

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMBINED PORTFOLIOS COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 23 AUGUST 2006 IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, PEGASUS BUILDING, 58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH FROM 1.30PM.

### **CONTENTS**

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 15 AUGUST 2006
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

#### **MATTERS FOR COMMITTEE DECISION**

5. 2007/08 ANNUAL PLAN - DEMOCRATIC PROCESS
6. COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

#### **MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

7. 2007/08 ANNUAL PLAN: REVIEW OF PORTFOLIO RECOMMENDATIONS
8. NOTICES OF MOTION
9. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
10. QUESTIONS
11. NEXT MEETING

#### **PRESENT**

Crs T K Burke (Chairman), A S Carroll, R H M Johnston, R I R Little, A R McKay, A G Neill, J F Slee, J M Waters and W E Woods.

#### **MANAGEMENT AND STAFF PRESENT**

B R Jenkins (Chief Executive), I W Thomas (Director Finance and Corporate Services), J D Talbot (Director Policy and Planning), W M Falconer (Director External Communications), N C Pilbrow (Portfolio Manager Finance & Corporate Services), R Phillips (Portfolio Manager Pests & Biosecurity), P Buell (Regional Harbourmaster), W Simpson (Communications and Relations Manager), and L M McDonald (Administration Officer).

#### **1. APOLOGIES**

Cr R M Kirk (leave of absence),  
Crs R A Budd, E H Cunningham, M E Oldfield and Wagner

**2. MINUTES OF MEETING 15 August 2006**

The minutes of the meeting for the meeting of the Combined Portfolio Committee held 15 August 2006 were tabled.

**Resolved**

***The minutes of the meeting held 15 August 2006 were taken as read, confirmed as a correct record of proceedings and adopted.***

Cr McKay/Cr Burke

**3. MATTERS ARISING**

John Talbot provided an update on the situation regarding discussions with Waimakariri District Council regarding access for whitebaiters to the Ashley Rivermouth.

**4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS**

Nil.

**MATTERS FOR COMMITTEE DECISION**

**5. 2007/08 ANNUAL PLAN – Democratic Process**

Rob Phillips introduced this item.

He confirmed that further reports on the review of the Regional Policy Statement including a scoping report would be presented to the Council later in the year.

**Resolved**

***That the Portfolio Committee notes there are no significant changes proposed for the 2007/08 Annual Plan requiring consultation with key stakeholders.***

Cr Waters/Cr Carroll

**6. COMMUNICATION STRATEGY**

Bill Simpson presented this item.

Cr Little requested that when the Finance and Audit Committee reviews the proposed expenditure, information on the costs of communications be considered. This should include comparison with other councils and the cost of complying with central government requires such as the development of the LTCCP.

There was also a request to review the effectiveness and readership of "Living Here".

**Resolved**

***That the committee receives the 2006/07 Democratic Process portfolio communication strategy.***

Cr Burke/Cr McKay

This meeting adjourned between 3pm and 3.45pm to allow the Coastal Environment and Navigation Safety Portfolio Committee to meet.

## **MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

### **7. 2007/08 ANNUAL PLAN: REVIEW OF PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

A summary of the recommendations from the Portfolio Committees meetings held 15 to 23 August 2006 was tabled. Neil Pilbrow explained that these recommendations would go to the Council meeting of 30 August and then following consultation with key stakeholders would flow through the November round of Portfolio Committee meetings.

Referring to the recommendation from the Water Portfolio Committee regarding funding policies it was noted that no changes had been signaled and it was agreed to amend the wording of the recommendation.

#### **Resolved**

***That the words “any changes to” be deleted from the recommendation from the Water Portfolio Committee and the recommendation therefore to read  
“That the Portfolio Committee workshop funding policies on water matters”***

Cr McKay/Cr Waters

#### **Recommendation**

***That the Council approves the following matters for further consideration and consultation with key stakeholders:***

##### ***LAND AND BIODIVERSITY***

- 1. That the following opportunity for cost efficiencies as identified by the Finance and Audit Committee Review:  
“Explore alternative methods for monitoring compliance to reduce Environment Canterbury input, i.e self monitoring with selected monitoring”  
be discussed at the Combined Portfolios Committee and then at the Council meeting as this is a serious and important item and should be put forward as a separate issue.***
- 2. That the Portfolio Committee supports the use of existing information as the first step in developing proposed measures and targets for levels of service.***
- 3. The possible increases to fund the implementation of the Urban Development Strategy***
- 4. That the Portfolio Committee note the increase between 2006/07 and 2007/08 and have some concern with components of that increase in the Land Portfolio budget.***

##### ***WASTE, HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES AND CONTAMINATED SITES***

***The change to the wording of the measure and target for Levels of Service 3.***

#### **HAZARDS**

- 1. That the Portfolio Committee notes there are no significant changes proposed for the 2007/08 Annual Plan at this stage.**
- 2. That the capital funding for the Waimakariri secondary stopbank may need to be reviewed.**

#### **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT**

**That the Portfolio Committee notes there are no significant changes proposed for the 2007/08 Annual Plan.**

#### **REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT**

**That the Portfolio Committee notes there are no significant changes proposed for the 2007/08 Annual Plan.**

#### **PUBLIC PASSENGER TRANSPORT**

**That the Portfolio Committee notes there may be significant changes required to the 2007/08 Annual Plan, but that no further stakeholder consultation is required at this stage.**

#### **WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND ECOSYSTEMS**

- 1. That the Portfolio Committee recommends that any changes to the planned 2007/08 outputs be signalled as soon as possible to a special meeting of the Portfolio Committee, to enable it to recommend matters that should be canvassed with key stakeholders; and**
- 2. That detail about the A-list work priorities is discussed with the Council in an October 2006 workshop item.**
- 3. That the Portfolio Committee workshop funding policies on water matters.**

#### **PESTS AND BIOSECURITY**

- 1. That the Portfolio Committee notes there are no shifts in direction planned in the portfolio.**
- 2. That the Portfolio Committee notes the amended operating expand the figures.**

#### **AIR QUALITY**

- 1. Discuss air quality initiatives for Timaru, Kaiapoi, Rangiora and other towns in terms of education and marketing for 2007/08.**
- 2. Discuss a programme of offsets in relation to resource consents for discharge of PM<sub>10</sub> in to air.**

#### **ENERGY**

- 1. Giving effect to development of Communities for Climate Protection (or similar initiative).**
- 2. Giving effect to the Regional Energy Strategy, complete the community consultation process.**
- 3. Developing a 'strategic context for action' to connect key activity areas in projects to deliver on community expectations (from seminars).**

#### **COASTAL ENVIRONMENT**

**That the Portfolio Committee notes there are no significant changes proposed for the 2007/08 Annual Plan.**

**NAVIGATION SAFETY**

***That the Portfolio Committee notes there may be significant changes required to the 2007/08 Annual Plan, but that no specific stakeholder consultation is required at this stage.***

**DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES**

***That there are no significant changes proposed for the 2007/08 Annual Plan requiring consultation with key stakeholders.***

CR BURKE/CR NEILL

**Meeting Dates**

A memorandum dated 22 August 2006 with proposed meeting dates for November 2006 was tabled.

**Recommended**

- (a) ***That in order to accommodate a review by the Finance and Audit Committee of the LTCCP process the scheduled November Portfolio meetings be amended as follows:***

**Tuesday 14 November 2006**

***am Water Quality Quantity and Ecosystems***

***pm Hazards and Emergency Management***

***Pests and Biosecurity***

**Wednesday 15 November 2006**

***am Air Quality and Energy***

***pm Regional Land Transport and Public Passenger Transport***

**Tuesday 21 November 2006**

***am Land and Biodiversity, Waste, Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Sites***

***pm Coastal Environment and Navigation Safety***

***Democratic Process***

**Wednesday 22 November 2006**

***Finance and Audit Committee meeting with Portfolio Chairs***

**Thursday 23 November 2006**

***Combined Portfolios' Committee***

Cr Johnston/Cr Burke

**8. NOTICES OF MOTION**

Nil

**9. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS**

Nil

**10. QUESTIONS**

Nil

**11. NEXT MEETING**

November 2006

The meeting closed at 4.36pm.

CONFIRMED

DATE \_\_\_\_\_ CHAIRPERSON

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO: 5</b>	<b>SUBJECT MATTER: 2007/08 ANNUAL PLAN: REVIEW OF PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<b>REPORT:</b> Council	<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> 23 NOVEMBER 2006
<b>FILE REFERENCES:</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b> All Portfolios <b>PROJECT:</b> – <b>OUTPUT:</b> –
<b>REPORT BY:</b> Neil Pilbrow, Portfolio Manager, Finance and Corporate Services	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b> Wayne Thomas, Director Finance and Corporate Services

## PURPOSE

1. To consider portfolio committees' recommendations on priorities, tradeoffs or deferrals for the 2007/08 Annual Plan.
2. To receive feedback from the Finance and Audit Committee Review of Portfolios (verbal).
3. To consider provisional rates estimates for 2007/08 for the list of indicator properties.
4. To consider multi-portfolio RMA Regulatory activities.
5. To recommend to the Council on priorities, tradeoffs or deferrals for the 2007/08 Annual Plan.

## ATTACHMENTS

Appendix 1: RMA Compliance and Enforcement- Opportunities for Efficiencies.  
Appendix 2: Rates Examples.

Information to be tabled at the meeting:

- A consolidated list of recommendations from portfolio committees.

## BACKGROUND

In August the Committee considered Portfolio Committees' recommendations on changes to portfolio levels of service and levels of funding to go forward into the draft 2007/08 Annual Plan.

By the time the Committee meets, portfolio committees will have met and considered stakeholder feedback and any additional information obtained since the August meetings, and made their final recommendations on priorities, tradeoffs or deferrals for the 2007/08 Annual Plan, for this committee to consider.

A consolidated list of portfolio committees' recommendations will be tabled at the meeting.

## LTCCP LEVELS OF EXPENDITURE AND GENERAL RATES FOR 2006/07 AND 2007/08

The 2006-16 LTCCP provides for an increase in expenditure in 2007/08 of \$3,312,000 or 3.8% compared with 2006/07. The increase includes an allowance for inflation on goods and

services and for wage and salary movements. The general rates increase is \$2,318,000 or 7.2%.

Table 1 lists total expenditure and general rates funding for each portfolio for 2006/07 and 2007/08, the percentage increase and the relative contribution to the total percentage increase made by each.

**TABLE 1: LTCCP Levels of Expenditure and General Rates for 2006/07 and 2007/08**

Column A shows: LTCCP for 2006/07 (current year).  
 Column B shows: LTCCP for 2007/08 (Annual Plan year)  
 Column C shows: % change within each portfolio, 2006/07 to 2007/08.  
 Column D shows: Each portfolio's contribution to the overall % increase.

PORTFOLIO	A		B		C		D	
	Current year LTCCP 2006/07 \$000		Annual Plan year LTCCP 2007/08 \$000		% change 2006/07 to 2007/08 (B-A)		Portfolios' contribution to the overall % increase	
	Total Exp	Gen rates	Total Exp	Gen rates	Total Exp	Gen rates	Total Exp	Gen rates
Air quality	9,888	2,409	10,499	2,373	6%	-2%	0.6%	-0.1%
Coastal environment	1,635	1,352	1,852	1,555	13%	15%	0.2%	0.6%
Democratic process	7,179	6,341	7,290	6,448	2%	2%	0.1%	0.3%
Emergency management	1,341	19	1,417	20	6%	5%	0.1%	0.0%
Energy	346	242	355	248	3%	3%	0.0%	0.0%
Hazards	8,985	2,676	9,415	2,846	5%	6%	0.5%	0.5%
Land	7,866	3,932	8,665	4,518	10%	15%	0.8%	1.8%
Navigation safety	680	523	742	584	9%	12%	0.1%	0.2%
Pests and biosecurity	9,877	2,094	10,265	2,191	4%	5%	0.4%	0.3%
Public passenger transport	28,594	57	28,923	45	1%	-21%	0.3%	-0.0%
Regional land transport	1,645	693	1,082	669	-34%	-4%	-0.6%	-0.1%
Waste, hazardous substances and contaminated sites	1,722	1,474	1,869	1,592	9%	8%	0.2%	0.4%
Water quality, quantity and ecosystems	14,043	10,261	15,012	11,304	7%	10%	1.0%	3.2%
Total	93,800	32,073	97,386	34,393	3.8%	7.2%	3.8%	7.2%

Portfolios contributing most to the increases in total expenditure are:

- Water quality, quantity and ecosystems
- Land
- Air quality
- Hazards

Portfolios contributing most to the increase in general rates are:

- Water quality, quantity and ecosystems
- Land
- Coastal environment
- Hazards

## **PROVISIONAL RATES ESTIMATES FOR 2007/08**

Provisional rates estimates for 2007/08 for a set of indicator properties are attached. These tables show an estimate of the rates for 2007/08 as per the LTCCP. They have been prepared based on:

- Property values for 2006/07, updated for growth.
- Equalisation fractions used for 2006/07.

These estimates can be used as a guide only. Actual rating fractions for 2007/08 will be different as both the property values and the equalisation fractions will be updated. The budget will also be updated to include shifts in direction and reductions in spending to be recommended by Portfolio Committees.

Updated equalisation fractions will be available in December and will include revaluations for Kaikoura, Selwyn, Ashburton, Waitaki and Mackenzie Districts completed up to November 2006. The rates tables will be revised when detailed budgeting has been completed for February 2007, when the Council will adopt the budget as the basis for the draft 2007/08 Annual Plan.

## **FINANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE REVIEW OF PORTFOLIOS**

Portfolio Committee chairs are due to meet with the Finance and Audit Committee on 22 November, the day prior to the Committee meeting. The Chairman of the Finance and Audit Committee may wish to report orally on the Review.

The Finance and Audit Committee will report the findings of the review to the Council in December.

## **MULTI-PORTFOLIO RMA REGULATORY ACTIVITIES**

RMA regulatory activities are common to five portfolios (Air quality; Coastal environment, Land; Waste, hazardous substances and contaminated sites, and Water quality, quantity and ecosystems) and generally do not lend themselves to being dealt with on a portfolio by portfolio basis. To assist, RMA Regulatory matters relating to levels of service, levels of funding and the responses required to the Finance and Audit Committee Review of Portfolios are referred to this committee for consideration.

In the past the Regulation Overview Committee has considered such matters. That committee may be a more appropriate forum to use in the future, provided meeting dates could be adjusted to feed in budgeting. A recommendation along those lines is presented for consideration.

In the meantime, proposed changes to levels of service and the questions raised in the Finance and Audit Committee Review of Portfolios need to be addressed.

### **Levels of Service**

It is proposed to add new measures and targets to the existing levels of service in the Air quality; Coastal environment, Land; Waste, hazardous substances and contaminated sites, and Water quality, quantity and ecosystems portfolios.

Reason for change	New or Revised Description	New or Revised Measure	New or Revised Target
Level of Service 4 in following portfolios: – Air quality – Coastal environment – Land – Waste; hazardous substances and contaminated sites – Water quality and quantity  The LTCCP promised that additional measures and targets would be developed in the 2007/08 Annual Plan	No change	The percentage of resource consents monitored for compliance. <sup>1</sup>	30%
		The percentage of significant non-compliance with Resource Management Act 1991 authorisations. <sup>2</sup>	<5%
		The percentage of environmental incidents resolved (no further action is required).	95%
		The percentage of resource consents consistent with Resource Management Act 1991 requirements, including proposed and operative regional plan requirements.	100%

### Levels of Funding

No changes are proposed to RMA Regulatory levels of funding in LTCCP for 2007/08, although there may be small adjustments between portfolios.

### Council resolutions

The following resolutions were adopted by the Council on 30 August 2006 that relate to RMA Regulatory matters. The Land portfolio resolution relates to the way work is undertaken. The resolution from the Water quality, quantity and ecosystems portfolio relates to funding.

#### *LAND AND BIODIVERSITY*

- That the following opportunity for cost efficiencies as identified by the Finance and Audit Committee Review: “Explore alternative methods for monitoring compliance to reduce Environment Canterbury input, i.e. self monitoring with selected monitoring” be discussed at the Combined Portfolios Committee and then at the Council meeting as this is a serious and important item and should be put forward as a separate issue.*

#### *WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND ECOSYSTEMS*

- That the Portfolio Committee workshop funding policies on water matters.*

### Finance and Audit Committee Review of Portfolios- RMA Regulatory matters

Two questions in the review with relevance to RMA Regulatory matters relate to the “opportunities for cost effectiveness and cost efficiency of service delivery” identified in their review of the draft LTCCP undertaken earlier this year. A condensed list of RMA Regulatory opportunities was considered by Portfolio Committees in August. The original list of is shown

<sup>1</sup> This is an operational issue and needs to be developed from risk assessment methodology. 30% is across all portfolios as an average. This can be broken down into portfolios (obviously each portfolio will have quite different percentages (a lot lower or higher). This work is continuing.

<sup>2</sup> <5% is across all portfolios as an average. This can be broken down into portfolios (obviously each portfolio will have quite different percentages (a lot lower or higher) This work is continuing.

in full Appendix 1, with an update of the current status of the points raised. Some issues have already been addressed in this years work programmes and others have been discussed in part by the Regulation Overview Committee.

It is proposed that the Committee reviews the list in light of the review questions and actions already taken, to ensure that no opportunities have been overlooked. The review questions to be addressed are:

**Q6: What opportunities exist for cost efficiencies in service delivery?**

**Response**

For the committee to determine.

**Q7: Are there possible alternative methods of service delivery?**

**Response**

For the committee to determine.

**WHERE TO FROM HERE?**

It is proposed that the committee reviews the recommendations from individual portfolio committees on changes to portfolios' levels of service and levels of funding in the LTCCP, taking into account priorities between portfolios, and compiles a consolidated recommendation to the Council in December on the shifts in direction for the draft 2007/08 Annual Plan .

Following this, staff will undertake the detailed budgeting work required and bring back a proposed draft budget in February to be adopted as the basis for the Draft 2007/08 Annual Plan.

Councillors are reminded that this November round of Portfolio Committee meetings is the second of three opportunities to introduce further changes. **The last opportunity is at the December Council meeting.**

**RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL**

1. *That in future the Regulation Overview Committee considers RMA Regulatory activity levels of service, and levels of expenditure and funding for input into annual plans and the LTCCP.*
2. *That the following recommendations from Portfolio Committees be endorsed for adoption by the Council . .....*

## APPENDIX 1: RMA Compliance and Enforcement Opportunities for Efficiencies

The following paper was prepared for the Finance and Audit Committee Review of the draft 2006-16 LTCCP.

The right hand column of the table contains an update of actions taken to date or intended course of action to be implemented.

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO:</b>	<b>SUBJECT MATTER: REVIEW OF EXPENDITURE AND LEVELS OF SERVICE</b>
<b>REPORT:</b>	<b>DATE OF MEETINGS:</b> March/April 2006
<b>FILE REFERENCES:</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b> Democratic Process/All RMA portfolios, Regulation Group, Compliance and Enforcement Section <b>PROJECT:</b> <b>OUTPUT:</b>
<b>REPORT BY:</b> Evan Walker RMA Compliance and Enforcement Manager	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b> Mike Freeman Director Regulation

### PURPOSE

To outline, for the RMA Compliance and Enforcement Section, areas where cost savings, efficiency gains, or increased cost effectiveness could be achieved in the 2006/2007 financial year – albeit with potentially significant implications for the relevant levels of service, statutory responsibilities, public acceptability, etc.. The issues, possible changes and impacts on level of service are tabulated.

### BACKGROUND/ASSUMPTIONS

- For 2006/2007 the section is funded 51% user pays; 49% ratepayer projects.
- It is assumed the primary focus on savings is on ratepayer projects.
- The increase in staff numbers in this section proposed to date is entirely aimed at providing the service considered to be needed to fulfil Council obligations. These obligations include additional work under national initiatives, (e.g. NES, changes to the Building Act, marine farm permits as deemed consents etc) and under the Council's own Plans, strategies and commitments (examples: Air Plan, social marketing campaign over Christchurch domestic solid fuel burners, Coastal Plan implementation, subdivision stormwater management post Aidanfield, industrial stormwater quality post Heathcote oil spill, water metering post Lynton).

Issue	Changes	Impacts on Service	UPDATE NOVEMBER 06
<b>Generic Cost Savings</b>			
General rate expenditure on enforcement projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce funding of generic projects from present programme by arbitrary cuts eg additional legal costs \$100K.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce ability to respond to incidents.</li> <li>Decisions on formal enforcement action made on financial rather than legal/ environmental grounds.</li> <li>Reduce external legal advice with consequent risks.</li> <li>Not fulfil commitments to the community on Hotline response capability.</li> <li>Risk of over-expenditure on essential enforcement activities and having no general reserve to fund.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demand for hotline response continues unabated.</li> <li>Increasing expectation of formal enforcement action over illegal irrigation takes, and dairy shed waste disposal.</li> <li>One FTE removed from the waste and hazardous substances portfolio for 07/08 This was budgeted for enforcement of HASNO; no decision made on this yet.</li> </ul>
Resource Consents database administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present expenditure circa \$200k; reduce by removing one proposed additional staff member, reduction approximately \$80k.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present progress with updating and QAing resource consents database halted.</li> <li>Reduced reliability of database to answer external and internal enquiries.</li> <li>Reduction in ability of consents database to serve as essential reliable central information point for resource management e.g., air and water information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demand for information from the consent database continues to grow, both from external and internal customers.</li> <li>Improvements and quality assurance of the database is essential to achieve efficiencies of monitoring across all portfolios. One new database position has been transferred from Regulation to IT reducing direct costs but adding to overheads.</li> </ul>
Consents Advisory General Rate Funded Project (RMACE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce activity in this area by limiting discussions with consent holders, and referring enquiries back to other sections (e.g. Customer Services, current budget approx. \$226K).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enquiries passed around the organisation.</li> <li>Reduced quality of customer service and consequential reaction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incoming requests continue, especially relating to information from the database. This project is under review, but no change for 07/08.</li> </ul>
Permitted Activity monitoring general rate funded projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit activity to responding to incoming and unavoidable issues, for example on-site waste disposal, Certificates of Compliance applications, enquiries. Potential savings \$50K.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced monitoring of permitted activities and therefore not effectively implementing operative Plan rules.</li> <li>Cease recording of permitted activities on database.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full list of PA's requiring monitored has been reported to ROC; still to develop programmes for monitoring of new rules.</li> <li>Ongoing requirement for monitoring of permitted activity dairy and piggery waste etc.</li> <li>No change for 07/08.</li> </ul>

Issue	Changes	Impacts on Service	UPDATE NOVEMBER 06
Increased managerial and/or administration support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminate additional management staff (\$130K)</li> <li>No additional administration staff. Savings \$100k (estimated 30% cost recovered).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present restructure to provide additional management support not proceeded with.</li> <li>Overworked management staff, and reduced overall service as a result.</li> <li>Lose momentum on improvements in administration, business planning, and reporting</li> <li>Increased problems with staff retention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RMACE Section organisation examined closely and it is essential that additional management resources are proceeded with to achieve efficient programmes.</li> </ul>
<b>Generic Cost Effectiveness Improvements</b>			
Compliance Monitoring Funding Policy and Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change to funding policy away from the predominantly time-based actual and reasonable basis to, for example, standard annual charges, and/or volume based charging (perhaps via rates).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieve significant reduction in costs of recovering monies; eliminate one administrative position.</li> <li>Reduce risks of challenge to present system which can be considered to not allocate charging on a reasonable basis.</li> <li>Improve consent holder and stakeholder perception of fairness of charging.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further review required of alternative funding mechanisms, but awaiting national initiatives on charges, especially for water.</li> <li>Monitoring Accounts Administration position transferred from Regulation to Finance, thereby reducing direct costs but adding to overheads.</li> </ul>
Improve efficiency of compliance monitoring programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For several categories of consents, monitoring programmes already target consents which are rated high environmental risk. This could be expanded to other consents. Explore this ranking being done by IOs</li> <li>Introduce statistically valid sampling of consents compliance, rather than aiming at full coverage of all consents in any one consent category</li> <li>Encourage self reporting of compliance, provided audit capability maintained, alternatively encourage more third party independent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Energies and resources are focused on consents which have the greatest environmental impact.</li> <li>Sampling would reduce coverage of consents, so need to ensure monitoring programmes . are still targeted to achieve a high level of compliance by all consent holders..</li> <li>Greater acceptance of compliance monitoring activities among consent holders.</li> <li>Additional resourcing would be needed to initiate significant uptake.</li> <li>Reduce dependence on office based reporting, immediate hand over of reports, and lowered costs to CHs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fields added to resource consent database to allow ranking of environmental risk, further work needed to make this operational.</li> <li>Additional opportunities for self-monitoring explored. NOTE: Advocates for self-monitoring often mean self-regulation (i.e. no monitoring)</li> <li>Monitoring team administrator roles have been developed to provide lower cost followup of self-monitoring returns of information .</li> <li>Most consents have self-monitoring/reporting requirements already. Large corporate or TLA consent holders comply with these , although auditing is still required. Rural consents self-monitoring is very poorly complied with.</li> <li>Trial of group self-monitoring being conducted for the SCFIS (Opihi) consent holders who have employed a consultant to download their water use information from data loggers, analyse and report it to us.</li> </ul>

Issue	Changes	Impacts on Service	UPDATE NOVEMBER 06
	monitoring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve field IT capability to complete reports in the field and hand them to consent holders. In some cases revert to checklists</li> </ul>		
<b>Portfolios</b>			
AIR QUALITY			
Increased enforcement activity in air quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional enforcement staff in Christchurch or Timaru focused on air complaints (1 FTE 0.5 Christchurch, 0.5 Timaru). Savings circa \$100k.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate resources to respond to increased complaints about smoky chimneys in Christchurch, following social marketing campaign, and awareness of Air Plan rules.</li> <li>Inadequate resources to address issues arising out of complaints regarding legality of woodburners being sold or installed.</li> <li>No capability to deal with increased air quality complaints in <b>Timaru</b>, anticipated to arise from increased awareness.</li> <li>Air quality issues include odour; notable reduced tolerance of community to odours increasing complaints and need to respond.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hotline complaints related to air continue at the same high level, and the expectation remains that these reports will increase</li> <li>No change proposed for 07/08.</li> </ul>
Compliance monitoring of air discharges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No increase in compliance monitoring capability for monitoring of air discharges, savings 0.5 FTE. (\$50K) Mostly cost recovered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inability to respond to increasing complaints on air quality issues both odour and other consented discharges.</li> <li>Inability to provide supporting information on fuel use and emission inventories required to support environmental monitoring.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project being carried out to ensure all major discharges are aware of stack testing requirements, which is one form of self-monitoring.</li> <li>Still require supporting information on fuel use and emission to support EMQ survey work.</li> <li>No change for 07/08.</li> </ul>
COASTAL ENVIRONMENT			
Coastal compliance monitoring and enforcement activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No increase in staff for monitoring of increasing numbers of coastal consents, and no enforcement of unauthorised coastal activities. (0.5 FTE CMO, 0.25 FTE Enf - \$50K in cost recovered; \$25K Enf</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inability to fulfil compliance monitoring programmes on coastal outfalls and marine farms.</li> <li>Inadequate implementation of the new Regional Coastal Environmental Plan.</li> <li>Inability to respond to inevitably increasing complaints about coastal structures (especially in the Estuary).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased requirement for monitoring of ocean outfalls, and construction phase of the CCC ocean outfall.</li> <li>No change for 07/08</li> <li>Can reconsider any increases for future years if variation of the coastal plan regarding structures is proceeded with.</li> </ul>

Issue	Changes	Impacts on Service	UPDATE NOVEMBER 06
<b>LAND</b>			
Land Compliance monitoring capability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 new CMO not employed (\$100K cost recovered)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No follow up on installation of new on-site disposal consents</li> <li>Limit capability to monitor subdivisional stormwater consents and practices. Not consistent with Aidanfield agreement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projected increasing need for follow up on subdivisional stormwater practices has been supported by continued problems with new subdivisions.</li> <li>No change for 07/08.</li> </ul>
<b>WATER QUANTITY, QUALITY AND ECOSYSTEMS</b>			
Compliance Monitoring capability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No increase in monitoring (2 CMOs \$200K)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No capability to increase work on industrial stormwater quality, as committed to as a follow up to the Heathcote Oil spill. Joint initiatives with the CCC stalled.</li> <li>Limit ability to progress roll out of water metering throughout the region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considered essential to increase efforts on industrial stormwater quality</li> <li>Developing relationship with CCC on this issue needs to be continued.</li> <li>Essential to roll out water metering and compliance with water use recording throughout the region.</li> <li>No change for 07/08.</li> </ul>

APPENDIX 2: RATES EXAMPLES							
TABLE 1: PROPERTY EXAMPLES							
Please Note the following :		CV = Capital Value					
		LV = Land Value					
		Area is in hectares					
		Pest - M & I = Monitoring & Inspections					
		<b>Valuations for some districts are being revised and the final values will differ from these examples</b>					
		<b>Equalisation fractions will be updated in December 2006</b>					
DISTRICT	VALUES USED IN			2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	
	2006-2007	2007-2008		\$	\$	\$	Narative
<b>KAIKOURA</b>		<b>Sep-03</b>	<b>Sep-03</b>				
(Rural)	CV	900,000.00	900,000.00	(General)	600.20	559.74	40.46 (more)
	LV	525,000.00	525,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00 (less)
	Area	156.6460	156.6460	(Civil Defence)	22.22	20.94	1.28 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	55.54	55.54	0.00 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	2.48	-2.48 (less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	12.65	12.34	0.31 (more)
				(Pests - M & I )	165.59	142.93	22.66 (more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	44.24	56.36	-12.12 (less)
					900.44	850.33	50.10
(Urban)	CV	210,000.00	210,000.00	(General)	140.05	130.61	9.44 (more)
	LV	125,000.00	125,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00 (less)
				(Civil Defence)	5.18	4.88	0.30 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	12.96	12.96	0.00 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.58	-0.58 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.47	0.46	0.01 (more)
				(Kaikoura River - Class U3)	29.63	29.63	0.00 (less)
					188.29	179.12	9.17
<b>HURUNUI</b>		<b>Sep-04</b>	<b>Sep-04</b>				
(Rural)	CV	810,000.00	810,000.00	(General)	395.60	368.94	26.66 (more)
	LV	750,000.00	750,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00 (less)
	Area	161.3560	161.3560	(Civil Defence)	14.64	13.80	0.84 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	4.90	4.63	0.27 (more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	1.63	-1.63 (less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	12.63	12.33	0.31 (more)
				(Pests - Amuri M & I )	79.68	69.53	10.15 (more)
				(Pests - Nassella Inspections )	57.53	56.14	1.39 (more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	44.18	56.28	-12.10 (less)
					609.17	583.28	25.89

DISTRICT		VALUES USED IN			2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	Narrative
		2006-2007	2007-2008		\$	\$	\$	
(Urban)	CV	180,000.00	180,000.00	(General)	87.91	81.99	5.93	(more)
	LV	60,000.00	60,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Area	0.1022	0.1022	(Civil Defence)	3.25	3.07	0.19	(more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	1.09	1.03	0.06	(more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.35	-0.35	(less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.16	0.15	0.00	(more)
					92.41	86.59	5.82	
<b>WAIMAKARIRI</b>		<b>Sep-05</b>	<b>Sep-05</b>					
(Rural)	CV	800,000.00	800,000.00	(General)	320.23	298.64	21.58	(more)
	LV	750,000.00	750,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Area	45.8926	45.8926	(Civil Defence)	11.85	11.17	0.68	(more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	11.47	11.47	0.00	(less)
				(Passenger Services)	4.89	0.00	4.89	(more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	1.32	-1.32	(less)
				(Regional Park)	11.20	12.46	-1.26	(less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	9.87	9.63	0.24	(more)
				(Pests - Ashley M & I )	34.32	30.15	4.17	(more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	34.52	43.98	-9.46	(less)
					438.35	418.82	19.53	
(Urban)	CV	245,000.00	245,000.00	(General)	98.07	91.46	6.61	(more)
	LV	110,000.00	110,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
				(Civil Defence)	3.63	3.42	0.21	(more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	3.51	3.51	0.00	(less)
				(Passenger Services)	15.83	20.00	-4.17	(less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.41	-0.41	(less)
				(Regional Park)	3.43	3.82	-0.39	(less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.22	0.22	0.00	(more)
				(Ashley River - Class F)	15.41	15.41	0.00	(less)
					140.11	138.24	1.86	

DISTRICT	VALUES USED IN		2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	Narrative	
	2006-2007	2007-2008					\$
<b>CHRISTCHURCH</b>		<b>Aug-04</b>	<b>Aug-04</b>				
City	CV	288,000.00	288,000.00	(General)	133.57	124.56	9.00 (more)
(Urban) Residential	LV	138,000.00	138,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	4.94	4.66	0.29 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	1.90	1.88	0.02 (more)
				(Clean Heat Incentive)	35.80	34.85	0.95 (more)
				(Passenger Services)	95.00	92.22	2.78 (more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.55	-0.55 (less)
				(Regional Park)	4.67	5.20	-0.52 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.34	0.33	0.01 (more)
				(Waimak-Eyre - Class D)	7.82	7.82	0.00 (less)
					284.05	272.07	11.98
<b>Belfast</b>							
(Urban) Residential	CV	229,000.00	229,000.00	(General)	106.20	99.05	7.16 (more)
	LV	34,800.00	34,800.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	3.93	3.70	0.23 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	1.51	1.50	0.02 (more)
				(Clean Heat Incentive)	28.47	27.71	0.76 (more)
				(Passenger Services)	20.87	20.26	0.61 (more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.44	-0.44 (less)
				(Regional Park)	3.72	4.13	-0.42 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.09	0.08	0.00 (more)
				(Waimak-Eyre - Class D)	6.22	6.22	0.00 (less)
					171.00	163.08	7.92
<b>Wairewa</b>		<b>Aug-04</b>	<b>Aug-04</b>				
(Rural)	CV	1,035,000.00	1,035,000.00	(General)	480.00	447.65	32.35 (more)
	LV	960,000.00	960,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Area	439.1852	439.1852	(Civil Defence)	17.77	16.74	1.02 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	6.84	6.77	0.07 (more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	1.98	-1.98 (less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	15.10	14.73	0.37 (more)
				(Pests - Low Plains)	173.06	91.55	81.52 (more)
				(Pests - BP M & I )	165.15	143.65	21.51 (more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	25.14	26.73	-1.59 (less)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb Control)	291.59	183.70	107.89 (more)
					1,174.65	933.50	241.15

DISTRICT	VALUES USED IN		2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	Narrative	
	2006-2007	2007-2008					\$
<b>Lyttelton</b>							
(Urban)	CV	255,000.00	255,000.00	(General)	118.26	110.29	7.97 (more)
	LV	109,000.00	109,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	4.38	4.13	0.25 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	1.69	1.67	0.02 (more)
				(Passenger Services)	78.22	71.88	6.34 (more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.49	-0.49 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.27	0.26	0.01 (more)
					202.81	188.71	14.10
<b>Akaroa</b>							
(Urban)	CV	355,000.00	355,000.00	(General)	164.64	153.54	11.10 (more)
	LV	105,000.00	105,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	6.09	5.74	0.35 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	2.35	2.32	0.02 (more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.68	-0.68 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.26	0.25	0.01 (more)
					173.34	162.54	10.80
<b>ASHBURTON</b>		<b>Jul-03</b>	<b>Jul-03</b>				
(Rural)	CV	1,680,000.00	1,680,000.00	(General)	1,028.24	958.93	69.31 (more)
	LV	1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Area	119.3820	119.3820	(Civil Defence)	38.06	35.87	2.20 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	54.54	54.72	-0.18 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	4.25	-4.25 (less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	26.10	25.47	0.63 (more)
				(Ashburton Rivers Class - AL)	1,281.10	1,281.10	0.00 (less)
				(Ashburton Stopbank Class - B)	146.47	146.47	0.00 (less)
				(Pests - M & I)	74.48	66.68	7.80 (more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	43.46	46.22	-2.76 (less)
					2,692.46	2,619.70	72.75
<b>(Urban)</b>							
	CV	121,000.00	121,000.00	(General)	74.06	69.07	4.99 (more)
	LV	48,000.00	48,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	2.74	2.58	0.16 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	3.93	3.94	-0.01 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.31	-0.31 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.15	0.15	0.00 (more)
				(Ashburton Rivers Class - U1)	8.77	8.77	0.00 (less)
				(Ashburton Stopbank Class - A)	21.10	21.10	0.00 (less)
				(Passenger Services)	4.86	4.88	-0.02 (less)
					115.60	110.78	4.81

DISTRICT	VALUES USED IN				2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	Narrative
	2006-2007	2007-2008			\$	\$	\$	
<b>SELWYN</b>		<b>Jul-03</b>	<b>Jul-03</b>					
(Rural)	CV	2,100,000.00	2,100,000.00	(General)	1,296.64	1,209.24	87.40	(more)
	LV	1,600,000.00	1,600,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Area	191.9720	191.9720	(Civil Defence)	48.00	45.23	2.77	(more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	37.60	37.86	-0.27	(less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	5.31	-5.31	(less)
				(Regional Park)	45.36	50.45	-5.09	(less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	32.12	31.35	0.78	(more)
				(Pests - M & I )	108.33	99.13	9.20	(more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	56.71	60.31	-3.60	(less)
					<b>1,624.76</b>	<b>1,538.87</b>	<b>85.88</b>	
Lincoln								
(Urban)	CV	210,000.00	210,000.00	(General)	129.66	120.92	8.74	(more)
	LV	95,000.00	95,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
				(Civil Defence)	4.80	4.52	0.28	(more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	3.76	3.79	-0.03	(less)
				(Passenger Services)	64.01	70.53	-6.51	(less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.53	-0.53	(less)
				(Regional Park)	4.54	5.05	-0.51	(less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.30	0.29	0.01	(more)
				(Waimak-Eyre - Class F)	1.58	1.58	0.00	(less)
					<b>208.65</b>	<b>207.21</b>	<b>1.45</b>	
Leeston								
(Urban)	CV	133,000.00	133,000.00	(General)	82.12	76.59	5.54	(more)
	LV	55,000.00	55,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
				(Civil Defence)	3.04	2.86	0.18	(more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	2.38	2.40	-0.02	(less)
				(Passenger Services)	40.54	44.67	-4.12	(less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.34	-0.34	(less)
				(Regional Park)	2.87	3.20	-0.32	(less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.17	0.17	0.00	(more)
					<b>131.13</b>	<b>130.21</b>	<b>0.92</b>	

DISTRICT	VALUES USED IN		2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	Narrative	
	2006-2007	2007-2008					\$
<b>TIMARU</b>		<b>Sep-05</b>	<b>Sep-05</b>				
(Rural)	CV	900,000.00	900,000.00	(General)	361.17	336.82	24.34 (more)
	LV	660,000.00	660,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Area	65.3993	65.3993	(Civil Defence)	13.37	12.60	0.77 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	21.86	22.23	-0.37 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	1.49	-1.49 (less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	7.31	7.13	0.18 (more)
				(Pests - SC M & I )	29.82	26.12	3.70 (more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	49.26	43.92	5.34 (more)
					482.78	450.32	32.46
Timaru City							
(Urban)	CV	190,000.00	190,000.00	(General)	76.25	71.11	5.14 (more)
	LV	55,000.00	55,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	2.82	2.66	0.16 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	4.61	4.69	-0.08 (less)
				(Passenger Services)	29.09	34.02	-4.94 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.32	-0.32 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.10	0.09	0.00 (more)
					112.87	112.89	-0.02
Temuka							
(Urban)	CV	170,000.00	170,000.00	(General)	68.22	63.62	4.60 (more)
	LV	80,000.00	80,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	2.53	2.38	0.15 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	4.13	4.20	-0.07 (less)
				(Passenger Services)	5.58	6.85	-1.27 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.28	-0.28 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.14	0.14	0.00 (more)
				(River - Orari-Waihi-Temuka D)	39.91	39.91	0.00 (less)
					120.51	117.38	3.13
Geraldine							
(Urban)	CV	220,000.00	220,000.00	(General)	88.29	82.33	5.95 (more)
	LV	50,000.00	50,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	3.27	3.08	0.19 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	5.34	5.43	-0.09 (less)
				(Passenger Services)	4.33	5.28	-0.95 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.36	-0.36 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.09	0.08	0.00 (more)
				(River - Orari-Waihi-Temuka E)	22.14	22.14	0.00 (less)
					123.45	118.72	4.73

DISTRICT	VALUES USED IN		2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	Narrative	
	2006-2007	2007-2008					\$
Pleasant Point							
(Urban)	CV	210,000.00	210,000.00	(General)	84.27	78.59	5.68 (more)
	LV	48,000.00	48,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	3.12	2.94	0.18 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	5.10	5.19	-0.09 (less)
				(Passenger Services)	1.59	1.95	-0.36 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.35	-0.35 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.08	0.08	0.00 (more)
				(River - Opihi U2)	112.74	112.74	0.00 (less)
					206.90	201.84	5.07
<b>MACKENZIE</b>		<b>Aug-03</b>	<b>Aug-03</b>				
(Rural)	CV	1,900,000.00	1,900,000.00	(General)	1,075.69	1,003.18	72.51 (more)
	LV	1,325,000.00	1,325,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Area	1,484.9700	1,484.9700	(Civil Defence)	39.82	37.52	2.30 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	58.12	58.12	0.00 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	4.44	-4.44 (less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	31.42	30.66	0.76 (more)
				(Pests - Mac M & I )	281.25	240.92	40.33 (more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	211.81	188.87	22.94 (more)
					1,698.12	1,563.72	134.39
(Rural)	CV	1,050,000.00	1,050,000.00	(General)	594.46	554.39	40.07 (more)
	LV	700,000.00	700,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Area	441.4109	441.4109	(Civil Defence)	22.00	20.74	1.27 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	32.12	32.12	0.00 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	2.46	-2.46 (less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	16.60	16.20	0.40 (more)
				(Pests - SC M & I )	67.73	59.33	8.40 (more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	111.90	99.78	12.12 (more)
					844.82	785.01	59.81
Fairlie							
(Urban)	CV	70,000.00	70,000.00	(General)	39.63	36.96	2.67 (more)
	LV	9,000.00	9,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	1.47	1.38	0.08 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	2.14	2.14	0.00 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.16	-0.16 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.03	0.03	0.00 (more)
				(River - Opihi Class U3)	26.62	26.62	0.00 (less)
					69.89	67.30	2.59

DISTRICT	VALUES USED IN		2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	Narrative	
	2006-2007	2007-2008					\$
Tekapo							
(Urban)	CV	225,000.00	225,000.00	(General)	127.38	118.80	8.59 (more)
	LV	107,000.00	107,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	4.72	4.44	0.27 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	6.88	6.88	0.00 (less)
				(Passenger Services)	4.51	5.54	-1.03 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.53	-0.53 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.40	0.39	0.01 (more)
					143.89	136.58	7.32
Twizel							
(Urban)	CV	110,000.00	110,000.00	(General)	62.28	58.08	4.20 (more)
	LV	40,000.00	40,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	2.31	2.17	0.13 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	3.36	3.36	0.00 (less)
				(Passenger Services)	5.28	6.48	-1.20 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.26	-0.26 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.15	0.15	0.00 (more)
					73.37	70.49	2.88
<b>WAIMATE</b>		<b>Jul-04</b>	<b>Jul-04</b>				
(Rural)	CV	1,770,000.00	1,770,000.00	(General)	831.72	775.65	56.06 (more)
	LV	1,570,000.00	1,570,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Area	274.8340	274.8340	(Civil Defence)	30.79	29.01	1.78 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	48.89	47.91	0.99 (more)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	3.44	-3.44 (less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	25.06	24.46	0.61 (more)
				(Pests - SC M & I )	102.26	89.57	12.68 (more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	168.94	150.64	18.30 (more)
					1,207.66	1,120.68	86.98
(Urban)	CV	119,000.00	119,000.00	(General)	55.92	52.15	3.77 (more)
	LV	30,000.00	30,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00
				(Civil Defence)	2.07	1.95	0.12 (more)
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	3.29	3.22	0.07 (more)
				(Passenger Services)	5.79	5.81	-0.02 (less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.23	-0.23 (less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.07	0.07	0.00 (more)
					67.14	63.44	3.70

DISTRICT	VALUES USED IN				2007-2008	2006-2007	Movement	Narrative
	2006-2007	2007-2008			\$	\$	\$	
<b>WAITAKI</b>		<b>Sep-03</b>	<b>Sep-03</b>					
(Rural)	CV	900,000.00	900,000.00	(General)	426.24	397.51	28.73	(more)
	LV	840,000.00	840,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Area	557.1600	557.1600	(Catchment - Works & Services)	12.70	12.70	0.00	(less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	1.76	-1.76	(less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	15.25	14.88	0.37	(more)
				(Pests - Omarama M & I )	111.12	94.65	16.47	(more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	102.78	91.64	11.13	(more)
					668.08	613.13	54.94	
(Rural)	CV	3,500,000.00	3,500,000.00	(General)	1,657.58	1,545.86	111.73	(more)
	LV	2,700,000.00	2,700,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Area	7,289.6000	7,289.6000	(Catchment - Works & Services)	49.39	49.39	0.00	(less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	6.85	-6.85	(less)
				(Biosecurity Rural)	49.01	47.82	1.19	(more)
				(Pests - Omarama M & I )	357.17	304.22	52.95	(more)
				(Pests - Bovine Tb)	330.35	294.57	35.78	(more)
					2,443.50	2,248.70	194.80	
<b>Kurow</b>								
(Urban)	CV	90,000.00	90,000.00	(General)	42.62	39.75	2.87	(more)
	LV	19,000.00	19,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	1.27	1.27	0.00	(less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.18	-0.18	(less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.05	0.05	0.00	(more)
					43.95	41.25	2.70	
<b>Dunroon</b>								
(Urban)	CV	55,000.00	55,000.00	(General)	26.05	24.29	1.76	(more)
	LV	12,000.00	12,000.00	(UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	
				(Catchment - Works & Services)	0.78	0.78	0.00	(less)
				(Canty Strategic Water Study)	0.00	0.11	-0.11	(less)
				(Biosecurity Urban)	0.03	0.03	0.00	(more)
				(River - L Waitaki B)	18.27	18.27	0.00	(less)
					45.12	43.48	1.65	