

Minutes: Public Forum – Hikurangi Swamp Scheme

Minutes of meeting held at Jordan Valley Farm on Wednesday 30 March 2011 at 11.00 am.

- Facilitator** Simon Weston
- Purpose** Open forum between the Whangarei District Council and Hikurangi ratepayers to discuss the Hikurangi Swamp Scheme
- Present** Simon Weston (facilitator), Andrew Carvell, Conal Summers, Bernadette Chastain (scribe), Mark Simpson, Cr Phil Halse, Cr Greg Martin, Mrs Martin and members of the public as follows:
 Gavin Donnelly, Eric Edwards, Peter Geddes, Martyn Smith, Mike Collins, Bruce Howse, Stephen Arthur, Roger Milina, Murray Cutforth, Bruce Cutforth, Richard Bleakley, Barry Thorn, Simon Donelley, Edwin Smith, Ben Smith, Pedro McHardy, Ray Hindrup, Neville Thorn, Luke Beehre, Noel Rockell, Louise Rockell, Pia Rockell, Philip Rockell, Greg Palmer, Cara Lindsay, Evan Smeath, Jack Ilich, Katarina Ilich, Ken Finlayson, Brian Hoult, Merv Rusk, Judy Imeson, Todd Imeson, Mike Barrington & Mike Cunningham
- Apologies** Evan Dugmore

Simon Weston opened meeting welcoming members with introduction of staff and representatives from Whangarei District Council, Greg Palmer from TransPacific Industries, Bruce Howse from Northland Regional Council, Peter Geddes from Hawthorne Geddes and Greg Palmer from TPI.

Simon advised all attending that the meeting would be recorded as well as minuted.

Item	Description/Action	Who
Simon Weston		
	Minutes of 29 November 2011 moved as a true and accurate record by Bruce Cutforth and seconded by Merv Rusk. Carried	
Matters Arising	Simon Weston advised meeting of Agenda items for discussion as per below:	
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resource consent requirements ▪ Spillway adjustments ▪ Level Monitoring ▪ Management Plans ▪ Scheme finances ▪ Current situation ▪ Rating scenarios with and without pump upgrades ▪ Operations feedback ▪ January Storms ▪ Farmers access to pump stations ▪ Queries on the Scheme- summary ▪ Any other business 	

<p>Resource Consent Requirements</p> <p>Simon</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Resource requirements relevant to the current proposed works are the spillway adjustments, to level and length and thence as per RC as issued by NRC. • Monitoring of spill events to provide data for ongoing adjustment and work on the scheme. Required to monitor at least the next 5 events and to then look at the impact of those events and make sure that the model we are using and the height and width of spillways are correct and to make sure that the model sits comfortably with what is happening in practice. • In terms of the spillway stop bank adjustments Mackenzie Contracting have been on site for most part of the summer (since Christmas time) Ngararatunua has about 3 weeks left weather permitting. Large volume of earthworks in order to get spillways into reasonable order. Original design required quite a footprint for those spillways and those of you that are aware of the Ngararatunua works has narrowed up the footprint and am sure you are aware of this and the dialogue in that regard. • Junction Work complete and remainder of spillway works to be completed within 4 week period. Weather permitting from about now so by end of April we are hoping that all spillway works will be completed this season. • Stopbank improvements will be undertaken next construction season.
<p>Simon Weston</p>	<p>Are there any questions?</p>
<p>Marcus Smith</p>	<p>When are the monitors going in?</p>
<p>Simon Weston</p>	<p>Covered in upcoming slide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop banks will be done next season and they are a result of the additional works this year on the spillways themselves. We have a choice either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to existing contract. 2. go out and re tender stopbank works as separate package . <p>When we tendered spillway works Mackenzie Contracting were 24% cheaper so we could go with existing. Its debatable whether we would get better prices.</p> <p>Peter Geddes stated that per metre rate for stopbanks lower due to decreased accuracy required</p>
<p>Barry Thorn</p>	<p>What model are you using for all of these spills when you have this in place? In my experience most events are different. Different rainfalls in different areas. Will we be continuing altering spillways this after 5 year period? What's the model?</p>
<p>Simon</p>	<p>Percentage allocation as per original scheme. The model has taken into account different events we have had and over the next five we will take info to ensure Scheme has divided the right sort of sharing originally envisaged. Could be okay or need further adjustments. Wont know until we have gone through those further events and any event is different so won't know until we do model.</p>
<p>Barry</p>	<p>Every pocket is a different size?</p>
<p>Simon</p>	<p>It's on a percentage basis. Do you want to comment on that?</p>
<p>Mark</p>	<p>When the original scheme was set up, think it was in volume 3 of those documents it said percentage should be taken by each pocket. I forget the percentage over time but Merv you would remember wouldnt you?</p>
<p>Merv Rusk</p>	<p>1966 value of floods were mapped and a percentage of water in each area was worked out Junction 5%, Te Mata was 20% Otonga was 23%, Tanekaha 3%, Mountain 14% Ngararatunua 10% Okarika 27% reduced 25%. These were set out in design document.</p>
<p>Mark</p>	<p>Terms of the RC are bringing back modelling to those figures that were identified. I think it was in volume 3 but can't remember. The percentage of flooding before and after the scheme was put in was identical.</p>
<p>Pedro</p>	<p>How did you come to those figures?</p>
<p>Mark</p>	<p>This is all the work of modelling and reviewing of storms over last few years.</p>

Mark	I think what you have to recognise here that this has gone through a very thorough process with the Regional Council. We have had Council and others work on this on your behalf and the position is agreed by all parties as fair. If you are unhappy with that process you should speak with Regional Council because they moderated that process.
Peter G	Now that you have monitoring it goes away from modelling to straight out measuring so you are simply measuring flows out of distance so becomes much simpler. Once modelled, becomes a measure and model. Direct measurement.
Simon	As stated at beginning the model is a live model always will be so as you go over the two few decades it will measured and remodelled to make sure the scheme is measured and compared.
Kim Ellis	I just want to say one thing. We should have been monitoring before – I find this irresponsible of certain people to say things are right and have changed again.
Simon	There has been information related to what been going on over the past few decades that has been taken into the model itself, it remains to be seen how it will change.
Mark	Clarified that it is a live document and what we have done and set it back the way of the old levels and that the only thing we are going to vary is the length. In the last 8-10 years what we have been trying to do is calibrate the model and that's what we have been doing with the various flood banks.
Scheme Management Plan	SMP has been altered to reflect the completion date of spill ways and also work on stop banks – gone to NRC and they have approved plan. Plan on website
Simon	
Carra Lindsay	Can you alter the management plan again for us as it was a document that we new what is happening at certain dates but now you are altering it. So can it be altered again next year?
Simon	It can be altered again but if so needs approval by NRC.
Levels and Sensors	Discussed level sensors as per slide
Simon	
Bruce Cutforth	Will there be any monitoring of water levels up stream?
Bruce NRC	My understanding is that there are already a number of level sensors installed up stream.
Roger	Those sensors – I think there is one on the bridge at Whakapara and some manual ones put in and they haven't been maintained, monitored or surveyed for 3-5 years so as far as I am concerned there is no real monitoring going on. No one comes and measures them so they are not being monitored.
Simon	As that has been recorded we will pick that up and deal with this with NRC. Make sure equipment such as that is functional.
Simon	Any other questions
Ray Hindrup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated meeting on work undertaken by Dr Steve Joynes including his recommendations for gauging sites and methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ water level gauges on the Mangahuru and Wairaki Streams and at the Lewis Bridge ○ alteration of the Whakapara gauge ○ need for more rainfall gauges, further 5 in catchment. • Concerns over impact of debris on level sensors, Steve Joynes recommended electronic monitoring of staff gauges at pump stations
Ray Hindrup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commented that Steve Joynes had done a model of the 2010 flood and reading from the gauges the reading ran up hill from Junction to Lewis Bridge, therefore presently our staff gauges are not accurate enough to presently use for recording. • Steve Joynes would put in the Mangahuru Stream gauge as top priority, the Lewis Bridge would be second, the crests gauges, in other words staff gauges, the Wairaka gauge and remainder of water level gauges the crest pocket level gauges, 3 rain gauges and then the rest of the rain gauges.
Simon	Discussion has been ongoing about how we monitor and problems associated and best management. Always get back to the multipronged attack of getting best info we can. Requested Steve Joynes info to look at and also review with NRC

Peter	The one thing Ray did say that is obvious and needs to be sorted through is that if these areas have logs and dead cows there is incorrect reading and has to be sorted out.
Simon	Absolutely, needs to be clear and able to function.
Conal	Staff gauges - had a survey done last month to see where they are sitting and there are some discrepancies which we will go through and make adjustments on them.
Ray Hindrup	Price comparison for sensors compared to monitoring at stations.
Simon	We will have a look at that.
Conal	Monitoring at the pump stations isn't necessarily going to give us a time and flow over crests so there needs to be a relationship established between those two measuring points.
Ray	Dr Joynes is not interested in measuring flow over the crests but wants to measure the height of river at the crest. Which is perhaps two different things.
Simon	Is there anything else needs to be raised on this particular slide?
Cara Lindsay	It is a requirement of the RC to have monitors within the spillway but it wouldn't be just a cost of staff gauges but it would be cost of going back and changing the RC which would end up costing us more than those monitors in a spillway.
Simon	You maybe right that could be a reality of it but we will do those checks just to do a comparison. Thank you.
Resource Consent Costs. Management Plan	Discussed as per slide, indicated \$500,000 in draft annual plan but probably only \$200,000-300,000 required
Simon	Discussed as per slide
Conal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Floodway Riparian plan looking at riparian management from a low flow channel from the Scheme, aligns with the Oxbow Cut-off Management Plan although due a year out there is some benefit in addressing both from the same plan. Have discussed with Fish and Game and Doc as to the best practice for the Oxbow Cut-off Restoration. The complete scheme management plan (you have seen copy of initial management plan) basically fine tuning as we go forward and have clearer idea of direction for the scheme in the future. Fisheries Management Plan working in with NIWA who have govt funding and also local IWI and building up programme on eel fishery and doing modifications to the pump intakes and allowing transfer of juvenile eels upstream and migrating eels downstream during flood events.
Scheme Finances	Discussion of financial scenarios as per slide. Clarification that all scenarios return scheme to zero balance and of timelines.
Simon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all need to work together on opportunity of cost reduction in operations looking for good ideas, continual feedback from people in the swamp as to how operationally we can get the scheme to work well and meet your needs and also reduce spending. Doesn't mean we will always agree with it but we appreciate it and take some of it onboard.
Edwin Smith	Raised concerns over new pumps going in under maintenance costs and queried depreciation
Simon Weston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basically the scheme carries on as it has in the past basic maintenance in terms of repairing things when they pack up. Pumps replaced as capital items Scheme has never charged depreciation and doing so from now forward would add costs. No pump upgrades in Scenario 1 <p>In accordance with the RC we need to do work on stopbanks. The pump replacement programme we put up before and spoke on in detail and a lot of information has been assimilated on what you want to do with the scheme in relation to the pump replacement programme.</p>

Edwin Smith	If you have a policy you can replace that pump when pump goes down, if you have no policy you will spend money on something that is inferior. You see what I am getting at, we have to have a policy to cover these scenarios. Same with a stopbank flow out. We don't have to replace every pump.
Simon	And that is detailed in the reports that we have proposing a pump replacement programme. And that's why one of these options, this one goes out to 2023 in other words the replacement of pumps won't be completed until 2034. It's a long programme. All of this is on the website.
Ben Smith	How many pumps have been replaced in the last 5 years?
Conal	We put in the two new flygts and reconditioned 5 Pleugers
Ben Smith	So we have done just about 50% of pump upgrade?
Conal	That's why the pump upgrade strategy we presented last time was based on a risk profile on what pumps have been serviced. So looking back at the service history we took an estimate of which pumps were most likely to fall over going forward and prioritise that for the replacement programme. Those 4 rounds or the 7 rounds for 2034 round are based on the risk of failure.
Simon	Rates Rise scenarios (slides 12, 13 & 14) This will be on the web so have a look say what's going to happen in 2018 and we have these different options being modelled and this is one option. Simon discussed the PP and outlined the various options. Simon asked if that answered Neville's question.
Neville	Yes I was just about right in my workings.
Simon	So we have option 1 and we have the options as well. So have a bit of a play around with these and we are looking for your feedback as to whether you think which one will work.
Luke Beehre	Just one question, when we look at the cashflow tabled I can see we go from 20010-2023 X 4 it doesn't look like X 4 from your starting point up on the PP. All I want is total income
Conal	Clarified that Scenario presented first was inadvertently labelled Scenario 3 on the spreadsheet
Luke Beehre	Those figures don't add up.
Conal	If we look that is sitting at about 70 hectare at he moment and going up to about 250 so about 3½ increase
Luke Beehre	4½ increase. Discussion ensued
Ray Hindrup	We can't afford upgrades we just carry on as required.
Simon	What this probably does do is not only make us decide as to whether we want to go ahead with a proactive pump replacement programme but there are also issues that a number of you have been raising – how can we improve the scheme. It's those issues we need to be talking about at this forum so that we are doing our level best for you guys.
January Storms	Overview of storms and response, cutting of banks, need for policy/procedure for this. Estimated power savings from cuts \$4600/day Conal to provide 4-6 weeks. Note: Costs for cutting/ reinstatements for 4 locations were \$28K
Ray Hindrup	Raised possibility of turning pumps off in such an event due to pasture losses being inevitable, and queried whether cut costs should be scheme or pocket.
Simon	Has to be done in a controlled manner. There needs to be a policy on this. Let me ask the floor. In terms of the costs associated with cutting your stopbanks has to be approved by WDC are you comfortable with those being pocket costs or scheme costs?
General discussion	
Meeting Agreed	Pocket Costs
Evan Smeath	Raised issues regarding number, size, location of flood gates.
Peter Geddes	Issue of flood gates being efficient is the setting mid flow to low flow. Our view is that you have more to be gained in ensuring that the mid to low flow is actually working so that you are actually going over the bottom of swamp and therefore your flood gates become more efficient. What happened in last storm is that the Mangahuru actually had the water at the same level for days, so in Neville's case wouldn't matter how long cut was there the river was higher than his place. So there needs to be an investigation to half way to low flow and then stopbanks make it more efficient and that is probably more money to be gained there.

Conal	There is a requirement in the consent that we explore the options of putting further gravity drainage within the scheme. So there is something in the Scheme Management Plan we will be working on.
Simon	This particular issue we will bring back to the floor but there are other issues of the RC we need to deal with at the moment.
Bruce Cutforth	Simon I think this is a really good discussion because it's starting to bring real focus in terms of economics and I am pleased to hear there is an acceptance that if banks cut they pick up the cost. To have a major ratepayer say that he didn't want his pumps on so should he get a discount on his rates. If others want pumps working for 2-3 days they should start asking some searching questions because it will be a big economic advantage for Pedro to pump that water off but not an advantage to Ray, then surely Ray would be entitled to get some economic advantage.
Simon	That is a good point to raise. Obviously the scheme is not set up to run the way you are suggesting. But what your suggesting is probably fair and should be considered and discussed.
Roger Milina	Suggested two rates, a collective rate and an individual rate. Having costs spread evenly over the scheme when only a few people benefit from a significant expense doesn't bother the one's benefitting.
Neville Thorn	I just understood at this last cutting of the banks it was ok by WDC Surely that is a Management Plan, so you decide if the pumps get switched off or land gets cut, or whatever you want to do. That's a management plan to me. Not talking about rates, we're talking about a management plan because overall we are going to be 2.6 million in arrears.
Simon Weston	The discussion has digressed a little but the points raised need to be considered so we will think on those points that have been raised.
Ray Hindrup	We really need a cost of cutting banks and from the farmers what we actually gain individually and then we will have some facts to make decision you were talking about.
Simon	Yes and I guess you can test the economics. This will change year by year so is particularly important for you deal with it. That may change from time to time.
Cara Lindsay	Can I just say I was involved with discussions with the Council about getting banks cut (Te Mata & Junction) and with James Blackburn at he time and his calculations for just Te Mata alone - it was going to take 10 days of pumping to get the internal water out and another 12 days of the water flown over so we are talking 22 days of pumping to get that off. There is the benefit of getting it off earlier with the cut. I am not saying the cut is right and thought it was a Council procedure after following March and now I see the other side and have spoken with Conal about putting procedure in place on the cut banks. But if it's 22 days just to pump out our water at the cost of nearly \$5000 a day we have saved the Council money.
Simon	Depends on circumstances within each pocket as to whether it's economic. We need to provide more information help in calculating that.
Question from floor	Simon I want to know for those that cut their banks what effect does have for those who don't cut their banks?
Simon	I will ask Peter to answer that one. Simon reiterated the question and also asked does it have any impact on level of river and the emptying of other pockets down stream?
Peter Geddes	Not a huge amount because basically the one's I saw there wasn't a lot of difference between pocket level and river level. So lifting the rivers not significant and looking at cross section of rivers and cross section of cuts they were tiny by comparison 2-3% across each area of the river. But the river was seriously stopped.
Simon	Thanks Peter.
Merv Rusk	Measured level change at Otonga before and after Te Mata had their cuts running river level was 400 mm that's the difference it made.
Peter Geddes	To be fair I didn't see any of that but what happened in this storm was quite unlike any other.
Simon Donelley	Questioned frequency of 80 year flood events
Mark	Gave brief overview of hydrological statistics

Simon Weston	On the operations maintenance side to comply with the OSH requirements the WDC needs to provide training to those of you who want to go and operate a pump station. Will arrange this over the next couple of months.
Maintenance Programme	As per slides. Discussed previous coding errors picked up in financial review and
Simon	
Neville Thorne	Raised issue with incorrect charge for Whau Valley pump
Simon Weston	Charge will be rebated
Any other business	Suggestion of having meeting on 6 monthly basis and reading the emails going back and forth that perhaps too wide a spread. Perhaps a quarterly basis? Your scheme what would you prefer. Quarterly. General consensus was quarterly.
Ray Hindrup	Updated on model progress, if downstream modification show to be beneficial than need to engage with NRC and downstream landowners immediately. Agreed to present info to next meeting. Spent \$13,500 on this particular project, \$60,000 on it previously to get it to where it was.
Simon	Any more questions?
Evan Smeath	Read out and moved resolution: That the farmer liaison committee be set up to provide all financial and management decisions on Hikurangi Management Swamp Scheme and the Hikurangi Swamp Drainage Scheme in liaison with the Council Management.'
Ben Smith	I will second that.
Simon	Queried whether ballot was more appropriate
Merv Rusk	If passed today then disenfranchising ratepayers and in breach of local government rules
Mark Simpson	Agreed at Ngararatunua Pump Station meeting with Cr Halse it will be a liaison committee with no delegated authority in the past its come under Works and Services which is now Infrastructure Services Group (I&S) and once I&S approve the minutes then they are ratified for action.
Edwin Smith	Wanted ability for selected delegates to overview scheme finances to ensure coding errors don't recur
Simon Weston	Will put procedures in place so that wont happen again.
Bruce Cutforth	Two issues in terms of this. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I would certainly support a survey going out to A & B ratepayers 2. Other issue I have real concern with is Terms of Reference (TOR) on that and am of the opinion that there needs to be some really reflective thinking about the TOR. To me it is a management team that you are asking us to support and I do not support a management team at any level. Too much parochialism in the past
Simon	OK. If we put forward a proposed Terms of Reference for that committee and then sent that out for people to say yes they want the committee and we want that as TOR would that answer the question?
Ray Hindrup	last 25-30 years a majority of people or ratepayers tip the scheme in their favour Council that used a majority vote to leave it like it was and because of the very nature of our Scheme we can never allow it to go back to where any committee can make a majority vote to change our Scheme to what they want.
Comment from floor	We want a liaison committee to have input and to be up to speed with what is happening but we don't want to run things.
Comment from floor	The issue that brought this to a head is Ngararatunua we have \$130,000 in job overrun because the job wasn't looked at properly. Extra fill being carted in. And docs say it was \$21 mtr for the extra stuff carted in that is the sort of thing that has brought this about and I think if we had a liaison committee to review some of these things before it goes to approval. Council will still have final say.

Ben Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2005 in the financials one pump station used \$43,000 worth of power 50% of the power. The least power used that year was \$3,000 by one pump station. • We haven't even got the ability at the moment to monitor which pump station is using how much power. Mr Hindrup talks about turning pumps off and the cost he saved for the Scheme but it's all an estimate we don't know what is a happening. • Cut the banks and say power has been saved but we have no quantitative measures of what is happening. I think it is about time that some of these facts come to light of actual facts – not hidden behind pieces of paper with 14% increase all the way through. • For our monitoring scheme we had 50,000 offered from the government for a Science and Innovation Scheme. Council were not interested in applying for it. Those are things that need to be put on the table we are broke. I would like that recorded too please that we are broke.
Roger Milina	<p>From Upstream State Highway 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rates got changed from B class to C class but no one was able to tell me. The issue is I pay \$4,000 in C class rates but on your model there I am looking at paying \$17,000 in 10/11 years time in rates and I don't have pump, stopbank, I don't get 1c of benefit from the electricity that is used on the Scheme nor do I get any benefit from any of the pump maintenance. • paid for all the Civil Works and am sure I speak for almost everyone on State Highway 1 that we are paying a disproportionate amount and I am not saying we don't get a benefit from this scheme because we do, but just as Ben said some people are having a lot of money spent on land that may not be that viable going into the future with the way the costs are going up. • I would like some consideration be given to how this whole rates review – there was some talk about it at last meeting and I would support that but to have a rates review we need more correct data in terms of who is paying what and why? <p>I wasn't aware that one pump station spend \$43,000 on electricity and that is not fair that people get all that benefit and don't pay anymore than someone else who doesn't get any benefit.</p>
Mark Simpson	<p>We have talked about this at the meeting a couple of weeks ago at Ngararatunua Pump Station Meeting. The Hikurangi Swamp has an enabling act a separate act of parliament and at the time it was set up all the wise people of the time did a rating scheme for it and people could object to that rating scheme and some did and had the various classes of A, B, C and D changed around that is actually locked in statute and we don't have the authority to change that. That will be an act of change of the local act. So what we have done is have straight ratios A-F and whether we agree with that or not we can't change.</p>
Roger Milina	<p>Can you answer then, as to why my rates were changed from B class to C class a matter of 2-3 years ago.</p>
Mark	<p>No – will need to have a look at that. The only person upset about that going from B to C would be yourself and the only thing I can think of is it has been miscalculation but we can go back and look at you specifically.</p>
Ben	<p>I have given information to Simon he has a spreadsheet. You have been varying the rates from A-F at different rates for the last 5 years. The F ratepayers only got an increase of 27% in the last 2 years. The A and B's got it 4 years previous to that. That information is there so it's incorrect.</p>
Conal	<p>Looking over the last 5 years rates within a couple of decimal places have moved in the same percentage across the board and the movement per year there is maybe half a percent difference but I can provide that spreadsheet through to you</p>
Ben	<p>Question to the Council. What percentage of ratepayers from A B ratepayers and what percentage from A, B and C ratepayers?</p>
Conal	<p>Can't answer off the top of my head but can get back to you. I think it is around the order of 70% from A, B and C.</p>
Ray Hindrup	<p>Raised possibility of farmers running scheme themselves</p>

Simon Weston	Reiterated WDC running scheme on behalf and feedback form scheme ratepayers essential. Suggested Terms of Reference be put together by mover/seconded of motion and sent to A B and C ratepayers
Evan Smeath	Suggested form a committee and then the Council and committee work out the terms of reference
Comment	Lets have a proper process and have appropriate areas represented and appropriate responsibilities in the TOR and in terms of the voting lets have it prorata to the rates paid. Then in terms of that appointment whether we will have a liaison group or not. But I am comfortable about a liaison group so lets put the foundations into this thing so we have some direction and capability to be constructive.
Simon Weston	Thank you for your comments this has added value to discussion I certainly think from my perspective I want everyone in the room and in the swamp to support the idea of having a Liaison Committee and to support decisions that they make. What I don't want to have is infighting against each other. Everyone in room wants the same thing and everyone could be working together. Now what we could do is ask for some volunteers from the floor to help us put together TOR and for that go out to be voted on and to move forward from there.
Evan	What say we have a group put together today to meet with Council and look at TOR and come back to next meeting where it will be ratified and then go to vote.
Simon Weston	Does everyone support that?
Merv Rusk	Yes I will however, Evan is moving an amendment to his own motion but that is ok he is moderating so that the rules will be worked out before the committee is formed I have never seen it done the other way round successfully. You need understanding of everyone together before you go into committee because once it gets teeth it gets very difficult to change. So I will second it and Evan has moved it.
Simon Weston	What's been moved at the moment is a selection of people from this floor will put together to help form the terms of reference, those terms of reference gets provided at the next meeting where it is voted on then it goes to a vote with everyone in this room (or the swamp) then it comes back to next meeting.
Phil Halse	<p>Chairman for Works & services committee for 12 years. The liaison committee was part of that committee, didn't react to anything, they didn't get a resource consent they would have paid about treble the amount as they didn't do it at the right time because they wouldn't address it - WDC had to do it by default after 7 years.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First their liaison committee needed to get everything set in place, legal obligations and you have to set in place and have a scheme. 2. Failed to do anything about rates so went for several years without addressing rates thus more financial problems. This is what a liaison committee did not a council. <p>Issue of farming methods being a factor.</p> <p>Need to consider TOR carefully.</p> <p>Responsibility will be the WDC and Councillors will be the ones who vote on it whatever you do. At the moment we are showing a 2.5 million debt and the rest of the community (ratepayers) can ask the Council why they should carry a 2.5 million debt for the Hikurangi Flood Scheme? They have every right to say no only give them half a million.</p> <p>Concerns over parochialism and factions in previous liaison committees</p> <p>CEO who has kept Council on side with the original debt of \$800,000 to \$2.6 million to help you out so don't attack Council as we are trying to be your allies here. No trust in our management to do it so you need to sit here and decide what you want to do and how you can reduce the debt flow by a million dollars.</p>

	<p>As Ray said perhaps turn the pumps off - you may have to do this - you may have to go 3 years to get this under control. You have to face the debt you have because Council is not prepared to keep adding to it. You have a CEO who has kept Council on side with the original debt of \$800,000 to \$2.6 million to help you out so don't attack Council as we are trying to be your allies here. You have no trust in our management to do it so you need to sit here and decide what you want to do and how you can reduce the debt flow by a million dollars. This is what you should be focussing on not about who is going to do it. You have to take responsibility just as Council does but just remember the Liaison Committee won't solve your problems.</p> <p>Thanks very much.</p>
Phil	<p>What we are trying to do is get you to focus on the problem because if you think forming a liaison committee is going to solve your problems you are wrong. There are a number of things you can do to cut costs. You can put in your TOR we will not have a pump replacement for 3 years.</p> <p>We used to operate on the process of everything went into a public agenda resolutions were made by voting and following Council procedure, if there was not a resolution to put the rates up they didn't go up and the rates didn't got up and went for a period years without any increase Edward. And that is absolutely 100% correct.</p>
Ray	<p>We will only go forward with WDC support and I have to work with Council like I have to work with the rest of you and for goodness sake if we are going anywhere we are going together.</p>
Mark	<p>Called halt to meeting, urged all to consider best t option, perhaps independent overseer a possibility. Scheme ratepayers have to take some responsibility for the scheme.</p> <p>Thanked all for attending.</p>
Simon	<p>Thanked all for attending</p>

Meeting closed at 1.00 pm

List of Attendees: Public Forum – Hikurangi Swamp Scheme

Name	Address	Phone Number
Peter Geddes	Hawthorne Geddes	
Greg Palmer	Transpacific Industries	
Stephen Arthur	Transpacific	
Bruce Howse	NRC	
Ray Hindrup	Mountain View Rd, PO Box 37, Hikurangi	09 433 8041
Simon Donelley	RD4, Hikurangi	09 433 9973
Mike Collins	Hukerenui Road	021 986 063
Gavin Donnelly		
Eric Edwards		
Greg & Diane Martin	RD1, Kamo	
Cara Lindsay	RD2 Hikurangi	
Merv Rusk	Marua Rd, RD1, Hikurangi	09 433 8182
Evan Smeath	White Rd, RD2, Hikurangi	09 433 9723
Martyn Smith	98 Heaton Rd, RD2, Hikurangi	09 433 8326
Murray Cutforth	Whananaki North Rd, RD1, Hikurangi	
Bruce Cutforth	17 Whananaki North Rd, RD1, Hikurangi	09 433 8767
Ben Smith	RD2, Hikurangi	09 433 8371
Todd Imeson	RD2, Hikurangi	09 433 8986
Ken Finlayson	RD6, Whangarei	09 437 0441
Roger Milina	Old Russell Rd	
Richard Bleakley	RD1, Kamo	
Barry Thorne	RD1, Kamo	
Edwin Smith	RD2, Hikurangi	
Pedro McHardy	RD2, Hikurangi	
Neville Thorn	RD1, Kamo	
Luke Beehre	RD2, Hikurangi	
Noel Rockell	RD2, Hikurangi	
Louise Rockell	RD2, Hikurangi	
Pia Rockell	RD2, Hikurangi	
Philip Rockell	RD2, Hikurangi	
Jack Glich	RD2, Hikurangi	
Katrina Ilich	RD2, Hikurangi	
Brian Hoult	RD2, Hikurangi	
Judy Imeson	RD2, Hikurangi	
Mike Barrington	Northland Advocate	
Mike Cunningham	Northland Advocate	
Brian Hoult	RD2, Hikurangi	

Minutes: Public Forum – Hikurangi Swamp Scheme

Minutes of meeting held at Jordan Valley Farm on Wednesday 31 August 2011 at 10.30 am.

Facilitator	Simon Weston
Purpose	Open forum between the Whangarei District Council and Hikurangi ratepayers to discuss the Hikurangi Swamp Scheme
Present	Simon Weston (facilitator), Andrew Carvell, Conal Summers Tracey Barach (scribe), Cr Phil Halse, and members of the public as follows: Ken Finlayson, Ray Hindrup, Richard Bleakley, Rudi Hoetjes, Mike Collins, Bruce Cutforth, Neville Thorn, Even Smeath, Pedro McHardy, Allan Halliday, Te Raa Nehua, Cara Lindsay, Ben Smith, Clim Lammers, Martyn Smith <i>plus others unsigned on the register</i>
Apologies	Cr Greg Martin, Luke Beehre

Simon Weston opened the meeting welcoming members, with introduction of staff and representatives from the Whangarei District Council. Simon advised all attending that the meeting will be recorded and minuted, although just the minutes will be distributed.

Item	Description/Action
Matters Arising	Simon Weston advised meeting of Agenda items for discussion as per below:
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minutes of last meeting ▪ Draft Terms of Reference for Liaison Committee ▪ Any other business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Stopbank Adjustments – Alternative Management Options
Simon Weston	Minutes of 29 June 2011 & 10 August 2011– no matters arising or comments. The terms of reference were sent out to Jason Woolley on 12 August for circulation to the wider farmer group. This did not happen and Council circulated the document on 30 August. Please ensure the minutes are distributed to everyone.
Draft Terms of Reference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A meeting with WDC and 2 representatives from each pocket was held on 10/08/2011 to discuss the Liaison Committee - Terms of Reference. A draft Terms of Reference was proposed.
Simon Weston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simon went through all of the draft terms of reference.
Draft Terms of Reference Discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comment was made that the wording in Terms of Reference 2 – which reads Whangarei District Council, which is the Scheme operator and administrator, be changed to Whangarei District Council, which is the Scheme management. It was agreed to retain the existing wording.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that in the case of emergency work, we adopt the guideline “where ever practicable the Liaison Committee is informed of works”. It was decided this does not need to be added to the Terms of Reference, and the guideline is enough to cover it. If there are any problems, the Liaison Committee can address them.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was discussion around what will happen if the Liaison Committee & the public forum don’t agree with council’s decisions. Simon advised Council has final say regarding how the scheme is managed & they are accountable. Council will ensure they listen to all the Liaison Committee’s recommendations and work through any issues.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted the Liaison Committee need to be active in advising people what is going on, as there are a lot of people who don’t know what is going on - as they don’t attend the meetings.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference 6 – Ray Hindrup noted there is no reference to the fact that the scheme is governed by Resource Consent. Simon advised he won’t change that clause and that Liaison Committee discussions should take into account the requirements of the Resource Consent.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rudi Hoetjes the Regional Manager from Fish & Game advised that they would like to see someone with a conservation background on the Liaison Committee. Rudi is happy to put himself up for this. The Liaison Committee will pick this up.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Martyn Smith nominated to adopt the Terms of Reference and Ben Smith seconded. All were in agreement to adopt the terms.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tony Davies-Colley was nominated as the independent chairman of the Liaison Committee by Ben Smith (seconded by Clim Lammers), however it was decided to leave appointing a chairman for the first Liaison Committee meeting.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cr Halse noted a possible conflict in having Tony Davis-Colley as chairman, as he is a NRC representative and may be unable to advocate for the committee in other matters related to the scheme.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the next month the Liaison Committee will need to select representatives, select a chairman and be operating. The responsibility is with Ben to ensure this happens.
Stopbank Adjustments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimate last year at \$365K using McKenzie Contracting rates based on remedial works to all low areas. We will go out to competitive tender for these works; this tender document will go to the Liaison Committee for comment. There is potential for reduction in this by prioritising worst sites, staging and negotiating reduced rates (tolerances less crucial) under current contract or retendering. This means NRC would need to approve changes to management plan This can be picked up by the Liaison Committee to have a look at and see how they want to progress with works. This item should go the first Liaison Committee agenda. Conal to send through survey from last years works to Liaison Committee. There is no tender document prepared as yet - WDC seek input from the Liaison Committee regarding preferred way forward.
Management Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the last meeting an alternative management proposal was talked about which give the pockets more control over the operations. WDC seek input from a Liaison Committee with regards to the following operational aspects: Weed removal at pump station Drain cleaning and spraying Pump operation (potential for power saving) Pump replacement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of the operational costs lie within the pockets themselves – so instead of being a blanket cost across the scheme there will be two rates – one will be a rate that covers everything to do with the scheme & the other will be to do with the associated works within each pocket. It is all one rate at this point in time.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council would like the Liaison Committee to discuss the proposal of a rate for each pocket determined by the work in each pocket. Please discuss at first meeting.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted council staff will record their time spent on the scheme on time sheets.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ray noted he would like the WDC staff timesheets to refer the cost back to the pockets they spend time on. He wants these costs put back on the pocket that is causing them. Breaking down the costs back to the pocket will ensure we can see what is going wrong and sort it out. All agree.
Questions/ Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Carvell commented WDC would prefer one point of contact – please put all requests through Conal. If Conal is on leave please put through to Andrew. Cr Halse noted there shouldn't be many requests as they will all go through the Liaison Committee. The Liaison Committee is to let WDC know what you want us to work on and look at. Ben noted the Liaison Committee will need information promptly.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew advised WDC are currently looking for an Operations Engineer, part of this role is to assist the operations of the scheme. Responsibility will then be moved from Conal when this position is filled.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question regarding the monthly financial reports - when will they be available for the Liaison Committee meeting? Advised they will be available in the 3rd week of the month for the previous month. This information will be available at the monthly operational meeting - one farmer representative will have access to this information. Conal to confirm.

Next Meeting: TBA

List of Attendees: Public Forum – Hikurangi Swamp Scheme

Name	Address	Phone Number
Ken Finlayson	RD1, Hikurangi	437 0411
Ray Hindrup	Mountain View Road	433 8041
Richard Bleakley	Crane Road	437 7773
Rudi Hoetjes	Fish & Game	438 4135
Mike Collins	Hukerenui Road	021 986 063
Bruce Cutforth	Whakapara	433 8767
Neville Thorn	812 Otakairangi	433 5801
Even Smeath	RD2, Hikurangi	433 9723
Pedro McHardy	RD2, Hikurangi	403 8321
Allan Halliday	RD2, Hikurangi	022 035 1285
Te Raa Nehua	Puhipuhi Road, Hikurangi	433 9871
Cara Lindsay	RD2, Hikurangi	433 9854
Ben Smith	RD2, Hikurangi	433 8371
Clim Lammers	RD2, Hikurangi	433 8284
Martyn Smith	RD2, Hikurangi	433 8326
Cr Phil Halse	WDC	