



**STRATFORD
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

61-63 Miranda Street
PO Box 320, Stratford, 4352
Phone 06 765 6099
Fax 06 765 7500
www.stratford.govt.nz

Our reference:

7 May 2020

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

Notice is hereby given that the **Ordinary** meeting of Council will be held via audio visual link on *Tuesday 12 May 2020 at 4pm*.

Timetable for 12 May 2020 as follows:

11am	Workshop for Councillors
4pm	Ordinary meeting

Yours faithfully



Sven Hanne
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

2020 - Agenda - Ordinary - May (12/05/2020)

Table of Contents:

Notice of Meeting	1
Agenda	2
Attendance Schedule	5
Confirmation of Minutes	6
Ordinary Meeting – 14 April 2020	6
Audit and Risk Meeting – 17 March 2020	14
Policy and Services Committee Meeting (Rates Remission Policy) – 28 April 2020	23
Policy and Services Committee Meeting – 28 April 2020	27
Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group – 3 March 2020	36
Taranaki Solid Waste Committee Minutes – 20 February 2020	42
District Mayor's Report	46
TABLED ITEM: Decision Report - Procurement	51

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL
TUESDAY 12 MAY 2020 AT 4.00 PM

A G E N D A

1. **WELCOME**
2. **APOLOGIES**
3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report *Decision Report – Procurement* be added as item 8 of this agenda in accordance with Standing Order 9.12 as an urgent matter that cannot be delayed. Delegating authority to act outside of Council’s Procurement Policy is urgently required for crucial economic stimulus funding and economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Moved/Seconded

4. **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS INTEREST**
Elected members to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda.
5. **ATTENDANCE SCHEDULE**
Attendance schedule for Ordinary and Extraordinary Council meetings.
6. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**
 - 6.1 **Ordinary Meeting – 14 April 2020**
D20/6330 (Pages 7-14)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 14 April 2020 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

Moved/Seconded

6.2 **[Audit and Risk Meeting – 17 March 2020](#)**
D20/7601 (Pages 15-23)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the unconfirmed minutes of the Audit and Risk Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 17 March 2020 be received.
2. THAT the recommendations in the minutes of the Audit and Risk Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 17 March 2020 be adopted.

_____/_____
Moved/Seconded

6.3 **[Policy and Services Committee Meeting \(Rates Remission Policy\) – 28 April 2020](#)**
D20/7484 (Pages 24-27)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the unconfirmed minutes of the Policy and Services Committee Meeting to hear and consider submissions to the Rates Remission Policy held on Tuesday 28 April 2020 be received.
2. THAT the recommendations in the minutes of the Policy and Services Committee meeting to hear and consider submissions to the Rates Remission Policy on Tuesday 28 April 2020 be adopted.

_____/_____
Moved/Seconded

6.4 **[Policy and Services Committee Meeting – 28 April 2020](#)**
D20/7485 (Pages 28-36)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the unconfirmed minutes of the Policy and Services Committee meeting held on Tuesday 28 April 2020 be received.
2. THAT the recommendations in the minutes of the Policy and Services Committee meeting held on Tuesday 28 April 2020 be adopted.

_____/_____
Moved/Seconded

6.5 **[Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group – 3 March 2020](#)**
(Pages 37-42)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the unconfirmed joint committee minutes of the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group held on Tuesday 3 March 2020 be received.

_____/_____
Moved/Seconded

6.6 **Taranaki Solid Waste Committee Minutes – 20 February 2020**
(Pages 43-46)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the unconfirmed minutes of the Taranaki Solid Waste Committee held on Tuesday 20 February 2020 be received.

/_____
Moved/Seconded

7. **DISTRICT MAYOR'S REPORT**
D20/8008 (Pages 47-51)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Mayor's report be received.

/_____
Moved/Seconded

8. **TABLED ITEM:**
DECISION REPORT – PROCUREMENT
D20/8360 (Pages 51-56)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.
2. THAT Council adopt **Option 1** contained within this report, authorising the Chief Executive to suspend any elements of the procurement policy for projects as required to meet the eligibility criteria of COVID-19 related external stimulus funding requiring less than 30 per cent of local co-funding.

Recommended Reason

Option 1 is considered the most effective method to enable access to any external funding that requires either suspension of, or amendments to be made to Council's Procurement Policy. The application of the inherent authorisations is restricted to a narrow definition of projects and elements of the existing procurement policy, local co-funding to a maximum of 30 per cent and expenditure within current budgets – unless further expenditure is authorised by a separate report. These restrictions provide safeguards against any excessive application of the requested authority.

/_____
Moved/Seconded

9. **QUESTIONS**

5. Attendance schedule for 2019-2020 Ordinary and Extraordinary Council meetings.

Date	29/10/19	12/11/19	10/12/19	11/02/20	10/03/20	14/04/20	12/05/20	09/06/20	14/07/20	11/08/20	08/09/20	13/10/20	10/11/20
Meeting	I	O	O	O	O	O (AV)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Neil Volzke	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Grant Boyde	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Rick Coplestone	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Peter Dalziel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Jono Erwood	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Amanda Harris	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Alan Jamieson	✓	✓	✓	A	✓	✓							
Vaughan Jones	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Min McKay	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
John Sandford	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Gloria Webby	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							

Key	
O	Ordinary Meeting
E	Extraordinary Meeting
I	Inaugural Meeting
✓	Attended
A	Apology/Leave of Absence
AB	Absent
S	Sick
(AV)	Meeting held by Audio Visual Link

MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD BY AUDIO VISUAL LINK ON TUESDAY 14 APRIL 2020 AT 4 PM

PRESENT

The District Mayor N C Volzke (the Chairman), the Deputy Mayor A L Jamieson, Councillors G W Boyde, R W Coplestone, P S Dalziel, J M S Erwood, A K Harris, V Jones, M McKay, W J Sandford and G M Webby.

IN ATTENDANCE

The Chief Executive – Mr S Hanne, the Director Community Services – Ms K Whareaitu, the Director Corporate Services – Mrs T Radich, the Director Assets – Mrs V Araba, the Director Environmental Services – Mr B Sutherland, the Executive Administration Officer – Ms R Vanstone, the Customer and Leisure Services Manager – Mrs A Mathews, the Corporate Accountant – Mrs C Craig, and one member of the media (Stratford Press).

1. **WELCOME**

The District Mayor welcomed the Chief Executive, Councillors, staff and the media.

2. **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mayor Volzke noted that a late agenda item had been received. There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report *Decision Report – Agree to the Amendments to the LGFA* be added as item 11 of this agenda in accordance with Standing Order 9.12 as an urgent matter that cannot be delayed. The signing of the amendment documentation cannot be delayed as expected changes to the LGFA must be executed by 30 April 2020 at the latest, with changes taking effect from 1 July 2020.

BOYDE/ERWOOD
Carried
CL/20/22

4. **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS INTEREST**

The District Mayor requested Councillors to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda.

Councillors were reminded that the monthly update for the declaration of member's interest would be circulated by email for them to update and acknowledge by return email.

In relation to today's agenda, elected members had no real or perceived conflicts of interest.

5. **ATTENDANCE SCHEDULE**

The Attendance Schedule for Ordinary and Extraordinary Council meetings was attached.

6. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

6.1 **Ordinary Meeting – 10 March 2020**
D20/5389 (Pages 7-11)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday 10 March 2020 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

JONES/HARRIS
Carried
CL/20/23

The Executive Administration Officer undertook to make the following amendments:

- Page 10, change wording to reflect that Councillor Jones was disappointed that Stratford Press's article omitted that dogs would be required to be on leash in the areas of Broadway and Prospero Place.

7. **DECISION REPORT – APPROVAL FOR RELEASE OF DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2020/21 FOR PUBLIC FEEDBACK**

D20/4350 (Pages 12-141)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/BOYDE
Carried
CL/20/24

2. ~~THAT the following options for the rates requirement for the financial year ended 30 June 2021 be considered:~~

~~**Option One:**~~

~~Rates increase of 5.72%, as per Year 3 of the Long Term Plan 2018-28, and detailed in the draft Annual Plan 2020/21 attached to this report.~~

~~**Option Two:**~~

~~Rates increase of 4.90%, removing \$119,000 from Option One above.~~

~~**Option Three:**~~

~~Rates increase of 3.86%, removing \$218,596 from Option One above.~~

~~**Option Four:**~~

~~Rates increase of 0%, removing \$706,642 from Option One above.~~

3. THAT the draft Annual Plan 2020/21, with the preferred rates increase option above as decided on by elected members, be released for public feedback and is

brought back to the May Policy and Services Committee meeting for deliberations and adoption.

JAMIESON/COPLESTONE
Carried
CL/20/26

RECOMMENDED REASON

Council is required to adopt an Annual Plan, pursuant to Section 95 of the Local Government Act 2002 (“the Act”), before the commencement of the year to which it relates - by 30 June 2020, and prior to setting the rates for the financial year.

6.1

The District Mayor noted that the rates increases had been discussed at length in earlier workshop sessions and the Director – Corporate Services had been asked to come back to council with rates increase options for the 2019/20 year.

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following points:

- The intention was to come to the March Policy and Services Committee meeting with a rate increase of 5.72 per cent however the Covid-19 event has changed this situation.
- The Chief Executive added that the key aspect of the presented options is that key infrastructure renewals remain untouched. He added a caution that a reduction now will add to next year’s rates increase.

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Councillor Boyde noted his support for a balance between options 2 and 3. In light of the extraordinary circumstances, he understood the need to get the balance right. Whilst he was aware of the hardships facing the community, he also recognised the need for continuing to ensure that council delivers its services. Councillor Boyde wished to note his support for the government’s stimulus plans. An increase in the early 4 per cent range would be adequate to continue to deliver on core services and infrastructure works.
- Councillor Harris was leaning toward option 2. She suggested strongly that the forestry strategy study proceed and be conducted in house as suggested. In light of the Chief Executive’s cautionary comments, Councillor Harris considered that the effects of Covid-19 would be felt for a number of years. Option 2 gave some relief now and in later years.
- Councillor McKay was weighing up options 1 and 2 – and recommended no or slight changes. Having done some rough urban rates calculations, she noted that the difference between the options was between 44 cents and \$1 per week. She was of the view that an increase in this range would not cause any easing in terms of hardship but that the consequence of not increasing, was a lack of service being delivered. She was of the view that council should consider supporting the community in other ways.
- Councillor Jones sought clarification on repairs and maintenance to council buildings and whether carpet in the Centennial Restrooms was considered key infrastructure. He also questioned where the \$50,000 budgeted contribution to Tapuae Roa sat. In summary, Councillor Jones favoured an option between 2 and 3.
- Mr Hanne agreed with Councillor Jones that carpet was not key infrastructure. Tapuae Roa funding is part of a regional strategy and in itself does not deliver economic development but leads into it. He felt it sensible to review the contribution. The Director - Community Services added that Tapuae Roa funding was more about establishing an ecosystem for regional priority areas like food futures for instance, to flourish. Mayor Volzke added that State Highway 43 was part of the Tapuae Roa strategy and that economic development ought to be assessed as a region.
- Councillor Webby was hovering between options 1 and 2. She felt that the community was being supported through rates postponements and remissions.
- Councillor Erwood agreed that action was required in these unprecedented times. He supported option 2 adding that some projects could potentially be reduced, such as carpeting.

- Councillor Sandford was weighing up options 2 and 3. He considered that some activity areas like library purchases or training could be reduced. He also asked for more detail around pensioner housing as he had been told by those tenants that they did not consider renovations necessary nor desirable. Councillor Sandford agreed that council needed to show some empathy to ratepayers.
- Councillor Dalziel noted that increases for options 2 or 3 equated to fairly low actual dollar increases. He thought that businesses would be looking at their existing costs closely. He did not accept the bow wave argument being presented by some councils. Councillor Dalziel was of the view that maintenance and supplier contracts should be reviewed closely with cost savings in mind. He was also raising not fully funding depreciation as an option. Other savings ideas from Councillor Dalziel included offsetting rates increases with council surplus, pulling money from the council farm and staff transitioning to a 4 day working week. Councillor Dalziel ended by advising that he supported a zero percent rates increase.
- Councillor Coplestone was supportive of option 2. In his mind, option 1 was not a good look and a zero per cent increase was bad economics. Any surplus should be used for projects that benefitted the town and stopping projects or activities this year did not see them disappear next year.
- Councillor Jamieson agreed that the district needed to see a rates reduction in these tough times and that council should be leading the charge. He thought that an increase of just below or on 4 per cent was satisfactory. Decisions about specific areas or activity cuts could be made later with recommendations from council officers.
- Mayor Volzke thanked elected members for their arguments - it appeared the support for options 2 and 3 was fairly evenly split. Whilst he agreed with Councillor McKay's comment that there was little difference in terms of dollars, there was a political message which needed to be conveyed. It was worth noting that New Plymouth District Council were anticipating a 4 per cent increase and South Taranaki District Council, no higher. He was convinced that an increase of between 3.68 and 4 per cent was satisfactory and achievable.
- Mayor Volzke questioned whether transferring the interest on debt saved in option 3 plus reducing Tapuae Roa funding and making smaller reductions in areas like staff training would bring the figures down to a more palatable option 2 increase with little impact on the community and provision of council services.
- Mrs Radich clarified that this could be achieved by reducing the interest rate assumption.
- Mr Hanne disagreed with Councillor Sandford's view to cut the library (new book purchases) budget any further as customers would immediately notice the reduction.
- Councillor Boyde was happy with a 4.3 per cent increase – he felt this was a happy medium.
- Councillor McKay was comfortable with that figure adding that cuts could be genuinely absorbed now but not in the future.

A division was called.

RECOMMENDATION

2. THAT Council's rates increase be set at 4.3% for the financial year ending 30 June 2021.

BOYDE/HARRIS
 Carried
CL/20/25
 Division
 For 8
 Against 3

Those voting for the motion were Councillors: Boyde, Coplestone, Erwood, Harrison, Jones, Webby, Sandford and the District Mayor.

Those voting against the motion were Councillors: Dalziel, McKay and the Deputy Mayor.

8. DECISION REPORT – FARM AND AERODROME COMMITTEE – TERMS OF REFERENCE

D20/4471

(Pages 142-149)

6.1

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received, and the attached proposed Terms of Reference for the Farm and Aerodrome Committee be adopted.
2. THAT the members of the Farm and Aerodrome Committee are to be appointed by the Mayor.
3. THAT the first meeting date and time for the Farm and Aerodrome Committee be set.

McKAY/JONES
Carried
CL/20/27

Recommended Reason

The Mayor announced after the 2019 local government election that a new Farm and Aerodrome Committee will be established to provide governance oversight, and recommendations to Council, on the combined activities of the Farm and Aerodrome. The recommendations above support the implementation of the Committee.

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following points:

- The terms of reference of council’s Farm and Aerodrome Committee sets the objective, purpose and scope of the committee.
- Councillor Boyde was satisfied with the document and had nothing to add.
- Councillor Jones suggested inserting a reference to the aerodrome in the second paragraph and that a degree of flexibility be considered in relation to the point 3 which currently states in relation to the farm, “*To return to Council an annual ‘dividend’ of \$50,000, with any remaining profit put towards repaying debt.*” Flexibility would see either the repayment of debt, or as a higher dividend or reinvestment.
- Mrs Radich noted that the repayment of debt objective was required by elected members in June 2019.
- Councillor Boyde agreed with Mayor Volzke’s suggestion that the objective could be reworded by removing the second part of the sentence. Once strategic plans are done, going forward any dividend could go into capital works, repaying debt or paying a higher dividend.
- Mayor Volzke clarified that the terms of reference would be reviewed at the three yearly self-review of the committee, following a question from Council Erwood.
- Mrs Radich clarified that the reference to remuneration on page 149 would be expanded noting that committee members will be remunerated according to the remuneration set by the Remuneration Authority.

9. DECISION REPORT – SWIMMING POOL DEVELOPMENT LOCATION

D20/3457

(Pages 150-164)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/SANDFORD
Carried
CL/20/28

2. THAT following consideration of the four options for the location of the new swimming pool facility, Council adopt Option 2 being the co-location with the TET MultiSports Centre.

McKAY/JAMIESON
Against ERWOOD & SANDFORD
Carried
CL/20/29

Recommended Reason

A decision on the location of the new build of the Stratford swimming pool facility must be made to enable the project to move forward and for detailed plans to be completed. While the capital cost of option 2 to co-locate with the TET MultiSports Centre is higher than the three other options, the operational benefits and synergies that are gained from this co-location make it a better long term location.

The Customer and Leisure Services Manager noted the following points:

- The pool location has been workshopped a number of times with elected members. A decision on the location of the development is required to move onto the next phase – the detailed design work.
- Councillor McKay wholeheartedly supports option 2 and believes that the pool development will go a way towards creating a vibrant community and attracting people from outside of the district.
- Councillor Jamieson was also in favour of option 2.
- Councillor Boyde expressed his support for option 2 adding that the synergies of having a pool and TET in the same development outweighed any other options.
- Councillor Erwood spoke to the contrary. In relation to the benefits (item 7, page 155 of the report), the councillor noted limited car parking. He asked what the cost would be to extend the east side of Portia Street or to utilise the primary school as a carpark. He also noted that the development was not visible from Broadway and asked what other impacts there would be for the TET during construction. Councillor Erwood’s preferred option was to put the pool development behind the police station. He therefore supports option 3 which would see a pool development on council land but standalone.
- Councillor Erwood asked how council would ensure that the synergies between the pool and the TET were going to work. Two entrances were going to make this difficult.
- The Chief Executive noted that car parking has been significantly discussed and council officers thought that additional (street) car parking could be added later on if required.
- Mrs Mathews clarified that the additional entrance provided afterhours access to events in the TET stadium. One main entrance would serve the TET and the pool during normal opening hours.
- Councillor Erwood expressed that he would like his concerns noted.

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Mayor Volzke added that the project would be put forward as shovel ready as part of the government’s recovery stimulus package.

Points noted in discussion:

- Councillors Erwood and Sandford voted against the motion. The motion was carried.

9. **DISTRICT MAYOR'S REPORT**

D20/6115 (Pages 165-170)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **THAT** the District Mayor's report be received.

VOLZKE/BOYDE
Carried
CL/20/30

2. **THAT** Deborah Clough be confirmed as a Council appointed Trustee to the Percy Thompson Trust.

3. **THAT** Councillors Grant Boyde, Vaughan Jones and Peter Dalziel be confirmed as appointees to the Council's Farm and Aerodrome Committee. Councillor Boyde is appointed as Chairman of this Committee.

VOLZKE /WEBBY
Carried
CL/20/31

The District Mayor noted the following points:

- Acknowledged all council staff working at the TEMO office and those staff who are covering for them.
- That Powerco has completed much-needed infrastructure work at Whangamomona.
- The Percy Thomson Trust deed requires that at least 50 per cent of the trustees shall not be current elected members of the Stratford District.
- The appointment of Deborah Clough follows a robust selection process.

11. **TABLED ITEM:**

DECISION REPORT – AGREE TO AMENDMENTS TO THE LGFA

D20/6198

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **THAT** Council approves the attached Deeds of Amendment and proposed amendments to the Local Government Funding Agency ("LGFA").
2. **THAT** Council authorises two elected members and the Chief Executive to execute the changes by signing the amendment documentation attached to this report, comprising of:
 - Amendment and Restatement Deed (Multi-issuer Deed)
 - Amendment and Restatement Deed (Guarantee and Indemnity)
 - Amendment and Restatement Deed (Notes Subscription Agreement)
 - Guarantee certificate

McKAY/BOYDE
Carried
CL/20/32

Recommended Reason

A Council resolution is required to authorise the signing of the amendment documentation.

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following points:

- Mrs Radich apologised to elected members for the lateness in submitting this report. By way of an explanation, the paperwork was forwarded to her (and other non-shareholder councils) only last week. The LGFA requires all paperwork to be signed by 30 April 2020. Shareholder members are able to attend the LGFA AGM's and were therefore aware of these requirements – Stratford District Council is not a shareholder.
- The key change is that council controlled organisations (CCOs) are able to borrow directly from the LGFA from 1 July 2020. Many councils loan to CCOs – administratively it is easier and tidier for them to borrow directly from the LGFA. CCOs must seek approval from council and council is required to guarantee the loan.
- Councillor Boyde expressed concern around the CCO borrowing directly from the LGFA and the risks to the council's LTP and budgeting processes that this would bring. Mrs Radich reiterated the approval process.
- The District Mayor noted that Stratford District Council would be required to review its policies in relation to its only CCO – the Percy Thomson Trust.
- Councillor Dalziel pointed out that the risk is no greater than the council borrowing themselves.
- Councillor Dalziel also asked why this matter had not been brought to our attention much earlier, especially given that the AGM notice was dated November 2018. Mrs Radich clarified that she had questioned LGFA about the timing of this but had received no response.
- It was clarified that any two elected members could sign off on the documentation.

10. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

The meeting closed at 5.25pm.

N C Volzke
CHAIRMAN

Confirmed this 12th day of May 2020.

N C Volzke
DISTRICT MAYOR

MINUTES OF THE AUDIT & RISK COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL ON TUESDAY 17 MARCH 2020 AT 4.00 PM

6.2

PRESENT

K Denness (the Chairman), the District Mayor N C Volzke, the Deputy Mayor A L Jamieson, Councillors P S Dalziel, J M S Erwood and M McKay.

IN ATTENDANCE

The Director Community Services – Ms K Whareaitu, the Director Corporate Services – Mrs T Radich, the Director Environmental Services – Mr B Sutherland, Councillor G W Boyde, the Executive Administration Officer – Ms R Vanstone, the Health & Safety and Emergency Management Advisor – Mr M Bestall (*part meeting*), the Corporate Accountant – Mrs C Craig (*part meeting*), and one member of the media (the Daily News).

1. WELCOME

The Chairperson Ms K Denness welcomed the District Mayor, Councillors and staff.

2. APOLOGIES

An apology was noted from the Director Assets – Mrs V Araba.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the apology be received.

DENNESS/DALZIEL
Carried
A&R/20/01

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Health & Safety and Emergency Management Advisor advised all attendees of the COVID-19 ‘stop sign’ at the entranceway to the building and encouraged frequent handwashing.

4. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. ATTENDANCE SCHEDULE

The attendance schedule for 2019 – 2020 Audit and Risk Committee meetings was attached.

6.2

6. PROGRAMME OF WORKS

D19/32844 (Page 8)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee’s programme of works for 2020 be received.

DENNESS/ERWOOD

Carried
A&R/20/02

7. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

7.1 Audit and Risk Committee Meeting Minutes – 17 December 2019

D19/34500 (Pages 9-19)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 17 December 2019 be confirmed, with any amendments, as a true and accurate record.

DENNESS/McKAY

Carried
A&R/20/03

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Clarification was sought from the Chair on whether council could exit from the commitment of being a Local Government Funding Agency (‘LGFA’) guarantor. The Director – Corporate Services advised that clarification would be sought from the LGFA and requested that this be added to matters outstanding.
- Councillor Boyde clarified that the farm has a health and safety register and that the risk register for the farm and aerodrome is currently being reviewed.

8. MATTERS OUTSTANDING

D18/27474 (Page 20)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the matters outstanding be received.

JAMIESON/DALZIEL
Carried
A&R/20/04

Questions/Points of clarification:

- With regards to the outstanding swim school response item, the Director – Community Services advised that council is working with the school to complete the necessary documentation by the second school term.
- There was discussion around the liability for council as the provider of the venue and lifeguards to a commercial operator.

9. COMMITTEE REVIEW 2017-2019

D20/4135 (Pages 21-23)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee’s review for the period 2017- 2019 be received.

DENNESS/ERWOOD
Carried
A&R/20/05

10. DECISION REPORT – INTERNAL AUDIT PLAN 2019/20

D20/2515 (Pages 24-31)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.
2. THAT the Internal Audit Plan 2019/20 be approved.

DENNESS/DALZIEL
Carried
A&R/20/06

The Chair took both recommendations at once.

The Corporate Accountant made the following points:

6.2

- The council plans on completing the internal audit plan for 2019/20 by internal staff. As well as a cost saving, an internal audit provides a training and development opportunity.
- The potential for conflict of interest has been eliminated as much as possible by removing the ability of staff involved in day-to-day activities to review their own activity.
- The first two risk activities identified for audit have come from council's top 10 risk register. The next six risks are reasonably topical and relevant to council and the wider world at present. The last two are not on the risk register but are possibly relevant to council's activities. The outcome of the review will determine whether these risks go into the register.
- The internal audit will commence once the minutes of this meeting are adopted. The audit results will be presented to this committee.

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Councillor McKay asked whether staff had a template structure to work from so if staff were not entirely knowledgeable about the area being reviewed, they would be aware of the relevant questions to ask. The Corporate Accountant clarified this adding that the template allowed for detail such as process changes or enhancements and cost savings to be identified. Councillor McKay asked if a peer reviewer step was included in the template. Mrs Craig confirmed this to be the case.
- Councillor Boyde asked whether the internal audit ought to be peer reviewed by an external party in the future. Mrs Craig responded that this could be considered moving forward. Mrs Radich clarified that a detailed report would be brought back to the Audit and Risk Committee and that in doing so, this forum would be peer reviewing the internal audit also. It was also thought that a peer review function could be shared across the three Taranaki councils at some point in the future.
- Councillor Dalziel, in identifying procurement contracts (item number 25 on Appendix 1), asked whether this required review having just been reviewed by the external auditors. Mrs Craig clarified that it was worthwhile to ensure that council is compliant. The Chief Executive noted that significant changes have been implemented since the previous external audit.
- The District Mayor commented that he liked the idea of an internal audit being carried out by staff periodically - one year out of three – as a possibility and he agreed that there were substantial savings to be made. An internal audit also gave staff a holistic view of the organisation whereas external auditors tended to focus on one issue.

11. INFORMATION REPORT – RISK REVIEW

D20/3572

(Pages 32-53)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT this report be received.

JAMIESON/McKAY
Carried
A&R/20/07

The Director – Corporate Services made the following points:

- Fraud related risk in terms of management overriding internal controls was added to the risk register having been raised at the last Audit and Risk Committee meeting and by the external auditor.
- Other changes to the top ten risk register include adding an infectious disease outbreak/pandemic risk in light of the corona virus outbreak, reducing the residual risk of the release of incorrect or confidential information and updating minor server failure and government policy impacting on local government and resourcing in light of occurrences in council.

In a pandemic update, the Chief Executive made the following points:

- Council had been busy on a daily basis adjusting to the ever evolving situation and understanding of the risks posed by COVID-19.
 - As an organisation council has increased cleaning measures across all of its facilities and has been working with neighbouring councils to provide a unified approach to service and communications.
 - Council continues to await legal, sector and wellbeing advice from organisations such as Local Government New Zealand, the Ministry of Health and Taranaki Health Board.
 - Taranaki Emergency Management ('TEMO') has been activated to ensure the flow of information through the region. At this stage, one council staff member has been seconded to TEMO and a second secondment is being considered from one of the councils. The scenario provides good experience and practice for staff. New Plymouth District Council have chosen to activate their own Emergency Operational Centre ('EOC'). At this stage Stratford have decided that there would be no benefit in activating a local EOC as it would draw resources out of our business as usual roles.
 - The organisation is working through business continuity plans. General indications are that there will be a 9-12 month pandemic 'tail' so the business as usual activities like paying bills and rates are being focused on. We are looking at ways of providing services by staff working from home. Over next few days we will do a full work from home test.
 - National advice is being stitched together by the Society of Local Government Managers ('SOLGM') regarding the opening of council facilities – we expect that some time next week.
 - A communication strategy for customer service advice to the public around social distancing etc. is being formulated. This would not include health advice.
 - We are in the process of setting up a 'hygiene bubble'. Hand sanitiser has been installed in a number of locations and is available at the front counter. Access to the back part of the building has been restricted to staff and contractors. The water technicians are temporarily based at the water treatment plant. Discussions are taking place with other councils about the cross-training of staff for essential services.
- Mayor Volzke will attend a health board facilitated meeting tomorrow with key agencies to receive an update and discuss a unified regional response. He expects a communique from that meeting.
- The Chair asked if council had considered remote meetings. Mr Hanne responded that at this stage, council chambers allows for safe distance working however this is likely to be reviewed if the current event progresses.
- The Chair asked if staff and elected members with underlying health conditions had been identified. Ms Whareaitu confirmed that staff had been asked to self-identify risk

factors including age, underlying illness, living with people with an underlying illness and to advise their managers.

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Councillor Dalziel expressed his concern for the lone worker. The Health & Safety and Emergency Management Advisor clarified that there had been robust discussion around the question of the lone worker and he was satisfied with the moderate risk scoring. He advised that he continues to explore the option of a security device for the lone worker. Councillor Erwood added recruitment and ongoing training as aspects of consideration for the lone worker. Mayor Volzke reiterated Councillor Dalziel’s concerns adding that the legislation requires all reasonable and practicable steps to be taken.

The Corporate Accountant left the meeting at 4.58pm.

12. QUARTERLY REPORT – HEALTH AND SAFETY

D20/4087 (Pages 54-58)

<p><u>RECOMMENDATION</u></p> <p><u>THAT</u> the report be received.</p> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 20px;"> <p><u>DENNESS/DALZIEL</u> Carried A&R/20/08</p> </div>
--

The Health and Safety and Civil Defence Advisor made the following points:

- There have been three health and safety incidents in this quarter, including a major incident where a logging truck slid off the road. In this case the contractor did everything practicable leading up to and after the accident. There have been no further incidents with contractors.
- The biggest challenge lately has been dealing with the more unstable elements of the community that decide to visit council facilities. One person has been trespassed from all facilities.

Questions/Points of clarification:

- In referring to items 2.4 and 2.5, Councillor Erwood recommended dialling 111, not senior staff in the first instance. The Chief Executive responded that pool staff had called the police and it took them 45 minutes to respond.
- Councillor McKay asked if staff had been put through de-escalation training. Mr Bestall advised that all pool staff completed de-escalation training 1.5 years ago but there have been a lot of staff changes since then. Training was being considered again however.
- The Chair asked whether the council had considered security at the pool. The Director – Community Services responded that this had not been considered.

The Health and Safety and Civil Defence Advisor left the meeting at 5.06pm.

13. **INFORMATION REPORT — AUDIT NEW ZEALAND —
PROCUREMENT RISK REVIEW**
D20/4084 (Pages 59-67)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Committee receives the Audit New Zealand report on the Procurement Risk Review, finalised in February 2020.

DENNESS/ERWOOD
Carried
A&R/20/09

The Chief Executive made the following points:

- Audit NZ separately audited procurement due to its identification as a high risk activity for councils. This council's core procurement processes are sound however the report highlighted some areas for improvement including procurement planning, conflict of interest management and the evaluation of tenders in relation to the reviewed contracts for three waters maintenance, general roading maintenance and open spaces maintenance.
- Mayor Volzke clarified that the Office of the Auditor General and Audit NZ met with himself and the Chief Executive to discuss the previous audit and there was some focus on the procurement report. The auditors were satisfied with the responses given and there were no suggestions of impropriety.

14. **INFORMATION REPORT – FINANCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT
REPORT**
D20/4000 (Pages 68-78)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report be received.

McKAY/DALZIEL
Carried
A&R/20/10

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Mayor Volzke asked what the implications were in relation to underspent capital expenditure of \$2.1 million. The Director – Corporate Services suggested that \$7.3 million would need to be spent for the year and that water supply expenditure was the underspend area.
- Mr Hanne clarified that there was not enough free capacity to complete the design work for water supply zoning which council had proposed to elected members as part of a resilience discussion.
- Ms Radich added that other water supply projects were unlikely to be completed by the end of the financial year including the grit tank replacement and meter replacements. Mayor Volzke expressed his concern for the failure to deliver on elected members'

commitments to get the work done and this was not an insubstantial amount being talked about. Mayor Volzke ended by saying that council must make its best endeavours to spend the money because there is no guarantee that the budget will be rolled over.

- Mr Hanne added that council is committed to the work however the ability to deliver was proving more problematic.

15. INFORMATION REPORT – ANNUAL REPORT 2018/19 – AUDIT OUTCOMES

D20/3968 (Pages 79-85)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report be received.

DENNESS/McKAY
Carried
A&R/20/11

16. INFORMATION REPORT – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTION 2019 DEBRIEF

D20/3965 (Pages 86-93)

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the report and the attachments are received.

DENNESS/VOLZKE
Carried
A&R/20/12

The Director – Corporate Services made the following points:

- The Chief Executive was given a mandate to encourage voter participation following a legislative change. Electoral participation and voter participation in this district is notably higher than the average.
- Mayor Volzke commented on the election signage issue which saw inconsistencies between the Signage Bylaw and the District Plan. The Director – Environmental Services advised that the bylaw was being drafted and would come before elected members in this half of the year.
- Mayor Volzke clarified that Māori wards had been considered by this Council but were decided against. Mrs Radich confirmed that this would be corrected in the report.
- The Chair asked for a breakdown of voters by age group however this was not available from Election Services.

17. GENERAL BUSINESS

17.1 Insurance Claims

The Director – Corporate Services advised that five insurance claims, all for vehicle windscreen repairs have been made in the financial year to date.

The meeting closed at 5.33pm.

K Denness
CHAIRMAN

Confirmed this 19th day of May 2020.

N Volzke
DISTRICT MAYOR

**MINUTES OF THE POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING OF
THE STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD BY AUDIO VISUAL LINK
ON TUESDAY 28 APRIL 2020 AT 1PM TO HEAR AND CONSIDER
SUBMISSIONS TO THE RATES REMISSION POLICY**

PRESENT

The Deputy Mayor A L Jamieson (the Chairman), the District Mayor N C Volzke, Councillors M McKay, V R Jones, R W Coplestone, P S Dalziel, G W Boyde, W J Sandford, A K Harris, J M S Erwood, and G M Webby.

IN ATTENDANCE

The Chief Executive – Mr S Hanne, the Director Community Services – Ms K Whareaitu, the Director Corporate Services – Mrs T Radich, the Director Assets – Mrs V Araba, the Director Environmental Services – Mr B Sutherland, the Executive Administration Officer – Ms R Vanstone, the Revenue Manager – Mrs J Erwood and two members of the media (Stratford Press and Taranaki Daily News).

1. **WELCOME**

The Deputy Mayor welcomed the District Mayor, the Chief Executive, Councillors, staff and the media.

2. **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Policy and Services Committee meeting. It was reinforced to Councillors that the purpose of this meeting was to hear and consider submissions on the Rates Remission Policy. Councillors were asked to hear submissions with an open mind, to restrict their question time to the submitter to points of clarification or issues pertaining to the subject matter. Councillors were requested not to get into direct dialogue with the submitter as there is tight timeframe scheduled for the day. Councillors could take notes whilst the submitter was speaking.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS INTEREST**

The Deputy Mayor requested Councillors to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda.

There were no declarations of interest.

5. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SUBMISSIONS**

Submissions pages 4-11

Attached are the 3 submissions received.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT each of the 3 submissions to the Rates Remission Policy be received.
2. THAT each submitter be individually thanked for their submission, and a copy of the minutes of the Policy & Services Committee Meeting and subsequent meetings be provided to each submitter.

BOYDE/VOLZKE
Carried
P&S/20/39

Recommended Reason

Each submission is formally received and the submitter provided with information on decisions made.

6.3

6. **SUBMITTERS TO BE HEARD**

(no report)

Submitters are given 5 minutes to speak to the Committee. Five minutes is also allocated for questions from the Committee.

Mr Richard Pratt joined the meeting at 1.05pm.

Richard Pratt	Whangamomona Hotel
Points noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Whangamomona Hotel sees value in the rates remission as provided by the council. With little infrastructure in the town, the pub becomes the hub for support to residents and visitors. • When questioned by the District Mayor, Mr Pratt clarified that the hotel has heritage 2 status and as such exterior alterations cannot be made to the building. Where they must be made, there is an expectation that 'like will be replaced by like'. There are no other financial implications imposed on him as the owner of a heritage status building. • The Deputy Mayor asked Mr Pratt whether he thought the hotel should be eligible for a subsidy given it operated as a commercial business. Mr Pratt responded that he sees himself as the caretaker of the hotel and that the sustainability of the business is very much dependent on support from the district. While his business seeks funding, the township of Whangamomona is the vehicle to access that funding. Even the smallest level of support was an acknowledgement of the hotel's importance to Whangamomona and the wider district. 	

Mr Richard Pratt left the meeting at 1.11pm.

7. **RATES REMISSION POLICY – DELIBERATION AND ADOPTION**
D20/6368 (Pages 12-18)

Discussion

Council needs to consider submissions to the Rates Remission Policy as part of the consultation process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/HARRIS
Carried
P&S/20/41

2. THAT subject to any new information from submissions highlighted at the hearing, the *draft* Rates Remission Policy be adopted.

3. THAT the commencement date of the Rates Remission Policy be 1 July 2020.

JAMIESON/COPELSTONE
Carried
P&S/20/42

Recommended Reason

The changes to the current Rates Remission Policy ensure a fair and efficient approach and application of rates.

The Director – Corporate Services noted that three submissions were received and proposed one change to the original draft policy - to retain the biodiversity remission policy covering land with biodiversity vegetation.

Submissions:

- The Director – Environmental Services confirmed that central government is currently considering legislative changes around biodiversity. No timeframe has been established as yet. For this reason, the Revenue Manager clarified that the biodiversity remission policy would remain until more was known. Any change would be brought back to council in the future.
- Whilst Mr Pratt held the view that the removal of any support for heritage buildings endangered their existence, of the 29 registered heritage buildings and sites in the district, only three were currently receiving a rates remission, reported Mrs Erwood. These are the Douglas Boarding House (a private residence), a historic kauri tree in the grounds of the former Douglas School and the Whangamomona Hotel. In the current financial year, the total remission across the three sites totalled \$558.35. It was therefore prudent to ask whether rates remission was the best way to achieve protection.
- Councillor McKay asked what targeted rates the Whangamomona Hotel was currently charged. Mrs Erwood confirmed that the hotel is not charged a targeted rate and that any changes to the building itself were entirely funded from the owner’s pocket.
- The District Mayor confirmed that contestable funding is available for heritage classified buildings, however heritage 1 buildings were the major recipients. The Whangamomona Hotel as a heritage 2 listed building has limited opportunities to receive the same funding.
- In considering the Federated Farmers and QEII National Trust submissions, which opposed the removal of rates remissions for land subject to an open space covenant and land with biodiversity values, Mayor Volzke commented that removal of the rates remission on covenanted land could see council become subject to the Council’s interpretation. While not

necessary from a rating perspective as covenanted sites were non-rateable under the Local Government Rating Act, inclusion could aid clarity.

- Mayor Volzke asked if the historic tree should continue to receive a rates remission. The Deputy concluded that if the tree was under reserve status, a remission is entirely appropriate. Councillor Coplestone sought clarification on whether the tree was in the correct category for consideration. Mrs Erwood confirmed that the tree is listed in the heritage register.
- Councillor Boyde asked whether rates remissions are publicised. Mrs Radich confirmed that the rates remission policy is publicised with the annual assessment notice that goes to all ratepayers at the beginning of the financial year. The policy is also available on council's website.
- Councillor Dalziel asked for the total cost of rates remissions to council if all eligible sites applied. Mrs Erwood explained that of the 29 heritage sites eligible for rates remission (heritage society registered), 16 are privately owned. The remainder are council properties. In terms of costing, there is no set procedure in place.
- Mrs Radich advised that no other councils that she investigated have a heritage remission policy. Some choose to support by way of heritage funding.
- Councillor Jones suggested that elected members be presented with options enabling heritage sites to be supported. This was reiterated by the Deputy Mayor who added that all ratepayers received the same benefits in terms of roads, water and waste and that the community was the beneficiary of the heritage sites. He would like to see heritage sites supported in a different way.
- Mayor Volzke suggested that while removing the remission would satisfy the rating demand, support to private and public heritage buildings could be through the Community Relationships Policy being considered for finalisation later in this meeting. The Director – Community Services confirmed that this was an option.
- The Deputy Mayor moved that the rates remission policy covering land with a heritage structure be removed and council officers consider and report on other options of support. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Webby.

The meeting closed at 1.37pm.

A L Jamieson
CHAIRMAN

Confirmed this 26th May day of 2020.

N C Volzke
DISTRICT MAYOR

**MINUTES OF THE POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING OF
THE STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD BY AUDIO VISUAL LINK
ON TUESDAY 28 APRIL 2020 AT 3 PM**

PRESENT

The Deputy Mayor A L Jamieson (the Chairman), the District Mayor N C Volzke, Councillors M McKay, V R Jones, R W Coplestone, P S Dalziel, G W Boyde, W J Sandford, A K Harris, J M S Erwood, and G M Webby.

IN ATTENDANCE

The Chief Executive – Mr S Hanne, the Director Community Services – Ms K Whareaitu, the Director Corporate Services – Mrs T Radich, the Director Assets – Mrs V Araba, the Director Environmental Services – Mr B Sutherland, the Executive Administration Officer – Ms R Vanstone, the Roading Asset Manager – Mr S Bowden, the Communications Manager – Ms G Gibson, the Community Development Manager – Mr C Julie (*part meeting*), the Community Development Officer – Mr P Boyd (*part meeting*), the Senior Library Officer – Mrs B Roper and two members of the media (Stratford Press and Taranaki Daily News).

1. **WELCOME**

The Deputy Mayor welcomed the District Mayor, the Chief Executive, Councillors, staff and the media.

2. **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS INTEREST**

The Deputy Mayor requested Councillors to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda.

There were no declarations of interest.

5. **ATTENDANCE SCHEDULE**

The Attendance Schedule for Policy and Services Committee meetings was attached.

6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

6.1 Policy and Services Committee Meeting – 25 February 2020

D20/3404 Pages 7-15

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the minutes of the Policy and Services Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 25 February 2020, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

COPLESTONE/McKAY
Carried
P&S/20/43

The Executive Administration Officer undertook to make the following amendments:

- Amend the spelling error, *Wolzke* to *Volzke* in the item 12 recommendation.
- Correct the wording error under item 13.1 where Councillor Harris asked how the district compared with other councils in terms of the waste levy, not solid waste.

6.2 Policy and Services Committee Meeting (Bylaws Hearing) – 14 April 2020

D20/6328 Pages 16-20

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the minutes of the Policy and Services Committee Meeting to hear and consider submissions to the Wastewater and Solid Waste Bylaws held on Tuesday 14 April 2020, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

WEBBY/HARRIS
Carried
P&S/20/44

7. MATTERS OUTSTANDING

D16/47 Page 21

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the matters outstanding be received.

ERWOOD/BOYDE
Carried
P&S/20/45

The Chief Executive reported the following:

- The renumbering of Pembroke Road is underway by council officers. Elected members have been involved in initial conversations in workshop.
- The Percy Thomson investment profile and funding for Whakaahurangi Marae will be addressed in this meeting under the Corporate Services report and the Policy Review item, respectively.
- Temporary fences will be dealt with in a future policy review.

8. **DECISION REPORT – I-SITE AND LIBRARY OPENING HOURS**

D20/6329

Pages 22-28

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.

COPLESTONE/WEBBY
Carried
P&S/20/46

2. THAT Option 7 is adopted as the future opening hours for the co-location of the Visitor Information and Library services.

VOLZKE/BOYDE
Against DALZIEL & JONES
Carried
P&S/20/47

Recommended Reason

Opening hours of the co-location of the Visitor Information and Library services should be adopted in order to progress and plan for the co-location to be implemented.

6.4

The Director – Community Services noted the following points:

- Plans are underway for the co-location to commence as soon as possible and council is now looking at the operations' hours, staffing plans and communication to users. It is worth noting that the delivery of the service is expected to be together.
- Council officers are recommending option 7 (as noted in paragraph 7.4 and appendix B of the decision report). The proposed operating hours are below what the I-Site is currently open for but above the libraries opening hours.
- A weekday opening time of 8.30am would allow bus users to utilise the facility and interact with staff to purchase additional tickets, for instance. A closing time of 5pm is recommended as analysis shows that a minimum number of users are utilising library services between 5-5.30pm. Weekend hours are proposed as Saturday 9am-1pm to capture summer's visitors and tourists and winter's sports players, particularly those from the eastern communities. Option 7 opts out of opening on public holidays.
- Currently, the I-Site does not open until 10am and sees a drop off in users between 12 noon and 1pm. AA does not provide telephone support after 12 noon on a Saturday to its counters. and the service does not operate on public holidays.
- Councillor Jones asked if any analysis had been completed on the staff required for the proposed opening hours. Overall, the more hours that the service is open, the more it costs in terms of overheads and cost savings is one of the main reasons for combining the services, as confirmed by the Deputy Mayor. Ms Whareaitu clarified that initial workings showed a saving of one full-time equivalent position and other considerations included aiming to do away with the lone-worker situation.
- Councillor Boyde agreed that option 7 looked to be a good option. He sought clarification on whether the new roles, which are quite different for each service, are well defined. Ms Whareaitu clarified that this was being worked through currently with the ultimate aim to have customer service officers working across both services. She added that one or two staff had started training already.
- The Deputy Mayor considered operational hours to be a management decision. The Chief Executive confirmed future 'tweaking' of hours to be an operational issue however this proposal represents a significant change affecting level of service.
- Mayor Volzke observed from the graphs that the library and I-Site were frequented at similar times suggesting that the services were quite complimentary and that users went from one to

another. He therefore suggested that the proposed times were right and did not require major change. Mayor Volzke supported and Councillor Boyde seconded, option 7.

- While Councillor Dalziel agreed that option 7 was workable, his preference was for option 6. He questioned what additional business bus users bought before 9am and he considered that a service should be provided during the summer public holidays including Easter. Councillor Coplestone agreed and asked why the library service could not be ‘chained off’. Ms Whareaitu clarified that this was considered however it was felt that the entire service should be available. There were also staffing and security issues to consider. The Senior Library Officer advised that the library was a flexible space which could be used in a number of different ways. Library staff were wary of making structural changes to the building.
- Councillor Erwood was also in favour of option 7.
- Councillor’s Dalziel and Jones were against the recommendation.

9. DECISION REPORT – DRAFT COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

D20/6145

Pages 34-39

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.

McKAY/BOYDE
Carried
P&S/20/48

2. THAT the *draft* Communication and Engagement Strategy be adopted and released for public feedback and brought back in June for deliberations and adoption.

JAMIESON/McKAY
Carried
P&S/20/49

Recommended Reason

The recommendation from the Committee is required to initiate the public feedback process and adopt the draft strategy as a framework for supporting communication and engagement between Council and the community.

The Director – Community Services acknowledged the work done by the Communications Manager in getting the strategy to this stage.

Questions/Points of clarification:

- When questioned by the Deputy Mayor, the Communications Manager clarified that a brand audit was a refresh of the external facing communication tools of council - publications, documents, logo and website.
- Councillor Dalziel asked what value potentially expensive public consultation added as from his perspective, the document read well. Ms Gibson clarified that it was appropriate to share the draft with the community adding that she values any feedback the public can provide in terms of how they wish to be engaged with. The Deputy Mayor shared this view noting that communication and engagement had been bought up many times in the 2019 customer satisfaction survey.
- Councillor Dalziel sought clarification on the costs associated with the brand reset, including website. Ms Gibson confirmed that all initiatives in the strategy were planned for the current budget and no extra would be required. Consultation costs would be met from within the normal operating budget. Councillor Dalziel looks forward to the confirmation of these costs.

- Councillor Webby added that consultation was another opportunity for transparency within council.
- Mayor Volzke sought consistency when referring to either Māori contribution, as referred to in the Local Government Act, or participation.

10. DECISION REPORT – POLICY REVIEWS 2018/19 & 2019/20 – TENTH TRANCHE

D20/5077

Pages 49-54

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/HARRIS
Carried
P&S/20/50

2. THAT the attached, updated and new policies, being the:

*Asset Management Policy (updated), and the
Community Relationships Policy (new)*

be adopted.

HARRIS/McKAY
Carried
P&S/20/51

Recommended Reason

This is part of the policy review round currently under way. Policies require review from time to time to ensure they still reflect current legislation and best practice, as well as the views and business needs of the organisation. The policies recommended for withdrawal have either been found to be not required, amalgamated into an existing policy or replaced by a new policy as outlined in the body of this report.

The Chief Executive noted that the Asset Management Policy update includes a minor textual change while the Community Relationships Policy attempts to provide a more consistent approach to collaboration with community groups. Historically these relationships have evolved. It makes sense to apply the same lens across all groups in order to be fair, equitable and to get the best outcomes.

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Mayor Volzke would like to add ‘sustainable’ under the heading of *Roles and Responsibilities* in the Asset Management Policy (page 57 refers).
- Mayor Volzke sought clarification on lifecycle management asking at what point council officers depreciated the value of an asset and determined that it needed replacing. Mrs Araba confirmed that the Asset Management Policy is a high level statement of how staff will undertake asset reviews. When it comes to determining whether or not an asset needs to be replaced a database such as RAM for roading or Asset Finder for three waters, is the first indicator. A visual check is also completed. Mr Bowden talked elected members through the process involved in reviewing a bridge replacement. He said that a detailed check of the bridge is conducted every 6 years. As the bridge approaches end of life, there are more frequent visits. Maintenance checks also consider options to prolong life.

11. **MONTHLY REPORTS**11.1 **ASSETS REPORTS**

D20/3462 (March) & D20/3462 (Feb)

Pages 76-107

RECOMMENDATIONTHAT the reports be received.BOYDE/McKAY
Carried
P&S/20/52

6.4

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Councillor Boyde requested an update on the progress of the subdivision in relation to budget. Mrs Araba advised that she is keeping a watching brief.
- In response to a question from Councillor Coplestone, the Roading Asset Manager clarified that the Kohuratahi Bridge work had fallen behind due to the COVID-19 lock-down however bulk of the timber replacement had been completed. Ironwork was yet to be done. The cost is expected to be just over \$100,000 as budgeted.
- Mayor Volzke sought an update on roadworks at Tututawa. Mr Bowden responded that work had been expected to be completed by the end of March but was delayed due to COVID-19. Work crews were being remobilised this week with the priority being finishing the structural metalling of the road. There is a risk that sealing the road will be delayed due to encroaching winter weather.
- Mayor Volzke asked for an update on the status of the Bike Park project – the cost of which seemed to be increasing significantly and was now ridiculously expensive. Mr Hanne noted that this update would be added to matters outstanding.
- Councillor Boyde advised that the council farms yearly target had been surpassed and the farm was performing outstandingly well in relation to the once a day or 16 hour milking schedule.
- The Deputy Mayor asked, in relation to dumped tyres (page 132 refers) just outside the road reserve on private land, whether the landowner had been informed. Mr Bowden clarified that the landowner had reported the dumping. He estimated a cost of \$10,000 to remove by council warning that this would set a precedent. Following questioning by Councillor Harris, Mr Hanne confirmed that there was no correlation between this dumping and a LGOIMA request seeking information about dumped tyres in February. Mayor Volzke asked whether this matter should be reported to the Taranaki Regional Council as dumped tyres on private land were surely an objectionable, environmental issue.
- Councillor Dalziel sought clarification on the \$45,000 in NZTA funding received (page 100 refers) for a State Highway 3 roading project. Mr Bowden clarified that this initial sum of money covered consultant's fees to look at crossing points on Broadway under the Walking and Cycling Strategy.

The Community Development Manager, Community Development Officer and the Stratford Press reporter all left the meeting at 3.59pm.

14.2 COMMUNITY SERVICES REPORTS

D20/3459 (March) & D20/3459 (Feb)

Pages 120-137

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the reports be received.

WEBBY/McKAY
Carried
P&S/20/53

6.4

The Director – Community Services noted the following points:

- Prior to lock-down the successful event highlights included Colour in the Park, the Positive Aging Forum and Children’s Day.
- Sport New Zealand Rural Travel funding is on hold until the impacts of COVID-19 are better understood. The closing date for Creative Communities funding has been extended however it is likely to be a similar short-term outcome.
- Some data could not be reported due to the closure of facilities.

14.2.1 Council Organisation and Council Representatives on Other Organisations

- The Deputy Mayor acknowledged the efforts of the Safer Communities Trust, those contributors to the regional emergency management effort and community organisations such as Team Hope and many others for the efforts made to care and protect the communities vulnerable during the COVID-19 crisis.
- Councillor Coplestone sought an update on digital enablement on Broadway. Ms Whareaitu reported that options were being explored and would be bought back to elected members for consideration.

14.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES REPORTS

D20/3382 (March) & D20/3382 (Feb)

Pages 138-151

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the reports be received.

HARRIS/McKAY
Carried
P&S/20/54

The Director – Environmental Services noted that the next month’s reporting would give a clearer picture of the effects of COVID-19. There were no questions from elected members.

14.4 CORPORATE SERVICES REPORTS

D20/4445 (March) & D20/4445 (Feb)

Pages 152-179

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the reports be received.

BOYDE/ERWOOD
Carried
P&S/20/55

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following points:

- It was her preference to provide the report in its entirety every month.
- The Percy Thomson Trust investment schedule was presented as requested.
- Mrs Radich confirmed that she would keep a watching brief of the cash flow situation as revenue had dropped significantly due to facility closures and rates payment cancellations (by automatic payment).

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Councillor Dalziel asked for further clarification as to the treatment of the Campbell property ‘in the books’. Mrs Radich advised that she would separate sale and loss in the future.
- Mrs Radich shared Councillor Dalziel’s concerns about the Percy Thomson Trust’s reliance on commercial property investment, especially in the current environment. Councillor Dalziel asked whether the trust could repatriate some of those investments. Mr Hanne advised that this question ought to be posed to the trust itself. As a ‘CCO’ (Council Controlled Organisation) the council’s influence extends to the appointment of trustees whereas shareholdership is a concern of the trust.
- Mayor Volzke supported Councillor Dalziel’s view and asked for more detail around the trust’s investments in order to know the position of these. This request was supported by Councillors Boyde and Coplestone and was added matters outstanding.
- Councillor Boyde, in referring to the district’s rates valuations to be conducted by QV at the end of this year, noted his interest in seeing if and how the COVID-19 crisis affects valuations.

15. QUESTIONS

- At the request of Councillor Dalziel, Mr Hanne advised that council officers had attempted to colour code the parts of the monthly reports which could be reported monthly (red shading) or three monthly (yellow shading). Director’s feedback was that this would not reduce their workload however, as two report templates would be required to be maintained and the data would still need to be collated on a monthly basis. Also, some measures are required to be reported monthly for the annual report mechanism although it was possible to negotiate this with the next auditor.
- Councillor Boyde suggested that he had no issue with detail while Councillor Dalziel clarified that he had suggested streamlining to save on reading time. Councillors were satisfied with the current monthly reporting format.
- Councillor Dalziel asked Mr Hanne what he was doing to reduce council’s running costs at a time when small businesses were facing tough economic decisions. Mayor Volzke responded that all councils were accelerating their capital spend and considering ways to reduce their costs without cutting core functions or economic development. Mr Hanne added that council was constantly reviewing its costs with a view to reduction especially as central government passes more and more responsibility to deliver essential services to local government. He suggested that it would be adverse at this point to reduce staffing given that COVID-19 is a reasonably short-term event. In addition, most contracts go through a tender process and exit penalties apply. The council utilises all of government procurement procedures to find the cheapest ways to procure services and the annual plan process has identified further areas to reduce costs.
- Councillor Dalziel was not convinced that the proposed rating increase of 4.3% was final especially given South Taranaki District Council’s proposed a zero rates increase. Mr Hanne confirmed that a rates position was a political decision however he reiterated that this council consistently applies the procurement policy.
- Mayor Volzke clarified that the time to review rates is after feedback comes in. If that feedback is significant and meaningful it would be considered and/or changes made.

The meeting closed at 4.46pm.

A L Jamieson
CHAIRMAN

Confirmed this 26th day of May 2020.

N C Volzke
DISTRICT MAYOR

6.4



Committee	Taranaki Emergency Management Group Joint Committee		
Date	3 March 2020, 1.30pm		
Venue:	Taranaki Regional Council chambers, 47 Cloten Road, Stratford		
Document:	2441793		

Members:	Councillors	M Cloke	Taranaki Regional Council
		P Nixon	South Taranaki District Council
		N Volzke	Stratford District Council
Attending	Messrs	M Nield	Taranaki Regional Council <i>(part meeting - left 3.17pm)</i>
		S Hanne	Stratford District Council
		C Campbell-Smart	Taranaki Emergency Management
		T Velvin	Taranaki Emergency Management
		A Hickey	
	Ms	M Meads	Consultancy Services
	Councillor	C Littlewood	Taranaki Regional Council <i>(part meeting - left 3.30pm)</i>

Apologies Apologies from Mayor N Holdom and Mr C Stevenson from New Plymouth District Council and Mr W Crockett from South Taranaki District Council were received and sustained.

Notification of Late Items There were no late items.

1. Appointment of Chairperson

1.1 Mr M Nield, Director – Corporate Services, Taranaki Regional Council, took the Chair for the Appointment of the Chairperson.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- receives the memorandum *Appointment of Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Chairperson.*
- appoints Tom Cloke as Chairperson of the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee
- agrees that the term of the appointment of the Chairperson of the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee be until the October

2022 local authority elections unless resolved otherwise or section 30(9) of the Local Government Act 2002 applies.

Volzke/Nixon

2. Confirmation of Minutes – 17 September 2019

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) takes as read and confirms the minutes and resolutions of the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee meeting held at the Taranaki Regional Council, 47 Cloten Road, Stratford, on Tuesday 17 September 2019 at 10.30am
- b) notes that the unconfirmed minutes of the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee meeting held at the Taranaki Regional Council, 47 Cloten Road, Stratford, on Tuesday 17 September 2019 at 10.30am have been circulated to the Taranaki Regional Council, New Plymouth District Council, Stratford District Council and South Taranaki District Council for their receipt and information.

Cloke/Volzke

Matters Arising

- 2.1 Concerns around attendance at advisory group meetings were raised a letter will be sent to representative organisations by Mr C Campbell-Smart.
- 2.2 The \$260,031 underspend redistribution to Councils has been actioned an update will be provided later in the agenda under Annual Budget.
- 2.3 There has been nothing formal received in regards to the Group Submission which was made.
- 2.4 TEMO have moved to their temporary accommodation in Terminal 2 at the New Plymouth Airport. Pitch roof repairs have been delayed by 4-6 weeks.

3. Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Co-ordinating Group Minutes – 27 February 2020

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the minutes of the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Coordinating Executive Group meeting held in the Taranaki Regional Council chambers, 47 Cloten Road, Stratford, on Thursday 15 27 February 2020 at 10.36 am.
- b) adopts the recommendations therein.

Cloke/Volzke

Matters Arising

- 3.1 Some of the agenda papers for today's meeting refer back to the agenda papers from CEG however, there was no time to put this information in to the agenda before it needed to be made publicly available, these updates will be made verbally.

4. Taranaki Civil Defence Advisory Group Minutes

That the Taranaki Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the unconfirmed minutes of the meeting of the Readiness & Response Advisory Group (RARAG) held on 20 November 2019
- b) receives the unconfirmed minutes of the Taranaki Seismic and Volcanic Advisory Group held on 27 November 2019
- c) receives the unconfirmed minutes of the meeting of the Taranaki HAZMAT Coordination Committee Meeting held on 4 February 2020
- d) receives the unconfirmed minutes of the meeting of the Risk Reduction Advisory Group (RRAG) held on 5 February 2020

Cloke/Nixon

5. Quarter Two Performance Report

- 5.1 Mr C Campbell-Smart, spoke to the memorandum presenting the 2019/20 Quarter Two Performance Report for the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group.
- 5.2 Concerns were raised around the lack of statutory roles that are being filled and the availability of people to fill these roles. It would be helpful if there could be some people in these roles from other areas that could step in if required. Mr A Hickey, informed that this would open up for these people would be able to spend Council money.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the Memorandum, *Quarter Two Performance Report 2019/20*.
- b) approves that Craig Campbell-Smart approach neighbouring Emergency Management organisations to obtain people in statutory roles that can be pre-approved to respond to an event in Taranaki if required.

Cloke/Nixon

6. Capability Assessment Report for Taranaki CDEM Group from the Monitoring & Evaluation Process

- 6.1 Ms M Mead, Consultancy Services, spoke to the memorandum presenting the Capability Assessment Report 2020 for Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group.

- 6.2 Taranaki Emergency Management will be reviewing the recommendations and comparing against their current work plan and then look at reprioritisation.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the memorandum *Capability Assessment Report for Taranaki CDEM Group from the Monitoring & Evaluation Process*
- b) approves the recommendation presented verbally as determined at the Coordinating Executive Group meeting held 27 February 2020.
- c) instructs the Taranaki Emergency Management Office (TEMO) to facilitate a workshop reviewing the roles and responsibilities for CDEM local delivery and regional coordination, and Council CDEM statutory responsibilities.

Cloke/Nixon

7. Annual Budget 2020-2021

- 7.1 Mr C Campbell Smart, CDEM Regional Manager, spoke to the memorandum presenting the draft Annual Plan 2020-21 budget for the CDEM Group Office with consideration of actual Council budgeted amounts.
- 7.2 This budget has been prepared based on year three of the long term plans and included some other decisions that the joint committee has approved.
- 7.3 Mr C Campbell-Smart will draft a letter to the Ministry to inform of the struggle with our ability to fund the improvements and changes that are sought and the timelines in which those recommendations are expected to be completed.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the Memorandum, *TEMO Annual Plan Budget 2020-21*
- b) notes the budget development notes contained within the report, and draft budget options A through D, attached to this report
- c) approves the recommended budget option C.

Volzke/Nixon

8. Group Financial Policy including Reserve Policy

- 8.1 Mr C Campbell Smart, CDEM Regional Manager, spoke to the memorandum presenting Group Financial and Operational Reserve Policy for the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group and answered questions arising.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the Memorandum, *Group Financial Policy, including Reserve Policy*

- b) approves the Group Financial Policy, including the Reserve Policy, and that the maximum operational reserve is \$200,000 as the any amendments presented verbally as determined by the Coordinating Executive Group meeting held 27 February 2020.

Cloke/Nixon

9. Elected Member Briefing

- 9.1 Mr C Campbell Smart, CDEM Regional Manager, spoke to the memorandum and gave a presentation regarding elected members roles in emergencies and response.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the report and presentation *Elected Member Briefing*

Cloke/Nixon

10. Resignation of Matthew Parkinson as Group Recovery Manager

- 10.1 Mr C Campbell Smart, CDEM Regional Manager, spoke to the memorandum advising the Taranaki CDEM Group of the resignation of the Mr Matthew Parkinson as Taranaki Group Recovery Manager and to outline a process for replacement of this statutory position.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the memorandum *Resignation of Matthew Parkinson as Group Recovery Manager*.
- b) records the resignation of Mr Matthew Parkinson as Taranaki CDEM Group Recovery Manager
- c) determines that a letter of appreciation be sent to Mr Matthew Parkinson
- d) approves the options presented verbally
- I. Taranaki Councils nominate an existing senior and suitable qualified staff member for appointment to the role of Primary Group Recovery Manager;
 - II. TEMO investigate options for the funding and appointment of a primary Group Recovery Manager employed through the Group Office;
 - III. The interim appointment of Kelvin Wright as Primary Group Recovery Manager to the end of June 2020.

Cloke/Volzke

11. Appointment of Todd Velvin as Alternative Group Controller and Retirement of David Leask

- 11.1 Mr C Campbell Smart, CDEM Regional Manager, spoke to the memorandum recommending the appointment of Mr Todd Velvin to the role of Alternative Group Controller by the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Group and

to acknowledge the retirement of Mr David Leask from his role of Alternative Group Controller.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee:

- a) receives the memorandum *Appointment of Todd Velvin as Alternative Group Controller and retirement of David Leask*
- b) appoints Mr Todd Velvin to the role of Alternate Group Controller, to the Taranaki CDEM Group Joint Committee
- c) records the of Mr David Leask has provided for the Taranaki CDEM Group in his time as alternative Group Controller
- d) determines that a letter of appreciation be send to Mr David Leask.
Cloke/Volzke

12. General Business

12.1 Coronavirus

An update was provided on Corona virus and the preparation work that TEMO are doing in the event a pandemic is declared. There are currently over 100,000 confirmed cases worldwide. They have lost the ability to trace the source so it is now out in the communities. If there is an outbreak within the region it would be handled by the Ministry of Health then the Taranaki District Health Board. Emergency Management are currently working with both agencies around what needs to be done in the event Taranaki gets cases.

There being no further business the Group Chairperson Tom Cloke thanked attendees and declared the Taranaki Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Meeting closed at 3.59pm.

Confirmed

Chairperson _____

M J Cloke
2 June 2020



Date	20 February 2020, 10.30am
Venue:	Taranaki Regional Council chambers, 47 Cloten Road, Stratford
Document:	2430273

Members	Councillors	N W Walker	Taranaki Regional Council
		R Handley	New Plymouth District Council
		B Roach	South Taranaki District Council
		A Jamieson	Stratford District Council
Attending	Councillor	D McIntyre	(Taranaki Regional Council)
	Mr	G Bedford	(Taranaki Regional Council)
	Mrs	H Gerrard	(Taranaki Regional Council)
	Ms	J Mack	(Taranaki Regional Council)
	Mrs	K Hope	(New Plymouth District Council)
	Mr	D Miller	(South Taranaki District Council)
	Mrs	V Araba	(Stratford District Council)
	Ms	T Jensen	(EnviroWaste)
	Ms	J Dearden	(New Plymouth District Council)
	Ms	T Rankin	(Kellogg Rural Leadership Programme)

Apologies Apologies were received from Councillor M Bellringer, South Taranaki District Council and Mr M Oien, Stratford District Council.
Jamieson/Roach

Notification of There were no late items.

Late items

1. Appointment of Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson

- 1.1 Mr G K Bedford, Director Environment Quality, Taranaki Regional Council, called for nominations for Chairperson of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee.

Nominated: Councillor N W Walker Roach/Handley

- 1.2 There being no further nominations, Councillor N W Walker (Taranaki Regional Council) was elected Chairperson of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee.

- 1.3 Mr G K Bedford, Taranaki Regional Council, vacated the Chair to Councillor N W Walker.
- 1.4 Councillor N W Walker, Chairperson, called for nominations for Deputy Chairperson of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee.

Nominated: Councillor A Jamieson Roach/Handley

- 1.5 There being no further nominations, Councillor A Jamieson (Stratford District Council) was elected Deputy Chairperson of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee.

Resolves

That the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee:

- a) receives this memorandum *Appointment of Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson*
- b) appoints Councillor N W Walker, Taranaki Regional Council, as Chairperson of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management (Joint) Committee
- c) considers the appointment of a Deputy Chairperson of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management (Joint) Committee if required and appoints Councillor A Jamieson, Stratford District Council as Deputy Chairperson of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management (Joint) Committee
- d) agrees that the term of the appointment of the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management (Joint) Committee be until the October 2022 local authority elections unless resolved otherwise or section 30(9) of the Local Government Act 2002 applies.

Roach/Handley

2. Confirmation of Minutes - 22 August 2019

Resolves

That the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee:

- a) takes as read and confirms the minutes and resolutions of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee meeting held at NPDC Materials Recovery Facility, Colson Road Landfill, New Plymouth on Thursday 22 August 2019 at 10.35am
- b) notes that the minutes of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee meeting held at NPDC Materials Recovery Facility, Colson Road Landfill, New Plymouth on Thursday 22 August 2019 at 10.35am were authenticated by the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee Chairperson, N W Walker and the Taranaki Regional Council Chief Executive, B G Chamberlain, pursuant to standing orders.
- c) notes that the unconfirmed minutes of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee meeting held at the NPDC Materials Recovery Facility, Colson Road Landfill, New Plymouth on Thursday 22 August 2019 at 10.35am, have been circulated to the Taranaki Regional Council, New Plymouth District Council,

Stratford District Council and South Taranaki District Council for their receipt and information.

Roach/Jamieson

3. Regional Waste Minimisation Officer Report

- 3.1 Ms J Dearden, New Plymouth District Council, spoke to the memorandum on significant activities undertaken by the RMO in collaboration with the district council officers, waste minimisation activities in the wider community and other matters of potential interest to the Committee.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Regional Council:

- a) receives the memorandum Regional Waste Minimisation Officer's Report and notes the activities of the Regional Waste Minimisation Officer.

Jamieson/Handley

4. Kellogg Rural Leadership

- 4.1 Mrs Trish Rankin, gave a presentation on an overview of the research that she has undertaken relating to farm waste and the circular economy.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Regional Council:

- a) receives the presentation by Trish Rankin "What a Waste! – My Story" Improve Farm Waste & Journey towards a Circular Economy.

Walker/Roach

Mrs Rankin left the meeting at 11.35am

5. TSWMC Regional Submission on Landfill Levy February 2020

- 5.1 Mrs K Hope, New Plymouth District Council, spoke to the memorandum to advise Members that the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) had released a consultation document, Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy. Submissions were open up until 3 February 2020.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Regional Council:

- a) receives and notes the final submission to MfE on behalf of the TSWMC.

Handley/Roach

6. Update on NPDC Kerbside Foodscraps and Landfill Collection Service

- 6.1 Mrs K Hope, New Plymouth District Council, spoke to the memorandum to update members on NPDC's Kerbside collection of foodscraps as well as the landfill collection service.
- 6.2 It was noted that one of the tables has been updated since the agenda was compiled. Mrs K Hope, will circulate this to members.

Recommended

That the Taranaki Regional Council:

- a) receives the memorandum Update on NPDC Kerbside Foodscraps and Landfill Collection Service.

Handley/Roach

There being no further business, Committee Chairperson, Councillor N W Walker declared the meeting of the Taranaki Solid Waste Management Committee closed at 12noon.

Confirmed

Chairperson _____

N W Walker

21 May 2020



MONTHLY REPORT

TO: District Council
FROM: District Mayor
DATE: 12 May 2020
SUBJECT: **REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL 2020**

F19/13/04 – D20/8008

7

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the District Mayor's report be received.

Moved/Seconded

1. COVID – 19 CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY

The COVID-19 pandemic has continued to dominate every conversation and decision making process over the month of April and will remain at the forefront of our mind for some months to come. It is a huge relief to look back at April and be able to say that the new cases being recorded have fallen dramatically during that period and note that Taranaki has fared really well. It seems that the ongoing fall in new cases that allowed us to progress from Alert Level 4 to Level 3, may allow us to Level 2 within the very near future.

As we prepare to move to Alert Level 2 the focus of the emergency management has been shifting from a health based response to a welfare and economic recovery response. It goes without saying that for many individuals and businesses the road ahead will be very bumpy. It is our responsibility as a council to play a role to assist with the recovery, something we can do in different ways than other support packages.

Council is well advanced in its preparation for Alert 2 and will endeavour to have its facilities open for use, as permitted, and in ways that comply with the safety protocols. An example of a key service is building consents and inspections, which are vital for the building trades to operate, and where council can make a difference by speeding up processes.

Once again, I take this opportunity to acknowledge and thank council staff who have embraced the challenges of working under arduous conditions to keep council facilities and services functioning. In addition, some staff have played an important role in the operation of the Emergency Control Centre in New Plymouth, ensuring that Stratford District Council has played its part in the regional response.

I also thank the community as a whole because generally people have responded well to the rules and conditions of Alert Level 4, even though it was tough to do so. Like others though, I have expressed my concerns that following the move to Level 3 we have seen an increase in breaches of the rules around social distancing and gatherings of groups of people. We cannot over emphasise the need to maintain the social distancing rules if we want to hammer home the gains made in recent weeks.

2. ANZAC DAY

It was hugely disappointing that we were not able to hold our annual, traditional commemorative services for ANZAC Day 2020. An ANZAC Day without a dawn parade, a street march or a civic service seems so lacking given the significance of the day however, the alternative arrangements did give us the opportunity to remember the fallen.

The national promotion by the RSA to stand at your gate at 6:00am, was well supported in Stratford and as I looked down our street, there were plenty of cell phone lights to be seen. It was quite haunting to hear someone nearby playing the last post which echoed around the area and even more moving when a loan piper played Amazing Grace. The sound from the pipes carried some distance across town and were welcomed by many people. On behalf of the community, I stood alone and laid a wreath at the Cross of Sacrifice and the Malone Memorial Gates but look forward to a traditional commemoration next year.

3. CORRESPONDENCE - See attached.

4. SOME EVENTS ATTENDED

- Attended multiple video meetings of the ECC Controller and Governance Group
- Attended multiple video meetings of the regional Mayors and Chairs
- Attended multiple video meetings of the regional Emergency Services
- Attended multiple webinars on financial impacts of COVID
- More FM Interviews (x2)
- Daily News Interviews (multiple)
- Stratford Press Articles
- Attended Council Meetings
- Attended Council Workshops



**N C Volzke JP
DISTRICT MAYOR**

Stratford Volunteer Fire Brigade Call Outs April 2020

The Stratford Fire Brigade responded to 11 calls in April 2020

- 07-04-20 Tanker required at vegetation fire Ahuroa Road Toko assist Toko Fire Brigade
- 10-04-20 Fire inside a shed Kent Terrace Midhirst
- 11-04-20 Assist ambulance with medical call Tybalt Street
- 11-04-20 Motor vehicle accident car vs. bank SH 3 / Brookes Road assisted by the Eltham Fire Brigade
- 12-04-20 Vegetation fire Brookes Road
- 12-04-20 Tanker required at third alarm vegetation fire Hastings Road Matapu
- 18-04-20 Assist ambulance with medical call Olivia Street
- 20-04-20 Car fire Page Street
- 21-04-20 Investigate rubbish fire Fookes Street Midhirst
- 25-04-20 Scene protection required following motor vehicle accident East Road
- 26-04-20 Tanker required to assist New Plymouth Fire Brigade at a reported house fire Carrington Road. Stood down before arrival.

Rhonda Vanstone

Subject: RE: NZMCA's Commitment to you

From: Bruce Lochore <bruce@nzmca.org.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 30 April 2020 12:18 p.m.

Subject: FW: NZMCA's Commitment to you

Good afternoon to the Mayors and CEO's of our NZMCA Motorhome Friendly Towns

As our country looks to rebuild its economy in the aftermath of the Covid-19 lockdown, I'm writing to advise that the NZMCA is doubling down on its commitment to our Motorhome Friendly partnership with your Council and community – at our expense.

We're committing to a multi-pronged, national promotional campaign that's designed to revitalise responsible Motorhome Tourism in our 55 Motorhome Friendly towns this Spring*.

Highlights of the campaign (which we will fund) will include:

- * An absolute focus on our partners – you, the Motorhome Friendly towns;
- * Expanded promotion of Motorhome Friendly towns through our member magazine, our website and regular member eNewsletters;
- * Motorhome Friendly Celebration – 50,000 copies of a 120-plus page, full-colour magazine to encourage our members to stop, stay and spend in the Motorhome Friendly towns;
- * Introduction of a new NZMCA App that links directly to Motorhome Friendly destinations;
- * A renewed focus on our Events program in Motorhome Friendly towns – drawing a line in the sand to give Event organisers the confidence to commit to setting a date for their next event;
- * Supporting the campgrounds in your area with an expanded CampSaver program;
- * Plus, we are investigating the feasibility of reviving RV Explorers, the motorhome-based TV programme which has already provided mainstream TV coverage for such Motorhome Friendly regions as the Far North, Whangarei, Whanganui, Tarawera, Thames-Coromandel and Kaikoura.

The NZMCA is ideally placed to lead such an initiative; because while much of the tourism industry is going to be playing catch-up with domestic tourism, it's our area of expertise. When all the focus was on international tourists in the big-name destinations, we've led the charge to ensure that rural and provincial New Zealand got its fair share of tourist dollars.

We have appreciated your support in doing that and in these tough times we want to reassure you that we're still here for you.

So, come Spring, we're 'going hard' to once again bring responsible Motorhome Tourists in Certified Self-Contained vehicles to your Motorhome Friendly town.

In making these plans we're very aware that we are now operating in a 'new normal' which will be significantly different to what we have all become used to.

An obvious example of that is with international tourists out of the picture for the foreseeable future, domestic tourism – which already accounts for almost 60 per cent of the industry's revenue – is going to be more important than ever. In fact, it's the only game in town.

Another example will be how tourists get to your region and where they come from. With our airline services decimated, domestic tourists will not be travelling by air in the short to medium term – they will be going by road. That means proximity is important; so the majority of your visitors are most likely to come from the two or three regions closest to you.

Those changes are tailor-made for what the NZMCA has to offer. We have been heavily promoting domestic tourism – particularly in rural and provincial areas – for the past six years, which means we don't have to wait for Government-led schemes to get up and running. We already know this market inside out and, as a result, our 95,000-plus membership is the most organised domestic tourism consumer group in the country.

What's more, that group is going to grow. With international travel now off the agenda until who knows when, we're anticipating significant growth in our membership as more and more Kiwis discover motorhoming as the perfect way to explore this beautiful country of ours.

Right now, those members are sitting tight in lockdown – but they are just itching to get back out on the road once the Government signals it's safe to do so.

Having said that, we understand the health and safety of our fellow New Zealanders comes first, so unrestricted travel within the country is not going to be approved overnight. As I said earlier, this means our planning is based around 'rebooting' Motorhome Tourism floodgates this Spring*.

Finally, a couple of key questions:

What will all this promotion cost you?

Nothing, nix, naught, nil, zero, free...however you want to say it, this campaign is going to be funded by the NZMCA - at absolutely no cost to your community!

So what's the catch?

There's no catch – and no charge. All we ask is that you advise your RTO, the local iSite or your Chamber of Commerce about the promotion and ensure they play their part in providing the local information and facilitating contact with local businesses keen to take advantage of the promotional activity (again, at no cost to them) which enables us to show your community in all its glory.

** While Spring is our target launch date, this is of course dependent on the Government giving the all-clear for unrestricted travel with the country.*



BRUCE LOCHORE

Chief Executive Officer

New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc.

PO Box 72147 Papakura 2244

4 Graham Rd Takanini 2112

(09) 298 5466 ext 703 / Fax: (09) 298 5646

Mob: 027 298 5647 / bruce@nzmca.org.nz

www.nzmca.org.nz



CONFIDENTIALITY & PRIVILEGE NOTICE: The information in this e-mail and in any attachment may contain information which is legally privileged. It is intended only for the attention and use of the named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to retain, disclose, copy or distribute the message and/or any of its attachments. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify me and delete this message. Thank you.

DECISION REPORT



TO: Council

FROM: Chief Executive

DATE: 9 May 2020

SUBJECT: PROCUREMENT

F19/13/04 – D20/8360

8

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.
2. THAT Council adopt **Option 1** contained within this report, authorising the Chief Executive to suspend any elements of the procurement policy for projects as required to meet the eligibility criteria of COVID-19 related external stimulus funding requiring less than 30 per cent of local co-funding.

Recommended Reason

Option 1 is considered the most effective method to enable access to any external funding that requires either suspension of, or amendments to be made to Council's Procurement Policy. The application of the inherent authorisations is restricted to a narrow definition of projects and elements of the existing procurement policy, local co-funding to a maximum of 30 per cent and expenditure within current budgets – unless further expenditure is authorised by a separate report. These restrictions provide safeguards against any excessive application of the requested authority.

Moved/Seconded

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To enable Council to maximise the benefits of any external funding available to accelerate the economic recovery from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is recommended for Council to endorse a mechanism to suspend any elements of Council's Procurement Policy preventing access to external funding in a timely manner.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The COVID -19 pandemic has created unprecedented economic and social circumstances. The Government and other funders are responding to the economic impact of this pandemic through the provision of economic stimulus funding to councils and other organisations. This report anticipates that any economic stimulus funding in response to the economic impacts of COVID-19 will be conditional on the recipient meeting a range of criteria that will not align with Council's Procurement Policy. The purpose of this report is to find a balanced approach to maximising the benefit of any available external funding

while maintaining the principles of Council's procurement policy as much as possible.

3. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002 - SECTION 10**

How is this proposal applicable to the purpose of the Act?

- Is it for the provision of good quality local infrastructure? If so, why?; **OR**
 - Is it for the performance of a good quality regulatory function? If so, why?;
- OR**
- Is it for the performance of a good quality local public service?

AND

- Is it in a way that is most cost-effective to businesses and households? If so, why?

Good quality means, infrastructure, services, and performance that are efficient and effective, and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances.

Local public service means, a service provided for the community which is for the benefit of the District.

This proposal addresses the delivery of local infrastructure in the most cost effective way to businesses and households and therefore is in full alignment with the Act.

4. **BACKGROUND**

- 4.1 The COVID-19 pandemic has created unprecedented economic and social circumstances. The impact will not be even across the board with some sectors impacted more than others. The economic recovery is predicted to take several years. The community's well-being is therefore being tested.
- 4.2 In response to the impacts of COVID-19, including a forecasted decline in GDP and rise in unemployment, Council is currently considering mechanisms to support its community.
- 4.3 Council adopted a Procurement Policy in 2019. The purpose of the policy is to provide guidance to suppliers, contractors and the community on the key areas the Council will consider throughout the procurement process.
- 4.4 The existing Procurement Policy is considered unlikely to be flexible enough to capitalise on the opportunities provided by external stimulus funding and its application to stimulus projects would impact negatively on the economic recovery of the Stratford District as well as the wider Taranaki region.
- 4.5 To ensure competitive costing, Council has the ability to utilise a range of tools, such as open book pricing and comparison against scheduled items in competitively tendered similar works, including Council's maintenance contracts.

5. **CONSULTATIVE PROCESS**

5.1 **Public Consultation - Section 82**

No public consultation is considered necessary for this proposal. Where individual projects require consultation, this will be undertaken on a project specific basis.

5.2 **Māori Consultation - Section 81**

No separate Māori consultation is considered necessary for this proposal. Where individual projects require consultation, this will be undertaken on a project specific basis.

6. **RISK ANALYSIS**

Please refer to the Consequence and Impact Guidelines at the front of the reports in this agenda.

- Is there a:
 - financial risk;
 - human resources risk;
 - political risks; or
 - other potential risk?
- If there is a risk, consider the probability/likelihood of it occurring.
- Is there a legal opinion needed?

6.1 Any bypassing of the Procurement Policy has inherent probity and political risks, as it affects what is designed to be a level playing field. This has to be read in contrast to the alternative of not being able to uplift external funding. Risk is being minimised through the proposed suspension only applies to elements of Council’s Procurement Policy that would prevent the qualification for or uplift of external funding – not the procurement policy as a whole. It also only applies to a specific group of projects, rather than say all projects for a period of time.

7. **DECISION MAKING PROCESS - SECTION 79**

7.1 **Direction**

	Explain
Is there a strong link to Council’s strategic direction, Long Term Plan/District Plan?	It supports infrastructure delivery and economic development which are both anchored in the LTP.
What relationship does it have to the communities’ current and future needs for infrastructure, regulatory functions, or local public services?	This decision relates to infrastructure but solely from a procurement perspective.

7.2 **Data**

- Do we have complete data, and relevant statistics, on the proposal(s)?
- Do we have reasonably reliable data on the proposals?
- What assumptions have had to be built in?

This report anticipates that any economic stimulus funding in response to the economic impacts of COVID-19 will be conditional on the recipient meeting a range of criteria that will not align with Council’s Procurement Policy.

Should this assumption be incorrect, any authorisations given as a result of this decision report will remain without effect as their application is conditional on the existence of such criteria.

7.3 **Significance**

	Yes/No	Explain
Is the proposal significant according to the Significance Policy in the Long Term Plan?	No	Does not meet thresholds
Is it:	No	Once built any asset will form part of a strategic asset, in itself they are not.
• considered a strategic asset; or	No	
• above the financial thresholds in the Significance Policy; or	No	
• impacting on a CCO stakeholding; or	No	
• a change in level of service; or	No	
• creating a high level of controversy; or	No	
• possible that it could have a high impact on the community?	No	

In terms of the Council’s Significance Policy, is this proposal of high, medium, or low significance?		
HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
		X

7.4 **Options**

- An assessment of costs and benefits for each option must be completed. Use the criteria below in your assessment.
1. What options are available?
 2. For **each** option:
 - explain what the costs and benefits of each option are in terms of the present and future needs of the district;
 - outline if there are any sustainability issues; and
 - explain if the outcomes meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions?
 3. After completing these, consider which option you wish to recommend to Council, and explain:

- how this option is the most cost effective option for households and businesses;
- if there are any trade-offs; and
- what interdependencies exist.

Option 1: Authorise the Chief Executive to suspend any elements of the Procurement Policy as required to meet the eligibility criteria of COVID-19 related external stimulus funding for projects requiring less than 30 per cent of local co-funding.

Option 2: Determine that the suspension of any elements of the procurement policy to be eligible to meet the criteria of COVID-19 related external stimulus funding for projects requiring less than 30 per cent of local co-funding be considered by Council’s Executive Committee as and when required and delegate the authority to enable such a suspension to that committee.

Option 3: To determine that the suspension of any elements of Council’s Procurement Policy is undesirable and not apply for, or uplift any funding not aligned with this policy.

7.5 **Financial**

- Is there an impact on funding and debt levels?
- Will work be undertaken within the current budget?
- What budget has expenditure come from?
- How will the proposal be funded? eg. rates, reserves, grants etc.

To date, Council has submitted a total of 10 projects with a total value of \$39 million for stimulus funding. The overall value of projects to be approved and the requirement for any local co-funding is yet unknown. Expenditure outside of current council budget will require Council approval.

7.6 **Prioritisation & Trade-off**

- Have you taken into consideration the:
- Council’s capacity to deliver;
 - contractor’s capacity to deliver; and
 - consequence of deferral?

The majority of projects submitted for stimulus funding are already contained in Council’s Long Term Plan, with the remainder to be included in the upcoming Long Term Plan. Any external funding received may trigger a re-prioritisation of such project(s) due to a significantly improved benefit/cost ratio to Council as a result of external funding.

7.7 **Legal Issues**

- Is there a legal opinion needed?
- Are there legal issues?

There are not considered any legal issues with this proposal.

7.8 **Policy Issues - Section 80**

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are there any policy issues?• Does your recommendation conflict with Council Policies? |
|---|

The purpose of this report is to enable Council policy to adapt to the requirements of the economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Attachments:

Appendix 1 – Procurement Policy



Sven Hanne
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

DATE: 9 May 2020

APPENDIX 1**STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL**

POLICY: <u>PROCUREMENT</u>	
RESPONSIBILITY: Corporate Services	REVIEW DATE: 2018/19
VERSION: 5	APPROVED DATE: 11 June 2019
FILE NUMBER: D18/29563[v3]	NEXT REVIEW: 2022/23

8**PURPOSE – PROCUREMENT STRATEGY**

This Procurement Policy has been developed for use by council officers, current and potential suppliers, elected members, ratepayers and government funding agencies, and applies to all procurement, regardless of the value.

The purpose of this policy is to ensure Council, when procuring goods, works or services:

- achieves the right outcomes and value for money;
 - manages risk effectively;
 - allows council officers to exercise business judgement by enabling flexibility and fluid, innovative approaches to procurement;
 - demonstrates fairness; and
 - has health and safety risk management at the forefront.
1. This policy shall not be applied to invalidate New Zealand Transport Agency's Procurement Manual when applied to roads maintenance and construction.
 2. All council officers involved in procurement procedures are required to maintain confidentiality throughout, and of, the process.
 3. Council, as a public entity, must act fairly and consistently, and in accordance with relevant legislation.
 4. Tender processes can be a costly and lengthy exercise for everyone involved. Council has a responsibility to ensure the process is efficient and transparent (while keeping third party details confidential).

Stratford District Council Procurement Principles are:

- Value for money - where the projected whole-of-life cost is more important than the upfront quoted price.
- Procure for outcomes - planning and monitoring are key to successful outcomes.
- One-up principle for authorisation of all expenditure.
- Expenditure must be justifiable and be able to withstand public scrutiny.

APPENDIX 1**DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN THIS POLICY**

Council Officer – Any employee of the Stratford District Council whether fixed term, part-time, or permanent, or a contractor working on behalf of the Council.

Expenditure – Includes the purchase of goods and/or services but does not include the payment of borrowings and interest or any tax and rate payments.

High Risk Procurement – Any procurement activity that could lead to or in some way contribute to the triggering of a risk incident in relation to one or more of the Stratford District Council's top ten risks as per the Council's Risk Register.

Local – Operating within the official Stratford district mesh block boundaries.

One-up Principle – Expenditure incurred by a Council Officer is authorised by a more senior officer.

Procurement - Procurement is concerned with the buying of all of the goods, services, and physical works that are vital to Stratford District Council's operations. Procurement involves the process of selecting suppliers, strategic vetting, the negotiation of contracts, and all aspects of purchasing.

Procurement Value – Annual monetary value for operating expenditure, and total contract value for capital expenditure.

Tender Evaluation Team (TET) – The team of council officers (2-4) who evaluate incoming tenders in accordance with the conditions of tender to recommend the best Tenderer.

Value for Money – For the purposes of this policy, value includes meeting specific functional criteria as well as any other relevant objectives including health and safety and community benefits. The value offered is evaluated against the whole-of-life cost of entering into the contract. There may be situations where value for money is broadened to include outcomes such as economic, social, cultural, and environmental effects on the district's communities.

Whole-of-life Cost - The total cost of procurement including maintenance, disposal, and replacement costs, it may also include opportunity costs.

JUSTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURE

Council expenditure is subject to scrutiny by elected members and the general public. Throughout all Council procurement activities, officers must keep in mind that expenditure incurred by Council is mainly funded by ratepayers. All expenditure must be:

1. For a business purpose approved either through the LTP/Annual Plan process, or specifically approved by the Council and,
2. Compliant with all of Stratford District Council's various policies.

At all times, officers should seek market rates and favourable payment terms for Council ratepayers.

HEALTH AND SAFETY IN PROCUREMENT

The Stratford District Council has a legislative responsibility to actively manage the health and safety risk of all council officers, including contractor's and sub-contractor's workers.

Risk management processes

1. Council purchasing officers must identify potential health and safety risks at the procurement planning phase, prior to seeking quotes or tenders.

APPENDIX 1

2. Health and safety risk management will be incorporated into a Contractor's Tender. All public works contracts must include a section on Health and Safety.
3. No contractor doing any form of physical works is to be used by council officers for any physical works or physical services unless they have been pre-approved by the Health and Safety Manager in accordance with the pre-qualification process in the *Pre-Qualified Contractor Manual*.
4. Refer to the Council's Health and Safety Policy for further information on the Council's response to Health and Safety risks.

8

PREFERRED SUPPLIERS

The Council may, from time to time, establish direct relationships with suppliers to procure goods and services at a lower than market rate, or at an agreed level of service. This is intended to achieve value for money by consolidating spend and reducing the cost of business through reduced transactions and a reduced number of suppliers.

These suppliers will be listed on the *Preferred Suppliers Register*, following Director or CEO approval. They should be used in the first instance for the specified spend category, e.g. painting, legal, catering, accommodation etc.

An exemption from using a preferred supplier may be sought on the grounds of better value for money. This should be raised with the Director-Corporate Services, AND approved by a Director.

AUTHORITY TO PROCURE GOODS AND SERVICES

All expenditure must be made within the adopted annual budget (Annual Plan or Long Term Plan), or specifically approved by council, and within delegated authorities. Refer to Appendix 1: *Schedule of Financial Delegations*, and the *Delegations Policy*.

At least two council officers must be involved in the procurement of all goods and services, regardless of the value. The purchasing officer, as the procurer, is involved in developing the scope and design of what good and/or service is required, and the authorising officer (senior to the purchasing officer) will ensure the purchase complies with the *Procurement Policy*, where the expenditure is within their financial delegated authority.

Purchase Orders will not be required for any expenditure that has been approved as an exception. Refer to Appendix 2: *Schedule of Purchase Order Exceptions*. The Purchase Order must be approved before the purchasing officer can proceed with requesting delivery of the good or service.

The requirement for quotes, outlined below, may be waived where an existing maintenance Contractor has the capacity and ability to carry out physical works that are outside of the scope of the existing contract.

- **\$20,000 to \$100,000**

All goods and services with a potential procurement value over \$20,000 are to be purchased with a written contract or Purchase Order. At least three written quotes or written quotes from all available suppliers should be obtained unless the purchase is for specialised

APPENDIX 1

goods/services where there is a limited market, WITH an exemption from a Director or the CEO.

- **\$5,000 to \$20,000**

Where the proposed procurement value is between \$5,000 and \$20,000, at least two written quotes must be obtained and a Purchase Order must be used.

- **< \$5,000**

There are no formal procedures for procurement with a value of less than \$5,000 but council officers are to ensure preferred suppliers are used, where applicable, and a Purchase Order is raised.

- **< \$50**

Petty cash is to be used when money is needed in advance for purchases of less than \$50. A petty cash form must be completed and authorised prior to receiving the cash, and receipt/s or tax invoice/s must be provided to the Petty Cash officer as soon as practicable after the expenditure has been incurred. Alternatively, a Purchase Order must be raised.

COMPETITIVE TENDERING

The following competitive tendering procedure may be used regardless of the procurement value. However, thought must be given to the value of working through such a process for lower value procurement contracts.

Publically advertised competitive tender process

- **> \$100,000**

Any expenditure with a procurement value over \$100,000 must go through the formal public tendering process that is detailed in the *Procurement Manual*.

1. The Procurement Plan will establish the business need, and the design, scope and budget for the project.
2. All contract arrangements will need to be formal, with a single point of contact established for answering enquiries for each tender.
3. All tenderers will be provided with the same information at the same time.
4. A Request For Tender (RFT) is required. An RFT is a formal means of seeking tenders to provide goods and services where there are clearly defined requirements with little room for flexibility or innovation.
5. The range of criteria that may be considered in the evaluation of tenders are:
 - company track record;
 - experience of personnel;
 - health and safety;
 - price; and
 - other criteria (such as sustainability) that may be relevant to the procurement.
6. No late tenders will be accepted.
7. All contracts awarded with a procurement value over \$500,000 must be reported to the Policy and Services Committee.

APPENDIX 1

EXCEPTIONS TO THE COMPETITIVE TENDER PROCESS

Exceptions to the competitive tender process enable increased flexibility and innovation when procuring, and align with the purpose of this policy. Exceptions applied to contracts with a potential procurement value over \$500,000 must be approved by the Policy and Services Committee.

All of Government Contracts

Council officers will not be required to undergo a competitive tender process if Council is part of an All of Government contract, as Council accepts that the Government has already undertaken a robust tender process.

Contract Rollovers

In some situations, where a procurement contract is expiring with no further renewals, the supplier may offer continued pricing and/or service levels if the contract is renewed. If the Council Officer managing the contract is satisfied with the goods and/or services supplied throughout the term of the maturing contract and it is not cost-effective to go through a competitive tender process, then the procurement may be excluded from going through the process. Approval from the Chief Executive is required prior to proceeding, notwithstanding a contract may not be rolled over for a term exceeding the initial contract term (excluding renewals).

Emergency Procurement

In an emergency it may be necessary to dispense with parts of the *Procurement Policy* so that the Council can react quickly to unforeseen events. For the purposes of this policy, an emergency is defined as an event that puts life or public health or safety at risk, or could lead to devastating consequences for the Stratford District Council if not acted upon immediately.

Monopoly

Where there is a monopoly situation and only one supplier capable of supplying the business need, the supplier shall be used without the need to obtain more than quote. Attempts should always be made to establish whether there are any alternative potential suppliers. Approval to continue with the procurement needs to be obtained from the Chief Executive Officer.

Specialist Consultants

Where specialist equipment is to be maintained or serviced or specialist advice is required, the internal process will be same as *Monopoly* above. Specialist in this context means someone that is highly skilled in a specific and restricted field.

Regional / Shared Services

This exception specifically relates to joint efforts with other councils to collaborate in an attempt to achieve better procurement outcomes. In these situations it is accepted that a robust and appropriate procurement process would have been worked through.

APPENDIX 1

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

A conflict of interest occurs when someone who is involved in multiple interests - one of which could corrupt the motivation for an act in the other. This would make it difficult for that person to fulfil their duties fairly. Conflicts of interest may occur in cases of:

- professional or personal obligations;
- personal interests; and/or
- financial interests.

Conflicts of interest can arise at any time during the contracting process, but the most common occur during the planning and invitation to tender stages when people are able to influence the requirements, the evaluation criteria, or the way that the selection is made.

Managing conflicts of interest

All TET members are required to complete the *Declaration Regarding Any Conflict of Interest* document. Should any member indicate a conflict with any of the tenderers the process needs to be halted while the CEO or relevant Director makes a determination on whether the panel member should be replaced.

A conflict of interest register is held by the CEO office for all the Senior Leadership Team. No Director should authorise any contract to which they have a direct or indirect personal interest in. The CEO shall make the final call on whether there is a conflict of interest and remove that Director from the process if necessary.

It is important to avoid any suggestion of potential bribe or inducement arising from the acceptance of gifts to staff from companies or individuals. Staff should exercise judgment and consider the Procurement Principles when accepting gifts in connection with their council officer role, particularly where it could be perceived to influence a procurement decision.

Staff must disclose details of any gift accepted with a value of over \$50, in all cases, to their Director or to the CEO (if a Director).

No council officer directly involved on the TET should receive any personal benefit from their role as a panel member.

A personal gift of cash of any amount, and in any form ie cash, direct credit, loan, must never be accepted by any staff member.

CONTRACTS WITH ELECTED MEMBERS

An elected member is liable to disqualification from the Council if involved in, either directly or through a spouse or partner, contracts with Council in which payments to the associated entity exceeds \$25,000 in any financial year, without prior written approval from the Auditor-General.

While compliance is entirely the responsibility of the elected member, should staff become aware of a potential breach of their requirement, the matter should at once be reported to the Chief Executive.

APPENDIX 1

LOCAL PROCUREMENT POLICY

The principles of the local procurement policy are:

- To promote local economic sustainability and growth;
- To encourage business activity by local rate paying firms, where they are competitive suppliers in respect of price and quality; and
- Minimise transport costs and their environmental effects through measures which provide for Council to buy from local sources where competitive.

To acknowledge the potential reduction in transport costs and the environmental benefits of 'buying local' in applying the local procurement policy, a local provider will be allowed a 5% bias of the lowest conforming tender price, with a maximum bias of \$50,000.

Where NZTA funding is involved in roading related work, the local procurement policy does not apply.

SUSTAINABILITY

Council has a commitment to sustainability and environmental protection. Where cost-effective and legal this will be pursued by promoting purchasing practices which conserve water resources, demonstrate energy efficiency, minimise waste, have low toxicity and/or will protect the environment and public health, and maintain environmental safety and quality.

Consideration of any sustainability requirements should be made at the procurement planning phase. The competitive tendering process may include a criteria weighting for sustainability and environment protection. This will be decided by the Tender Evaluation Team. If sustainability objectives are a desired outcome of the procurement activity then they should be included in the RFT.

RISK MANAGEMENT IN PROCUREMENT

Procurement is a major activity for local government organisations and involves significant sums of money for the Council. It spans across all areas of the organisation and most council officers are involved in Procurement activities in some way or another. The consequences of failing to follow a robust policy and framework can be significant in terms of the potential financial implications, reputational damage, political scrutiny, and reduced Council performance.

There are important areas throughout each of the phases of Procurement that must be addressed in order to reduce the impact or likelihood of a risk incident. Each of these phases are addressed in further detail in the *Procurement Manual*.

Planning the Procurement – Phase 1

- Document business needs and reason/s for the procurement (Business Case usually done as part of preparation for Long Term Plan / Annual Plan).
- Develop detailed scope and design of the procurement project (Procurement Plan).
- Identify health and safety risks.

APPENDIX 1

- Consideration of alternative business models such as public/private partnerships, government schemes, social enterprise delivery, and potential alternative funding sources.
- Identify desired outcomes.

Engaging with the Market – Phase 2

- Ensure the approach to the market is fair and accessible, acknowledging that it is the perception of openness and fairness that matters.
- Develop a set of criteria and appropriate weightings based on the risk, complexity and nature of the work required.
- Consider the benefits of using alternative approaches such as shortlisting, requesting expressions of interest / RFI, or invitation only tenders where appropriate.
- The selection process should be fair and objective with any conflicts of interest declared prior to the appointment of the TET.
- Due diligence to be carried out on prospective suppliers.
- Ensure retention, dispute-resolution, confidentiality, contractor insurance and security clauses are incorporated into public works contracts.
- Draft contract for High Risk Procurement should be independently reviewed by a legal professional and the Health and Safety Manager before signing.

Review and Monitoring – Phase 3

- Regular and timely reporting provided by contractor on specific key contractual obligations and updated in Authority contract management system.
- Implement regular performance reviews, meetings.
- Retentions held until specific performance criteria met as per Contract Schedule.
- All records, minutes, and relevant communications between contractor and council officers to be filed in Content Manager.
- Internal audit programme to review Council Officer compliance with the *Procurement Policy* and *Procurement Manual*.
- Implement regular staff training on Council's *Procurement Policy*, *Procurement Manual*, and *Pre-Qualified Contractor Manual*.

The documentation that is to remain on file is listed in the *Procurement Manual*.

Council must also adhere to any requirements to consult with affected parties, and obtain appropriate consents.

Physical works contracts will not provide for contractor indemnities, advance payments, principal bonds and guarantees, variable pricing, and other high-risk methods of engagement in favour of the contractor, unless approved in writing by the Chief Executive Officer.

RELATED DOCUMENTS

Pre-Qualified Contractor Booklet	D18/29593
Procurement Manual	D16/2600
Schedule of Purchase Order Exceptions	D18/29594
Delegations Policy	D17/7725
Declaration Regarding Any Conflict of Interest (Tender Evaluation Team)	D13/18692
Procurement Plan – Long Form	D17/800

APPENDIX 1

Procurement Plan – Short Form
Business Case Process / Templates

D17/914
Promapp

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

- Construction Contracts Act 2002
- Contract and Commercial Law Act 2017
- Consumer Guarantees Act 1993
- Land Transport Management Act 2003
- Public Bodies Contracts Act 1959
- Local Government Act 2002
- Public Records Act 2005
- Health and Safety at Work 2015
- Local Authorities (Members' Interest) Act 1968

INDUSTRY CONTRACT STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

- NZS 3910: 2013 Conditions of contract for building and engineering construction
- NZS 3916: 2013 Conditions of contract for building and civil engineering – design
- NZS 3917: 2013 Conditions of contract for building and civil engineering – fixed term
- IPENZ standard contract conditions
- NZ Institute of Architects Standard Conditions of Contract

This policy will be reviewed at least every three years.

APPENDIX 1**SCHEDULE OF FINANCIAL DELEGATIONS**

Financial Authority (annual value for operating and total value for capital)	Delegated Authority	Process Requirement (see Procurement Manual)	Method of Engagement (pre-purchase)	Reporting Requirements
Exceeds Annual Plan/LTP Activity Budget by more than \$100,000 (net of any grant funding)	Council	Decision Report to Policy and Services Committee	N/A	Decision Report
Exceeds Annual Plan/LTP Activity Budget by more than the lesser of: 10% or \$50,000	CEO	Confirmation from CEO required - via Business Case	N/A	Monthly Reporting
> \$250,000	CEO and one Director*	Publicly advertised competitive process required, unless an Exception approved by the Policy and Services Committee.	Written Contract	Award of the contract must be reported to the next Policy and Services Committee meeting.
\$100,000 to \$250,000	Director	Publicly advertised competitive process required, unless an Exception approved by the Chief Executive.	Written Contract	As required by Chief Executive
\$20,000 to \$99,999	Within Delegated Authority	At least 3 written quotes or written quotes from all available suppliers if less than 3 unless for specialised goods/services WITH an exemption from a Director.	Purchase Order / Written Contract	None
\$5,000 to \$19,999	Within Delegated Authority	At least 2 written quotes obtained where there is an alternative competitor. Officers to ensure prices do not exceed market rates and/or preferred suppliers are used.	Purchase Order	None
\$50 to \$4,999	Within Delegated Authority	No formal procedures but officers to ensure prices do not exceed market rates and preferred suppliers are used.	Purchase Order	None
< \$50		Purchase order to be used where there is already a supplier account or Petty Cash reimbursement if there is no supplier account.	No specific requirements.	

*Contract / progress payments over \$250,000 may be signed off by contract manager and authorised by a Director.