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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A Meeting of the UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 23 FEBRUARY 2016 to commence at 4.00pm.

Adrienne Smith
Committee Advisor

Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as Council policy until adopted by the Council

BUSINESS

1. APOLOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 15 December 2015

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 15 December 2015.

4. MATTERS ARISING

5. DELEGATION
6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **Appointment of Chairperson – Utilities and Roading Committee – Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

*RECOMMENDATION*

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) **Receives** report N° 160211011001.

(b) **Appoints** Councillor Farrant as Chairperson of the Utilities & Roading Committee from 23 February 2016 to the end of the electoral term on 7 October 2016.

6.2 **Reallocation of Drainage Capital Budget – Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)**

*RECOMMENDATION*

**THAT** the Utilities & Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 160211010999

(b) **Approves** the reallocation of $38,000 from the Harrod Place Piping budget and $69,000 from the Middle Brook Piping budget to carry out drainage works in conjunction with the Good Street / Blackett Street Intersection Upgrade (estimated expenditure $87,625).

(c) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora Community Board for their information.

6.3 **Council Service Location through the Beforeudig Service – Sean de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer)**

*RECOMMENDATION*

**THAT** the Utilities & Roading Committee recommends

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 160212011096.

(b) **Approves** the draft Underground Service Locating Policy.

(c) **Notes** the following proposed approach for locating and protecting assets as part of Beforeudig applications:

1. Contractors will be responsible to locate and protect Council assets shown on the service plans provided as part of the Beforeudig process.

2. Council will mark out its assets, if requested by the contractor, using GPR and potholing. This service will be provided by the Council’s Water Unit and charged to the contractor.
3. Council will require a stand over for working near critical assets (criticality A or AA). The stand over will be provided by the Council’s Water Unit and charged to the contractor.

4. Council will locate any assets not in the vicinity shown on the service plans that the contractor has not been able to locate and update the asset records at Council cost.

(d) **Notes** that a pamphlet will be prepared and issued with all service plans that will highlight the Council's process, indicative charges, each parties responsibilities and reinforce our standard disclaimer.

(e) **Delegates** authority to Management Team to approve final pamphlet for the Beforeudig process.

### 6.4 Ashley Rural Water – Councillor Peter Farrant

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Utilities & Roading Committee

(a) Receives report no. 160216012540

(b) Recommends to Council that staff carrying out a budget comparison using the 2015/16 Ashley Rural Water budget (HDC) as the template to determine the overhead component that would apply if WDC were operating the network along the same lines as for all other existing WDC district water networks.

(c) That a report will be presented to U&R in April 2016 with the results of the exercise with any decision to further consultation and or carry out a customer survey with the affected residents to be deliberated at this meeting.

(d) Any further investigation work and or communication with HDC to be developed via a U&R workshop post public consultation with a view to evolving longer term separate or shared service management and or ownership structures for the area of the Ashley Rural Water Network within the WDC district Boundary.

### 6.5 Ashley Rural Water – Supplementary Information Memo – Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the information in memo no. 160217012604 is received.
7. REPORT FOR INFORMATION ONLY

7.1 Rangiora Town Centre – Changes to High Street Streetscape Plan – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager) and Joanne McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader)
(refer to copy of report no. 151123155258 to the Rangiora Community Board meeting of 9 December 2015, circulated separately)

7.2 Request to Engage On Grade Drainage and Excavation Ltd to Relay Sewer across 230 Williams Street – Gary Boot (Project Delivery Manager) and Paul Reed (Engineer)
(refer to copy of report no. 160215012023 to the Management Team meeting of 15 February 2016, circulated separately)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in Items 7.1 – 7.2 be received

8. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 Roading and Residential Streetscape – Cr John Meyer

8.2 Stockwater and Drainage – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead

8.3 Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Peter Farrant

8.4 Solid Waste– Cr Robbie Brine

9. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Report of Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)</td>
<td>Southbrook RRP/Transfer Station</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PUBLIC EXCLUDED REPORT FOR INFORMATION ONLY (Circulated separately)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Report of Oana Macarie (PDU Engineer) and Ric Barber (Wastewater Asset Manager)</td>
<td>Contract 15/70 Oxford Wastewater Renewal 2015/16 Tender Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Report of Ric Barber (Wastewater Asset Manager) and Paul Reed (EQ Recovery Water and Wastewater Discipline Leader)</td>
<td>Contract 15/14 New Charles Street Pump Station Tender Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Report of Ric Barber (Wastewater Asset Manager) and Paul Reed (EQ Recovery Water and Wastewater Discipline Leader)</td>
<td>Contract 15/35 Sneyd Street Sewage Pump Station and Pumping Main Tender Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Report of Oana Macarie (PDU Engineer) and Ric Barber (Wastewater Asset Manager)</td>
<td>Contract 15/50 Wastewater Renewals 2015-2016 Tender Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Report of Ric Barber, (Wastewater Asset Manager)</td>
<td>Contract 15/71 Rangiora WWTP Upgrade – Expression of Interest for Main Works Contract</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Report of Daniel Thompson (Special Projects Manager) and Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager) to Management Team</td>
<td>Approval to Award Contract 15/79 – Council Precinct and Durham Street Upgrade</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 – 9.7</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **QUESTIONS**

11. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**
WORKSHOP

At the conclusion of the meeting, Ken Stevenson will conduct a workshop on the Cycleways Project.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 15 DECEMBER 2015 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT

Councillor J Meyer (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors W Doody, R Brine and P Farrant

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors K Barnett, J Gerard
Messrs G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), K Stevenson (Roading Manager), K Simpson (Three Waters Manager), Mrs J Fraser (Utilities Planner) and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor).

The meeting was opened and adjourned at 4.00pm and reconvened at 4.23pm, at the conclusion of the Community and Recreation Committee meeting.

1. APOLOGIES

An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Brine for departure at 4.45pm.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 10 November 2015

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 10 November 2015.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5. DELEGATION

There was no delegations.
6. REPORTS

6.1 Oxford Rural No. 1 – Infiltration Gallery Urgent Rehabilitation Works – Suresh Mudliar (Water Asset Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

Messrs Cleary and Simpson presented this report to advise of urgent works required on the infiltration gallery at the Rockford Road intake on the Oxford Rural No. 1 scheme. The work is required due to the low flows into the intake chamber, following high water flow events, when the channel to the gallery is prone to blockage, and also the effectiveness of the infiltration gallery has been reduced by partial blockage from silts and other materials. The need to have contractors out to improve the water flow has increased and already have been six times this financial year. These contractor visits range in cost from $1,200 to $5,000 depending on the work involved. The recommended rehabilitation work will provide a near new gallery for the intake and increase the inflow of water into the chamber. Once this work is carried out, the number of maintenance visits required is expected to decrease.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Farrant

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) Receives report No. 151202159560

(b) Notes the rehabilitation works to be undertaken at the Rockford Road intake gallery for Oxford Rural No.1 scheme.

(c) Notes that the frequency of visits by the contractor (Rossiters) to clear the channel has increased from 2 – 3 times per year to 6 times for the first half of this current year.

(d) Notes that the cost of a visit to clear the channel ranges from $1,200 to $5,000.

(e) Notes that maintenance budget for headworks operations will be overspent by an estimate of $20,000 for the 2015/16 financial year.

(f) Circulates this report to the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board for their information.

CARRIED

6.2 Oxford Road Rangiora Requested Water Race Closure – Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager) and Janet Fraser (Utilities Planner)

Mr Owen Davies and Mrs Janet Fraser presented this report, to seeking approval to close the water race on the north side of Oxford Road, between Lehmans Road and the start of North Brook at 27J Oxford Road. This request has come from developer Westpark Rangiora Ltd and another property owner at 70 Oxford Road. This stock water race is no longer used for this purpose.

There will be no physical works required by the Council in relation to the closure of the stock water race, it is a change in classification. The Council will work with the property owners to determine whether the drain needs to be filled in or left open for flood management purposes. Staff have also discussed the proposed closure with Waimakariri Irrigation. It is anticipated that the closure of the water race would be beneficial to the operation of the stockwater race scheme.
The Water Race Drainage Advisory Group will be asking the question, if stock water races are going to be closed this will affect the collection of rates and Deputy Mayor Felstead suggested that an explanation be provided to members of the Advisory Group regarding this.

Mr Davies noted that the closure of the stock water race on the south side of Oxford Road will be the subject of a separate report to the Committee.

Moved Councillor Farrant seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Utilities & Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No 151125156380.

(b) **Approves** the closure of a section of the water race north of Oxford Road, Rangiora, between Lehmans Road and the start of the North Brook at 27 J Oxford Road, Rangiora (water race section R3Q, see Attachment i).

(c) **Notes** that staff will seek approval in the future from the Committee to consult on the proposed closure of another section of water race located along the south side of Oxford Road, Rangiora, between Lehmans Road and the start of the North Brook at 27 J Oxford Road, Rangiora (water race section R3N-1).

(d) **Refers** this report to the Rangiora Community Board and Waimakariri Water Race Advisory Group.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers noted that these are the last two stock water races running into urban Rangiora, and as there is no stock on this land any more, this is not the primary use for these waterways.

7. **REPORT FOR INFORMATION ONLY**

7.1 **Approval to engage MWH for bridge inspection and other specialist services for the period 1 September 2015 to 31 August 2016 – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)**

(refer to copy of report 151203159720 to the Management Team meeting of 7 December 2015)

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Farrant

THAT the information be received

CARRIED

8. **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

8.1 **Roading and Residential Streetscape – Cr John Meyer**

Nothing reported at the meeting.

8.2 **Stockwater and Drainage – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead**

Nothing to report.
8.3 **Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Peter Farrant**

Nothing to report.

8.4 **Solid Waste – Cr Robbie Brine**

Nothing to report.

9. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

10. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.45pm.

CONFIRMED

______________________________________________
Chairman

______________________________________________
Date

**STAFF BRIEFING**

At the conclusion of the meeting, a staff briefing was held for Committee members, to discuss:

1. Update on Avian Botulism
2. Update on Kaiapoi Pa Road and Preeces Road.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: GOV-01-06 / 160211011001
REPORT TO: Utilities and Roading Committee
DATE OF MEETING: 23 February 2016
FROM: Gerard Cleary, Manager Utilities and Roading
SUBJECT: Appointment of Chairperson - Utilities and Roading Committee
SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to facilitate the appointment of the Chairperson of the Utilities and Roading Committee.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Utilities & Roading Committee:
(a) Receives report No 160211011001.
(b) Appoints Councillor Farrant as Chairperson of the Utilities & Roading Committee from 23 February 2016 to the end of the electoral term on 7 October 2016.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. During the 2010-13 and 2013-2016 Council terms the Chairperson of the Utilities & Roading Committee has been rotated annually.

3.2. At the Council meeting of 29 October 2013 the following Councillors were appointed as Chair of the Utilities & Roading Committee, to be rotated for each November meeting: Councillors Felstead, Farrant and Meyer.

3.3. Councillor Felstead served his time on the Committee and Councillor Meyer commenced Chairmanship of the Utilities & Roading Committee from November 2014 and has continued to date as Cr Farrant was not able to fill the role in November 2015.

3.4. At the 10 November 2015 Utilities and Roading Committee the following resolution was passed:

THAT Councillor Meyer remain as Chair of this Committee until such time as Councillor Farrant is able to fill the Committee Chairperson role.

3.5. Councillor Farrant has advised that he is now able to fill the Committee Chairperson role.
4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1 Not sought.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Remuneration will be paid in accordance with the Remuneration Authority’s determination.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

   This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**


6.3. **Community Outcomes**

   Council appointments contribute to the achievement of all community outcomes.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to request approval of the Utilities and Roading Committee to reallocate $38,000 and $69,000 from Harrod Place Piping and Middle Brook Piping budgets respectively, for drainage works associated with the Good Street / Blackett Street Intersection Upgrade.

1.2. Both budgets are within the Rangiora Urban Drainage Capital works budget 15/16.

1.3. The Harrod Place drainage upgrade has been re-prioritised and is no longer necessary as it is partially superseded by the Rangiora flood works.

1.4. The drainage work proposed on the Middle Brook has been superseded by the Rangiora flood upgrade works, and is no longer required.

1.5. Reallocating the Harrod Place Piping and Middle Brook Piping budgets would not pose a financial or engineering risk to the Rangiora Urban Drainage Scheme.

Attachments:

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 160211010999

(b) Approves the reallocation of $38,000 from the Harrod Place Piping budget and $69,000 from the Middle Brook Piping budget to carry out drainage works in conjunction with the Good Street / Blackett Street Intersection Upgrade (estimated expenditure $87,625).

(c) Circulates this report to the Rangiora Community Board for their information.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Background**

3.1. The Blackett Street drainage upgrade is provided for in the Long Term Plan and budgeted, to be undertaken in 2018/19 financial year.

3.2. The original Rangiora Stormwater Model in 2001 identified a deficiency, requiring upgrades to improve drainage capacity in Blackett Street. This was reinforced by the more recent update to the Rangiora Stormwater Model. One of the strategic objectives of the Blackett Street upgrade project is to protect the CBD from the Northern Rangiora catchment.

3.3. A new roundabout is being constructed at the intersection of Good Street and Blackett Street this financial year. The contract for the roundabout has been awarded recently to Schick Construction Ltd.

3.4. The new roundabout is located on the proposed alignment of the stormwater pipeline.

3.5. The portion of drainage work near the intersection needs to be carried out in conjunction with the roundabout construction to avoid significant rework, additional cost and disruption to the community. By carrying out the drainage upgrade in conjunction with the roundabout construction the drainage capacity under the roundabout will be futureproofed. This has been included in the recently let contract as a provisional separable portion.

3.6. If approved by the Utilities and Roading Committee the work on this separable portion will proceed.

3.7. It is intended that the remaining section of the Blackett Street stormwater pipe will be upgraded in 2018/19 as budgeted in the Ten Year Plan.

3.8. Staff recommended drainage upgrades in Harrod Place and Middle Brook in a report undertaken in 2001. Subsequent observation and modelling of the stormwater drainage in Rangiora has discounted the need for the Harrod Place Upgrade. The proposed upgrade to the Middle Brook has been superseded by the work identified by the flood team, following the June 2014 floods.
Table 3-1 shows the budgets for Harrod Place Piping and Middle Brook Piping for 2015/16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>GL Code</th>
<th>2015/16 Capital Works Replacement Budget</th>
<th>Total Spent to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Harrod Place Piping</td>
<td>100 544 000 5123</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Middle Brook Piping</td>
<td>100 500 000 5123</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$107,000 $0

Table 3-1: Rangiora Urban Drainage Capital Works Budgets

Recommended Option

3.9. Undertake the portion of drainage works at Good Street / Blackett Street intersection – This is the option is recommended by staff, to be undertaken as part of the roundabout contract.

Other Options

3.10. Do Nothing – this option will not address the deficiencies in the stormwater network which could result in flooding in this area of Rangiora and the CBD.

3.11. Undertake the entire pipe upgrade in 2018/19 financial year – this option would require that a large portion of the new roundabout would need to be reconstructed at the expense and disruption of the Rangiora community.

3.12. Undertake the entire drainage upgrade in conjunction with the new roundabout construction – this option would require the drainage budget to be brought forward from the 2018/19 financial year.

3.13. The Management Team has reviewed this report and approves the reallocation of $38,000 from the Harrod Place and $69,000 from the Middle Brook Piping budgets, for the Good Street / Blackett Street Intersection Upgrade.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views have not been sought on this matter.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The reallocation of budget is all within the Rangiora drainage renewal budget, therefore there is no financial implication from a rates perspective.

5.2. The risk of delaying the drainage upgrade at the Good Street / Blackett Street intersection until 2018/19 is that a large part of the intersection would need to be reconstructed. This would require additional Council funding.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**
The Council is committed to maintaining the level of service to the customers.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**
Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

Owen Davies
Drainage Asset Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Utilities and Roading Committee of the proposed approach to locate and protect 3 Water assets through the Beforeudig process and to present the draft Underground Service Locating Policy. This report proposes that the Committee recommend that the Council adopt the draft policy.

1.2. When the Council receives a request from Beforeudig the Council currently only provides an indicative map of the location of its 3 Water assets which is pulled off the Council GIS system WAlmap which includes a standard disclaimer.

1.3. There have been a number of instances recently where Council assets have been damaged, particularly as part of the ultra-fast broadband roll out. Our standard disclaimer has recently been improved to clearly set out responsibilities, however there is a need to educate and inform the contracting community. It is therefore proposed to develop a pamphlet to be issued with all service plans, similar to that issued by Mainpower (refer Attachment ii).

1.4. Additionally Council does not have a standard approach for locating and protecting assets as part of Beforeudig applications, in particular we do not have a consistent approach for handling requests to markout services in the field or to providing stand over for working near key assets. This report proposes a standard approach to be adopted by Council.

1.5. The primary initiatives of the new approach is to help:

- Reduce the number of personal injuries and prevent injuries to workers
- Protect the Council underground assets from interruption and preventable damage
- Ensure that the Council corridors are maintained and new services are not installed over or near our assets that might interrupt us to efficiently and cost effectively maintain and operate our assets
• Educate all contractors through the Beforeudig system to take care and understand their responsibilities while working around the Council’s 3 water assets

• Provide a clear disclaimer that sets out responsibilities and sets out that the Council will claim back costs if its assets are damaged

• Provide stand over service when contractors are working near critical assets to minimise the chance of asset damage or disruption to the wider community

Attachments:
  i. Draft Underground Service Locating Policy
  ii. Map showing a sample of a current map and disclaimer to Beforeudig applicant
  iii. Pictures of water main blow outs and sewer damage

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 160212011096.

(b) Approves the draft Underground Service Locating Policy.

(c) Notes the following proposed approach for locating and protecting assets as part of Beforeudig applications:

1. Contractors will be responsible to locate and protect Council assets shown on the service plans provided as part of the Beforeudig process.

2. Council will mark out its assets, if requested by the contractor, using GPR and potholing. This service will be provided by the Council's Water Unit and charged to the contractor.

3. Council will require a stand over for working near critical assets (criticality A or AA). The stand over will be provided by the Council’s Water Unit and charged to the contractor.

4. Council will locate any assets not in the vicinity shown on the service plans that the contractor has not been able to locate and update the asset records at Council cost.

(d) Notes that a pamphlet will be prepared and issued with all service plans that will highlight the Council's process, indicative charges, each parties responsibilities and reinforce our standard disclaimer.

(e) Delegates authority to Management Team to approve final pamphlet for the Beforeudig process.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Current Process

3.1. The Beforeudig process is an online service which enables excavation works to obtain information on the location of underground pipes and cables in and around any proposed dig site; helping to protect themselves and valuable assets during their works. This process that the Council has adopted provides a 'one stop shop' for contractors (i.e.:
external contractors, other utility providers or private property owners undertaking work on their property near Council assets) to communicate about their planned activities with utilities and asset owners.

3.2. The current process for Beforeudig is that the personnel or contractor that contacts Beforeudig or uses the website, indicates the location/area in which they are enquiring about. They then note if it is for planning or physical works. If it is planned works then each utility provider that is part of Beforeudig provides a plan of their underground services in that area. If it is physical works than Beforeudig ask the extent of the physical works such as trenching and whether or not they require an asset locate. After this the applicant receives Corridor Access Request ‘CAR’ number with a CAR form from Beforeudig. The applicant then fills out the form noting that number, to be sent to the Council Corridor Manager with Traffic Management Plan for approval and to obtain a Works Access Permit ‘WAP’. Beforeudig then notifies the utility operators indicating that the applicant requires plans and an asset locate if requested.

3.3. When the Council receives a request from Beforeudig The Council currently only provides an indicative map of the location of its 3 Water assets which is pulled off the Council GIS system WAImap with a standard disclaimer. The Council currently does not provide an asset locate service on site as part of the Beforeudig process.

3.4. Other utility providers such as power (Mainpower) and telecommunications (Chorus/Transfield) currently offer an onsite service to locate their assets at a cost to the applicant as part of the Beforeudig process.

3.5. While most applicants using the Beforeudig website request an asset locate, only few actually want this service for the water utility services. Majority of applicants only require a service locate from power (Mainpower) and telecommunications (Chorus/Transfield). This is from a perceived thought that there was a form of risk if they did not get the utility providers to mark out these assets onsite prior to commencing works. This is due to health and Safety and the danger of working near live power and the high cost of damaging fibre cables which has the potential to cost up to $200,000 in repairs. Due to this it is, now adopted by most contractors’ good practice to ensure power and telecommunication is marked out onsite prior to excavation. It seems that majority of contractors are happy just with a service plan from Council and don’t see this as a potential risk that requires further information.

Issues Recently Encountered

3.6. Due to the role out of ultra-fast broadband there has been number of incidents that have been identified where fibre has either been drilled through, installed right next to the or immediately on top of the Council assets. Of these cases where Council has worked in these areas after the role out of the ultra-fast broadband the Council has had to fix the damaged services, which has been a struggle in some cases to reclaim costs.

3.7. Such instances have resulted in a larger increase in time to maintain and operate these assets. In some incidents the Council is unable to access the asset resulting in the Council going back to the utility provider to relocate the asset.

3.8. There are competent contractors that Council knows of that employs sub-contractors to use Ground Penetrating Radar ‘GPR’ to locate where Council services are, by using the indicative map provided by Council as a guide. The GPR is not under any circumstances a full proof system to locate underground services as it only picks up an, irregularity in the ground which could be a pipe. Therefore this method relies heavily on the quality and accuracy of the service plans provided. In some cases competent contractors will
pothole the service to confirm their exact location prior to commencing works. As noted this method is only adopted by small number of competent contractors.

3.9. Majority of contractors will only go off the indicative maps provided by Council with limited knowledge of how to interpret them. This has become evident during the role out of ultrafast broadband in the district as noted above.

3.10. This adopted train of thought by majority of personnel and contractors that the Council services are less risk, to their works than other utility providers. There also appears to be a lack of understanding of Council underground services, which has resulted in contractors exposing large sections of infrastructure or removing thrust blocks that hold some of our network, especially our aged network in place. This has resulted in water main and pressure sewer blow outs, disruption to the integrity and damaged infrastructure (see photos in Attachment iii for examples).

3.11. This has potential health and safety risks to the contractor with high pressure water blowing out which can also result in contamination of the water supply which is health risk to the general public especially if its minor leak that is not immediately identified. A blown pressure sewer could potential fill up a trench with sewage in matter seconds with workers in the trench is another health and safety and health risk. In some cases blow outs from sewer and water pressure rising mains can result in undermining of the ground around it which is health and safety risk in its self.

3.12. Even though these risks are not as obvious as power to most contractors it is important for Council to notify the contractor that are working around these services the potential risk involved.

3.13. Not all damage to Council underground services is picked up straight away and can be picked up months after the contractor has left the site. Leaving a lot of damage assets which, when identified in the future, Council needs to repair at Council's expense. Or in cases where a services request are lodged to the Water Unit with no follow up on who caused the damage to recover the costs for the repair.

3.14. The greatest risk to Council is external contractors working near critical assets such as sewer and water rising mains or main trunks mains. Potential damage to these underground assets can result in a larger impact to the community while Council shuts down these services to repair the infrastructure. Being that majority of these critical assets are large size diameter pipes have a greater risk in regards to health and safety and health risk if they are damaged resulting in blow outs.

**Approach of other Utility Operators**

3.15. Mainpower provide a stand over service which is requirement to the Contractor or personnel if they are working near or exposing their larger size cables due to the larger area of their customers that will be affected if it is damaged and for obvious health and safety risks.

3.16. The Council could take the approach that the Council will provide a location service to all contractors working near Council underground assets, similar to that of Mainpower and Chorus by using GPR to mark out the service on the ground. Keeping in mind that power for example is a lot easier to locate due to the metal and electric properties of power cables compared to Council underground services which compose of concrete, old ceramic pipes and different forms of plastics. The question would be is Council willing to take that risk with no guarantee that where they marked the services on the ground is clear and accurate location of where the underground services are. As majority of contractors will take that as an exact location of where those services are positioned.
3.17. The only way to increase the accuracy of locating the underground services is by potholing. This is more expensive option that majority of applicants using the Beforeudig system will not choose due to the costs. Especially when you compare the cost to Mainpower and Chorus costs to locate services by just using an electronic wand on the surface to their underground network.

National Code of Practice for Utility Operators’ Access to Transport Corridors

3.18. The National Code of Practice for Utility Operators’ Access to Transport Corridors requires the contractor to ensure that they notify the utility operators and Corridor Manager and obtain requirements required for work under, adjacent to or over their utility structures. Council does not yet provide this as part of the Beforeudig process the requirements in which the contractor has to follow when working near the Council underground services not unless approached.

3.19. The Code also indicates that it is the contractor’s responsibility to locate all affected underground services in accordance with the requirements of the Corridor Manager and the utility providers. Where excavations are required to locate the structures, employ safe digging practices, allow utility providers to observe works in close proximity to their utility structures.

3.20. It also states that if the Contractor cannot locate an identified structure in close proximity to the identified location, they are to notify the represented utility operator or Corridor Manager who is responsible for identifying or correctly locating its assets. Meaning the Council is required to assist the contractor if they cannot locate the Council asset.

3.21. Under the Code it also states under section 5.1.2 and 5.2.1 that the contractor responsible to ensure the works does not damage or disrupts the integrity of the utility providers’ assets. They are also responsible for meeting the obligations under the code, where the effected utility provider can seek to recover costs from the party that failed to comply with these requirements.

3.22. Council is required under the Code to hold records of the location of the underground utility’s and provide detail and plans noting the location of their assets. There is provisions within the Code, that notes that older infrastructure may not be completely accurate but requires them to be as accurate as responsibly possible. The Code notes that the utility provider is required to provide on request from a contractor to such a level of detailed location as is available to the Utility provider.

3.23. The National Code does not cover private property where there are Council assets underground this than falls under the Local Government Act which covers similar requirements in regards to third party damaging asset or working near the Council asset.

Proposed Changes to the Process

3.24. The Council will proceed with providing maps noting the indicative location of the Council underground services with an alteration to the disclaimer as per requirements under the Code.

3.25. The standard disclaimer has recently been changed to read:

‘Boundary information is derived under licence from LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved). The Waimakariri District Council does not give and expressly disclaims any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose. Information on this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it.'
The location of Council services are shown indicatively only and no guarantee is
given as to the accuracy of the information. The user of the information has the
responsibility confirm the exact location of the service prior to commencing
construction. When excavating in the vicinity of any Council service the contractor
is responsible for potholing and protecting existing services and will be held
responsible for all damage to Council property. The Council does not guarantee
the existence of service laterals to vacant lots, regardless of whether a lateral is
shown or not.’

3.26. Council staff recommends that the Council provides stand over as a
requirement when personnel or contractors are working near critical Council
assets as identified by the three waters team at expense to the applicant. To
minimise risk of the 3 water service outage to the large community or health and
safety and health risks to the applicant.

3.27. Staff, also recommends that the Council provides pamphlet with the map as part of
the Beforeudig application for planned or physical works.

3.28. The pamphlet will highlight the following to meet the initiatives outlined in the summary
as follows;

- Description of the responsibility of the Contractor working near Councils
  Infrastructure

- Council will assist and notify if stand over is required if work is done near critical
  assets at cost to the applicant

- The Council strongly recommends the applicant marks out all services on site
  and pothole to confirm location of services prior to commencing with their works.

- The Council can provide assistance if the Contractor is unable to locate these
  assets when working in close proximity of the Council underground assets by
  using GPR and potholing via hydro excavation at cost to the applicant.

- Council notes the requirements from Council when working near, under or over
  Council underground services including the separation distance off the Councils
  services as per the Council code of Practice.

- Council provide a disclaimer in regards to the accuracy of their plans and the
  Contractor obligations when working in close proximity of the Council
  underground services.

- The potential risk around Health and Safety and health when working near
  Councils assets and responsibility's the Contractor has when working near these
  assets to themselves and the public.

- The potential costs to the applicant if they disrupt integrity or damages the
  Council services. The Council is able to reclaim these costs as indicated under
  the Utilities Code and the Local government Act.

3.29. Staff, believes by providing this approach will help to minimise the damage to Council
assets and the encroachment of other assets within the defined Council service
corridors. The pamphlet will slowly educate Contractors and personal working near
Councils assets.

3.30. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Have not been sought but the wider contracting community have been part the panel that developed the National Code of Practice for Utility operators Access to Transport Corridors.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

Financial Implications

5.1. The worst incident this financial year was when another utility provider drilled through a pressure sewer resulting in $100,000 repair that had taken 6 months to reclaim the costs back from the damage of the contractor. Not including disruption by have to isolate the main to undertake the repair (see attached photo in Attachment iii).

5.2. There is approximately about three incidents a month ranging from large to small where Council is repairing damaged services from other contractors working around in close proximate to the Council underground services.

5.3. Majority of these are not claimed back and is covered by the maintenance budget as it is not clear on who had caused the damage.

5.4. To reduce the likelihood of similar instances occurring, it is proposed that Council will provide a stand over service for work near critical assets (criticality A and A).

5.5. The indicate charges to provide a stand over service or for Council to locate the services on site would be based on Water Unit rates as follows:

- Stand over based on hourly rate when working near critical infrastructure at $75.00 excluding GST per hour. This will cover two Water Unit staff and vehicle (Transportation to the site)

- Providing potholing if the Contractor cannot find the Council asset by using the vacuum digger if GPR has already been carried out by the Contractor at $220.00 excluding GST per hour. This will cover two Water Unit staff, vehicle (Transportation to the site) and the cost for the vacuum digging

- Providing potholing if the Contractor cannot find the Council asset by using the vacuum digger and GPR if the contractor has not already try mark service on the ground at $440.00 excluding GST per hour. This will cover two Water Unit staff, vehicle (Transportation to the site), the cost for vacuum digging and Cost for GPR services onsite.

5.6. Cost to carry services, resources from Water Unit and 3 Waters staff versus potential income as the Beforeudig applications vary throughout the year

5.7. These cost do not cover the time from 3 Waters staff to process the application, instruct the Water Unit, invoice applicants or chasing invoice from private contractors

**Risks to Council**

5.8. The Council is responsible to minimise the potential health and safety and health risks when contractors are working near Council underground services. Damage to the Council services as noted above has the potential in high pressure water blowing out which can also result in contamination of the water supply which is health risk to the general public especially if its minor leak that is not immediately identified. A blown pressure sewer could potential fill up a trench with sewage in matter seconds with
workers in the trench is another health and safety and health risk. In some cases blow outs from sewer and water pressure rising mains can result in undermining of the ground around it which is health and safety risk in its self.

5.9. As highlighted in the report above the greatest risk to Council are external contractors working near critical assets such as sewer and water rising mains or main trunks mains. Potential damage to these underground assets can result in a larger impact to the community while Council shuts down these services to repair the infrastructure. Being that majority of these critical assets are large size diameter pipes have a greater risk in regards to health and safety and health risk if they are damaged resulting in larger scale blow outs.

5.10. Staff consider that by taking the approach noted above in the proposed change to the process will help to minimise this potential risk to the Council infrastructure. It will also help to educate contractors working around the Council underground services of the care responsibility to be taken as to not damage or disrupt the integrity of the infrastructure and the potential implications it can cause.

5.11. It also shows that the Council is showing due diligence to minimise these potential risks to meet the legislative requirements illustrated in the Local Government Act, Health and Safety Act and National Code of Practice for Utility Operators’ Access to Transport Corridors. And by minimising the potential affects to the wider community which results in higher level of service.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. Legislation

6.3. Community Outcomes
Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner
INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

The purpose of this policy is to outline Council’s approach to locate and protect 3 Waters assets through the “Before You Dig” (Beforeudig) process.

The policy is designed to protect Council’s 3 Waters assets, particularly as a result of third party damage.

2. Policy Context

The Beforeudig process is an online service which provides information on the location of underground pipes and cables in and around any proposed excavation site. This assists with protecting both excavation workers, and below ground assets, during excavation.

Each utility provider that is part of the Beforeudig service provides a plan of their underground assets in that area. Persons wishing to proceed with excavation works apply for a Corridor Access Request (CAR) which is forwarded to the Council with a Traffic Management Plan. If approved, a Works Access Permit (WAP) is issued.

Other utility providers such as power (Mainpower) and telecommunications (Chorus/Transfield) currently offer an onsite service to locate their assets, at a cost to the applicant, as part of the Beforeudig process.

The Council requires a standard approach for locating and protecting assets as part of Beforeudig applications, and in particular requires a consistent approach for handling requests to mark out services in the field, or monitor works adjacent to key assets.

A standard approach will:

- Reduce the number of personal injuries;
- Protect the Council’s underground assets from interruption and preventable damage;
- Ensure that Council corridors are maintained and new services are not installed over or near assets that might interrupt the efficient operation of the assets;
- Provide information to all contractors through the Beforeudig system to understand their responsibilities while working around the Council’s 3 Waters assets;
- Provide a clear disclaimer that outlines responsibilities and sets out that the Council will claim back costs if its assets are damaged;
- Provide for monitoring services when contractors are working near critical assets to minimise the chance of asset damage or disruption to the wider community.
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3 Policy Objective

This policy seeks to define the roles and responsibilities of the Council and contractors (e.g.: external contractors, other utility operators and private property owners) as set out below:

1. Contractors will be responsible to locate and protect Council assets shown on the service plans provided as part of the Beforeudig process.

2. Council will mark out its assets, if requested by the contractor, using Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) and pot-holing. This service will be provided by the Council and charged to the contractor.

3. Council will require a "stand over" monitor for working near critical assets (criticality A or AA). The monitoring will be provided by the Council and charged to the contractor.

4. Council will locate any assets not in the vicinity shown on the service plans that the contractor has not been able to locate, and update the asset records at Council’s cost.

4 Policy Statement

During the role-out of ultra-fast broadband in Canterbury, there were a number of incidents where fibre has either been drilled through, or installed immediately adjacent to, Council’s 3 Waters assets, and in some cases, Council has had to repair its damaged assets.

The Council will provide a location service to all contractors working near Council underground assets, consistent with other utility providers, by using GPR and pot-holing to mark out the location of the underground service on the surface.

The National Code of Practice for Utility Operators Access to Transport Corridors requires the contractor to ensure that they notify the utility operators and corridor manager before excavation proceeds. Council will, as part of the Beforeudig process, provide the procedures to follow when working near Council underground services.

The National Code of Practice also indicates that it is the contractor’s responsibility to locate all affected underground services in accordance with the requirements of the corridor manager and the utility providers. Where excavations are required to locate underground assets, the Code provides for utility operators to observe works in close proximity to their utilities.

The Code also states that if the contractor cannot locate an underground asset in close proximity to the identified location, they are to notify the utility operator or corridor manager who is responsible for identifying or correctly locating its assets, which places an obligation on Council to assist the contractor if the underground Council asset cannot be located.

The Code places responsibility on contractors to ensure works do not damage or disrupt the integrity of the utility providers’ assets. Affected utility providers can seek to recover costs from parties that fail to comply with these requirements.
DRAFT UNDERGROUND SERVICE LOCATING POLICY

Council is required under the Code to hold records of the location of the underground utilities and provide details and plans noting the location of their assets. There is acknowledgement within the Code that the location of older infrastructure may not be completely accurate, but still obliges utility operators to provide information that is as accurate as reasonably possible. The Code notes that the utility provider is required to provide on request from a contractor the same level of detail as is available to the utility provider.

While the National Code does not cover private property where there are Council assets underground, this policy and the Beforeудing process extends to services on private property.

The Council will proceed with providing maps noting the indicative location of the Council underground services with the following disclaimer:

*Boundary information is derived under licence from LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved). The Waimakariri District Council does not give and expressly disclaims any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose. Information on this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it.*

*The location of Council services are shown indicatively only and no guarantee is given as to the accuracy of the information. The user of the information has the responsibility to confirm the exact location of the service prior to commencing construction. When excavating in the vicinity of any Council service the contractor is responsible for pot-holing and protecting existing services and will be held responsible for all damage to Council property. The Council does not guarantee the existence of service laterals to vacant lots, regardless of whether a lateral is shown or not.*

Council will provide monitoring as a requirement when personnel or contractors are working near critical Council assets as identified by 3 Waters at the applicant's expense.

The Council will provide assistance to the contractor if underground assets are unable to be located using GPR and pot-holing via hydro excavation, which will be charged to the applicant.

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

National Code of Practice for Utility Operators Access to Transport Corridors

6 Adopted by and date

7 Review

Review every six years.
Report from Councillor Peter Farrant to 23 February 2016 Utilities and Roading Committee Meeting

Trim: 160216012540

Agenda Item

Utilities & Roading Committee

23 February 2016 Meeting

Item: Ashley Rural water

Discussion:

This matter was first raised during the start of the current Council term. There was some discussion between elected members on this matter and a paper circulated (by myself) to members outlining concerns with the water treatment process introduced in mid-2013.

There are more recent developments in respect to the management of this water network and in particular, the southern end of the supply which is within the WDC boundary. These matters are of some substance and it is both timely and necessary to review how the WDC ratepayer section of the network is operated.

At the present time, a locally elected water committee is in place, which provides a user forum for advising HDC of matters that pertain to the overall well-being and strategic direction of the network. This board has been in place almost from the inception of the scheme in 1971 and has functioned effectively since then.

Of interest to the WDC elected members is that this board is the only means of ensuring that there is a measure of governance input into the network on behalf of WDC ratepayers. This has typically been via an elected Councillor representative and from 2010 onwards, via a member of the Woodend-Ashley Advisory Board and latterly, Community Board.

Apart from this structure, there is no capacity for WDC governance or administrative input to the Ashley Water Network and the policies and priorities set for it.

Post 1989 Local Government Amalgamation, there has been quite limited communication between the HDC governance structure and the operational staff sector apart from feed-back from WDC membership on the water committee. This level of non-communication has completely dried up post 2011, after a managerial re-shuffle within HDC.

The material raised in 2013/14 by myself was primarily in response to HDC not advising or informing WDC at governance or operation (staff) level of a decision to introduce a chlorine based water treatment process to the southern half of the network, primarily being the WDC ratepayer base. Of concern was that HDC did not choose to consult at all with the community or with WDC and failed by not discharging a reasonable duty of care.

There were some initial concerns echoed by the affected community with respect to the change in taste (in the treated water). There is also strong evidence to suggest that the treatment process
had not been continually operating over the first 18-months post commissioning and no advisory notice was issued to consumers to this effect at any stage.

The corollary of earlier discussions was to not advance any effort to consider future annexing of the WDC section of the network back into WDC ownership and operation as it was argued that the probability of introducing shared services and closer cross boundary co-operation at administrative level could well be implemented, potentially satisfying many of the issues that were raised. This has not occurred and the probability of this developing is lower now than in early 2014.

Also diluting the appetite for tackling the Ashley Water issues was the ongoing high work-load due to the quake and subsequently with dealing to the aftermath of the flooding events between March and June 2014.

Some effort was made by Gerard Cleary and his team to discuss the matter with their counterparts in HDC with regard to how the network could be split hydraulically and with minimal cost and disruption to consumers. There was stoic resistance to this by HDC and an uncooperative stance taken with regard to any future discussions and supply of relevant information.

More recent developments have occurred since early 2014 with HDC policy and strategic planning and these are discussed below, along with other pertinent and topical matters of importance. These suggest quite strongly that it is incumbent on WDC to consider the future ownership and operation of the network and the interests of our ratepayers affected under the current structure.

These matters are:

1. HDC have earlier on publicly signalled their intention of either dissolving or at least substantially diminishing the role of the locally elected water committees and placing these by putting the water networks under the control of local ward committees or Community Board (Hanmer). This would mean that the Ashley Rural Water Network would come under the jurisdiction of the Amberley Ward Committee, effectively excluding any WDC governance involvement with the network and representation on behalf of 3500 WDC community members.

   This process has taken another path (post March 2015) with most water committees now destined to remain in place (in the short term at least) with the chairs of each committee meeting as a group and making recommendations (on behalf of the members) to HDC on capital expenditure priorities and key policy aspects. However, this arrangement does not fit with the management team call to disband the committees and there is no assurance that another attempt at reducing the role of these committees will not arise again.

   This is of high significance and even the notion or possibility of such exclusion should have WDC on high alert.

2. In recent discussions with the Ashley Rural Water Committee Chair, it has been noted that there is still a 50:50 chance that the Ashley rural Water Committee will be disbanded and another group set up under the umbrella of the Amberley Ward Committee to function as a user group for the combined Ashley and Amberley networks. This is a real potential point at which WDC representation could be effectively excluded.
3. HDC have also signalled their intention of supplying the south (WDC ratepayer) end of the network with water from the already water short Amberley area from a deep bore at Leithfield. This will require considerable capex expenditure on new water mains between Leithfield and Sefton at cost to the consumers. The water from Leithfield is quite hard and while secure(biologically), it will introduce problems and nuisance effects to consumers.

4. Over the past 15-20 years, the Ashley Rural Water Committee and HDC have purposefully steered away from relying on one water source for the network and have invested in two deep bores around Amberley to supply water to the northern sector, leaving the original Ashley intake to meet the demand at the south end.

Any move to return to a single source of supply and reliance on long sections of water-main is counter intuitive and increases the risk of breaching continuity of supply. Such a decision is dubious at the very least and does not represent good strategic planning or engineering decision making. WDC management is duty bound to take this matter seriously as a very real compromise in service levels.

5. What is of real concern to me and should also be of concern to us all is that HDC have bought forward the capex programme to start on the Leithfield – Ashley mainline upgrade to the 2016/17 year, meaning that if we procrastinate to an extent, we lose any opportunity to consider other long term options for the supply of safe and nuisance free water to our own ratepayers.

The proverbial will hit the fan when the WDC consumers experience the hard water, as they have not been advised of this development and the horse is about to bolt. This is a fairly questionable recommendation by HDC management with regard to shutting down any further work on evaluating longer term supply options.

6. HDC have consciously elected to pursue a legislative loophole and use the interim measure of MIOX (chlorination) to stave off the potential high water treatment and/or alternative water source expenses for its smaller rural communities that have arisen under the recent drinking water legislation (Health Act amendment).

For their own lower populated rural communities, this is possibly a wise move, but to include the highly populated section of WDC rural semi-rural area in this mix without giving due regard to the demographics and expectations of this community (and that it is under a differing territorial authority), is short sighted and downright irresponsible. This is not a HDC governance decision as such, but failure of HDC administration to properly and professionally discharge their duties to all stakeholders.

I can image the response and resulting furore if WDC were to be as lax in discharging their responsibilities – it simply would not be allowed to happen. Yet, we seem to be willing to turn a blind eye to the failings of HDC in this respect. Not any more …..

7. Allowing HDC to persevere with their questionable long term goals for supplying water totally precludes much more sustainable and effective long-term direction setting such as searching for alternative deep groundwater (Saltwater Creek area) or attaching the supply onto the
Rangiora supply, avoiding the hard water and significant expenditure on water mains and the hard water from Leithfield. To preclude any future investigation in following up these alternative water sources is close to being neglectful, given that the concerns have been pro-actively raised at this stage and bought to the attention of WDC.

8. Under the current arrangement, WDC ratepayer consumers are obliged to work under two separate but concurrent annual and long term planning processes to be informed of how policy and strategic (or non-strategic) plans can affect them. This is not a fair arrangement and is quite confusing to stakeholders. The non-consulted MIOX implementation is a good case in point to highlight this conflicting arrangement.

9. With a district wide approach taken by HDC to spread water supply overhead expenses, the higher populated WDC part of the Ashley Rural Water Network is effectively propping up the account and partially subsidising the remaining networks within the HDC boundaries. This is based on the coarse estimate of 3500 population/11,000 total WDC (part) plus HDC (whole) population base served by council owner water networks at around 30%.

This is now reality as there is a uniform water rate applying across all water supply areas within the HDC boundaries (2015/16 year). The WDC ratepayer sector are currently paying around $200,000 towards the HDC water overhead account.

I am aware that moving on this matter is neither administratively appealing, but the direction that matters have taken means expediency and convenience associated with doing nothing is no longer a responsible choice.

This matter has also been raised by the WACB appointee to the Ashley Water Committee (Chris Prickett) and the Chair of the Ashley Rural Water Committee (Ian Ford), with the HDC mayor fully aware of their concerns about the subsidising effect

I am proposing we start some proactive direction setting for the affected WDC ratepayers along the following suggested strategy:

a. Carry out a preliminary exercise by overlaying the current HDC budget onto a WDC template to quantify the potential savings in overall rate charges that would apply if a switch was made immediately. We are probably looking at an immediate saving of $100,000pa, all other costs remaining as is.

b. Canvas/Consult with the affected community with the figures obtained in the above exercise and in a politically neutral framework, bring the key matters of concern to their attention and seek feedback (by way of a survey???) as to whether or not there is a desire for us to follow up on future ownership/management alternatives.

c. Develop more detailed considerations of long term options and strategic direction for the WDC section of the Ashley network based on community views and preferences. This may include a full and final division of the network along district boundary lines but may also incorporate a shared service type of management arrangement where a combined political governance arrangement can be put into place.
At this stage, I am insistent on getting some momentum underway and am seeking that an agenda item is included for the 23 February 2016 U&R meeting with a recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That U&R recommend to Council that staff carry out a budget comparison using the 2015/16 Ashley Rural Water budget (HDC) as the template to determine the overhead component that would apply if WDC were operating the network along the same lines as for all other existing WDC district water networks.

(b) That a report is presented to U&R in April 2016 with the results of the exercise with any decision to further consultation and or carry out a customer survey with the affected residents to be deliberated at this meeting.

(c) Any further investigation work and or communication with HDC to be developed via a U&R workshop post public consultation with a view to evolving longer term separate or shared service management and or ownership structures for the area of the Ashley Rural Water Network within the WDC district Boundary.
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REPORT TO: Utilities and Roading Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 23 February 2016

FROM: Gerard Cleary, Manager Utilities and Roading

SUBJECT: Ashley Rural Water – Supplementary information

The attached documents give some background information on the Ashley Rural Water supply scheme that is administered by the Hurunui District Council.

Gerard Cleary
Manager Utilities and Roading
3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE

This section of the covers the description of Water Services assets covered under this AMP along with schematics of the individual water schemes.

3.1 Background
Assets covered in this document are Water Services assets owned and operated by Council, as at June 2014. These cover seven townships and 12 rural water schemes as summarised in Table 3-1 and Figure 3-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Connections</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Served Ha</th>
<th>Reticulation Length (km)</th>
<th>On Demand Schemes</th>
<th>Water Treatment</th>
<th>Water Source</th>
<th>Replacement Value $ (2014)</th>
<th>Install Date</th>
<th>Pump Stations</th>
<th>Chlorine Back-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amberley</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Racecourse Rd - Deep well (secure)²</td>
<td>Kowai River – Shallow bore</td>
<td>$2,556,256</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culverden</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leithfield - Deep bore</td>
<td>New deep bore yet to be connected</td>
<td>$6,029,493</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamner</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Two galleries (Rogerson and Dibon Rivers)</td>
<td>Shallow gallery (Waiapu River) or 24m bore (Haurunga River)</td>
<td>$3,366,287</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1952 &amp; 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamner</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two galleries (Rogerson and Dibon Rivers)</td>
<td>Shallow bore adjacent to Mason/Waiapu River</td>
<td>$867,957</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipara</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>24m deep bore on the Waipara River</td>
<td>$652,598</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1960 &amp; 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anui Plains</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Main intake of water from Waipara River is aerated, MOX and UV</td>
<td>$2,416,152</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>682.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith's Rd water is filtered to</td>
<td>$22,353,440</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of the Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Connection Numbers (July 2014)</th>
<th>Area Served Ha</th>
<th>Reticulation Length (km)</th>
<th>Pump Stations</th>
<th>Install Date</th>
<th>Replacement Value $ (2014)</th>
<th>Water Source</th>
<th>Water Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balmoral</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$1'979,220</td>
<td>at Smiths Rd, Normally from a weir on the Awatui Stream, if the weir flow is unavailable, water is pumped from the Pahau River</td>
<td>remove manganese (not currently in service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>$782,294</td>
<td>Three bores adjacent to the Waiau River</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheviot</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>202.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$6,272,811</td>
<td>One large river gallery (Hurunui River)</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui #1</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>320.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>$9,853,531</td>
<td>Two adjacent river edge bores</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiwara</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$3,109,681</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Waitohi</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>$3,435,700</td>
<td>One shallow bore</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parunsassus</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$2,004,381</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaks</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>$760,202</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Waitohi</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>150.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>$4,776,715</td>
<td>One shallow river flat bore</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiau RWS</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$3,950,117</td>
<td>Shallow bore adjacent to the Waiau River</td>
<td>MIOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,695</strong></td>
<td><strong>263,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,134.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$76,539,681</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. Connection numbers to individual properties or on farm tanks
2. All the On Demand schemes apart from Leithfield Beach are fully metered
### Ashley Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Served 2013</td>
<td>% of district served by community water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of district served by community water supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Supply</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties</td>
<td>Connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Source</td>
<td>South - Five shallow bores at Lower Selton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East - Two deep bores at Smiths Road (Mays Well)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North - Two deep bores (Racecourse Road/Kowai Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>both included under Amberley Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Original scheme installed in 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value ($)</td>
<td>Replacement cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depreciated replacement cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Annually over last 5 years (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Average daily per connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disinfection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure &amp; Flow</td>
<td>Pressure target Level of Service at boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage Rate</td>
<td>Using winter night time flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Well security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual maintenance cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ashley Schematic**

- **Mays Well, Smiths Road**
  - 113 m x 225 mm
  - Not currently in service
- **Mays Wells Road**
  - 113 m x 225 mm
  - Not currently in service
- **Chimpunga Road**
- **Trip J**
  - 30 m³
- **Deep sand AVS filter**
- **Rainwater**
- **Lakefield**
- **Bromfield**
- **Forrest**
- **Forestry**
- **Henry's Ford / Ashley Village**
- **Mission Down**
- **Stewarts**
- **Pratleys**
- **Prat Boys**
- **Sefson**
- **Prat Boys**
- **Contractors**
- **Lotus Domain**
- **Smartis**
- **Ashley Forest**

**Cluster of 5 wells at Ashley River**
- 161 - 12.0 m x 300 mm
- 2 other bores not in service

---
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APPENDIX E  ASHLEY PROPOSED EXPANSION

Stage One – Leithfield Beach to Leithfield & Terrace Road/Mays Road
i. A new 200mm pipe is required to be laid from the bore in Lucas Drive, up Kings Road to the Pukeko Junction corner at State Highway 1. Estimated length is 1.8 kilometres.
ii. At the Pukeko Junction, a single 150mm pipe is required to be laid north up Old Main North Road into Leithfield. Estimated length is 1.3 kilometres. Five 63mm connections will be required to feed from this pipe into the existing network in Leithfield.
iii. Also, from the Pukeko Junction, another 150mm pipe is required to be laid up Mays Road to the junction with Terrace Road. Estimated length is 0.5 kilometres. A number of small connections may be required off this pipe, however, these may not be necessary as part of the capital works project.

Stage one is due to be completed by the end of 2014-15 financial year.

Stage Two – Leithfield to Balcairn
i. A new 150mm pipe is required to be laid from Terrace Road/Mays Road junction via Terrace Road & Gartys Road to Balcairn. Estimated length is 4.5 kilometres. One 63mm sub main (with road crossings) may be required on Gartys Road, however, this may not be necessary as part of the capital works project.
ii. A new 63mm pipe is required from the junction of Terrace Road & Gartys Road to feed from the 150mm pipe into the existing network south of Gartys Road. Estimated length is 0.2 kilometres.
iii. New 63mm and 100mm cross connections required at Gartys Road/Smiths Road junction to allow feed into existing network.
iv. Further smaller connections may be required off the 150mm pipe or existing 63mm pipes. This will allow more restrictors to be placed at road frontages.
v. PRVs are required at the entrance into Leithfield once Stage Two is complete and running.

Stage two is due to be completed by the end of 2015-16 financial year. This is dependent upon available funds.

Stage Three – Balcairn to D/S end of the gravity line
i. A new 150mm dedicated rising main pipe from Balcairn booster pump station along Robertson's Road to Marshmans Road junction. Estimated length is 3 kilometres. Existing 50mm PVC pipe to be used as sub main.
ii. 150mm pipe to be laid along Marshmans Road to the end of the gravity line (north of Kowai River South Branch). Estimated length is 1.4 kilometres. This will include one river crossing and PRV at the northern end of this line.
iii. Connection to existing gravity line – will be back fed south from new main temporarily until end of Stage 5.
iv. New 100mm connection (with PRV) into Ashworths Bush Road 100mm main will allow existing Marshmans Road, Bruces Road & Robinsons Road connections to be fed.

Stage three is due to be completed by the end of 2016-17 financial year. This is dependent upon available funds. Stages three and four can be interchanged or, if possible, completed in parallel

Stage Four – Balcairn Booster Pump Station
Balcairn Booster Station with four storage tanks on existing council land. Flow will be limited into reservoir to 15 litres per second (this is to avoid head loss in new 150mm pipes).

Stage four is due to be completed by the end of 2017-18 financial year. This is dependent upon available funds. Stages three and four can be interchanged or, if possible, completed in parallel.

Stage Five – Marshmans Road south to Copples Road
i. A new 150mm pipe on Marshmans Road from the junction with Robertson's Road to Copples Road (north of Stony Creek).
ii. New 63mm sub main to connect to Copples Road & new 63mm cross connections onto Douds Road and McLeods Road.
iii. Optional: Ramsey Road can be fed back from McLeods Road down the gravity line or via a new 63mm pipe from Marshmans Road.
iv. Abandon gravity line from Stony Creek north to Ramsey Road.

Stage five is due to be completed by the end of 2018-19 financial year (to be confirmed). This is dependent upon available funds.

Stage Six – Northern section of gravity line to Kowai River North Branch
i. A new 150mm pipe on Marshmans Road between the two branches of the Kowai River. It is likely that the existing location of the pipe would be changed to run along the road. Existing connections may need to be changed.

There is no set timescale for this work. Pipe condition assessment samples have been taken on the existing section of AC pipe.

Stage Seven – Copples Road to Forestry Pump Shed
i. A new 150mm pipe on Marshmans Road from Copples Road up Prattleys Road to Forestry. This is optional but would provide a link into the existing system allowing the Main Intake to flow into the Leithfield area and potentially vice versa.

There is no set timescale for this work.