[redacted]

From: Official Information
Sent: Thursday, 1 September 2016 4:11 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: LGOIMA request

Dear [redacted]

My apologies for the delay but the final piece of information you requested took longer than expected to compile. On 24 June you requested information under the LGOIMA. The following information regards your questions regarding hazard mitigation.

Staff have provided the following information:

The information presented in the table below represents the Council's best current understanding of expenditure on these projects that may be related to sea walls/coastal protection/stop banks/erosion mitigation. We do not hold information that splits the expenditure on assets by the specific activities requested, so we cannot provide definitive information. For example, there are stormwater outlets that have been replaced along the estuary edge which may or may not have erosion protection installed. With these outfalls we have not recorded separately any rock protection that may be associated with these outfalls (i.e. the costs of erosion protection are not separated out from the cost of the outfalls). We have not tried to approximate this in any way and have provided the total outfall cost.

The table below represents project costs for projects that may include a significant erosion / natural hazard protection component and it may not represent all projects of this nature. Without going into the designs of each individual project it will not be possible to provide any greater certainty.

The table below shows that many of these projects may have been subject to cost share funding and the 'other funding' represents cost share contributions (NZTA or CERA).

There will be varying design / management / overhead contributions between the projects depending on who delivered them. Staff have not tried to 'normalise' the differing project activity types, e.g. some lines may include or exclude investigations/detailed design as these can be captured in different cost centres/codes.

Delivered By:	Project Name	Value ($)	Eligibility for CF	Other funding	Council Funding
SCIRT	Seawall Renewal (RW)	$ 1,439,959.54	90%	$ 1,075,650	$ 364,310
SCIRT	Southshore sth of Betty St	$ 249,570.72	100%	$ 149,742	$ 99,828
SCIRT	PS37 to Bridge Street Catchment	$ -		$ -	$ -
SCIRT	PS15 Central	$ 70,237.12	100%	$ 42,142	$ 28,095
SCIRT	Beachville Rd & Celia St	$ 8,508.51	90%	$ 6,356	$ 2,153

SCIRT	Cycleway	$	-		$ -	$ -
SCIRT	3 Laning Sea Wall	$	2,017,789.15	0%	$ -	$ 2,017,789
SCIRT	Main Road Causeway	$	1,439,959.54	90%	$ 1,075,650	$ 364,310
SCIRT	Beachville Road	$	911,335.23	90%	$ 680,767	$ 230,568
SCIRT	Monks Bay Sea Wall	$	28,254.76	90%	$ 21,106	$ 7,148
CCC	Avon stopbanks EQ Repairs	$	11,029,033.00	0%	$ -	$ 11,029,033
CCC	Temp Stop Bank Management	$	167,362.00	0%	$ -	$ 167,362
CCC	McCormack's Bay Culvert	$	3,083,940.00	0%	$ -	$ 3,083,940
CCC	Marine Pde Coastal outfall	$	225,000.00	0%	$ -	$ 225,000
CCC	Ebbtide St Stopbank	$	213,500.00	0%	$ -	$ 213,500
		$	20,884,449.57		$ 3,051,413.84	$ 17,833,035.73

Kind regards,

Sean.

From: Rainey, Sean
Sent: Friday, 5 August 2016 10:54 a.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: TRIM: LGOIMA request

Dear [redacted]

Thank you for your email, received on 24 June. You requested the following information, under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA):

I would like to request the following information from council for the period 2011?2016 relating to the following suburbs: South New Brighton, Sumner, Southshore and New Brighton.

I would like to know the following figures for each suburb:

- Earthquake insurance claim settlements
- Level of reinvestment of earthquake insurance settlements
- The number of dwellings
- The number of active residents' associations

- Financial support provided to residents? associations
- Rateable income
- Expenditure on infrastructure
- Expenditure on CCC facilities
- Expenditure on hazard mitigation (sea walls/coastal protection/stop banks/erosion mitigation - excluding emergency works)
- Estimated timeframe for completion of mitigation measures
- Estimated/budgeted expenditure.

Extension of timeframe

On 22 July, we extended the timeframe on our response to you by an additional 10 working days.

Refinement of request

On 7 July, you refined the scope of your request to the following:

The objective with the exclusion is to exclude or identify specifically work funded by EQC and work funded by CCC.

The more information the better. It is critical that we can identify where the funding for the hazard mitigation comes from.

Release of information

Staff have provided responses to your questions below:

For South New Brighton, Sumner, Southshore and New Brighton.

1. Earthquake insurance claim settlements
   The Council does not record its insurance income or track the application of it to the suburb level.

2. Level of reinvestment of earthquake insurance settlements
   As above in 1.

3. The number of dwellings
   I have attached an email Steve Ballard sent to you on 6 and the 29 July seeking refinement to your request. Staff are awaiting your response before providing an answer to your question.

4. The number of active residents' association

South New Brighton 1
Sumner 1
Southshore 1
New Brighton 2

5. Financial support provided to residents? Associations
   This is attached. Please note there is no record of funding for the two New Brighton Associations.

6. Rateable income
   As above in 3.

7. Expenditure on infrastructure
   The Council does not hold detailed collated financial information on a suburb-by-suburb basis. Such work is generally based on a project-basis and could also include SCIRT works. Information on specific works or facilities can be provided.

8. Expenditure on CCC facilities
   As above in 7.

9. Expenditure on hazard mitigation (sea walls/coastal protection/stop banks/erosion mitigation - excluding emergency works)
   Staff are currently assessing this request and it is taking longer than expected as much of the information is held by SCIRT. Staff will provide what information is possible but this is still being collected. My apologies for the delay and I hope to respond to this shortly.

10. Estimated timeframe for completion of mitigation measures
    As above in 9.

11. Estimated/budgeted expenditure.
    As above in 9.

In the Council's view the reasons for withholding these details are not outweighed by public interest considerations in section 7(1) favouring their release.

You have the right to request the Ombudsman to review this decision. Complaints can be sent by email to info@ombudsman.parliament.nz, by fax to (04) 471 2254, or by post to The Ombudsman, PO Box 10152, Wellington 6143.

Refusal of request

In light of the staff comments above, and where cited, the Council is refusing to provide some of the information requested under the following sections of the LGOIMA:

- 17(f) – the information requested cannot be made available without substantial collation or research
- 17(g) – the information requested is not held by the local authority

You have the right to request the Ombudsman to review this decision. Complaints can be sent by email to info@ombudsman.parliament.nz, by fax to (04) 471 2254, or by post to The Ombudsman, PO Box 10152, Wellington 6143.

Kind regards,

Sean

Sean Rainey
Senior Information Adviser and Privacy Officer
Office of the Chief Executive
Christchurch City Council
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch 8011
PO Box 73016, Christchurch 8154