

**CANTERBURY CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 5 SEPTEMBER 2005
COMMENCING AT 10.00 A.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY, 58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Members	Representatives	Supporting Staff
Ashburton District Council	Cr Darryl Nelson	
Banks Peninsula District Council	Cr Kirsty Macnab	
Christchurch City Council	Cr Sue Wells	Jane Parfitt
		Murray Sinclair
Environment Canterbury	Cr Sir Kerry Burke	John Talbot
Selwyn District Council	Cr Kelvin Coe	Paul Davey
Timaru District Council	Cr Richard Lyon	Peter Thompson
Waimakariri District Council	Mayor Jim Gerard	Jim Palmer

OTHERS PRESENT:

CDEM Group Controller	Bob Upton
NZ Police	Inspector Craig McKay
Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management	John Lovell

ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY STAFF PRESENT:

John Fisher
Jon Mitchell
Robyn Pay

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mayor Michael McEvedy (Selwyn District Council) and Mayor John O'Neill (Mackenzie District Council).

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved

That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2005, as circulated, be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Mayor Gerard – Cr Nelson

3. MATTERS ARISING

Mayor Gerard referred item 4 in the previous minutes, and asked whether there had been any discussion with the Minister when he was in Christchurch for the Local Government Conference. Staff confirmed that this had not been possible, but endeavours will be made to follow this up again.

Paul Davey referred to Mayor McEvedy's comments about the feasibility of Group-wide disaster relief funds. Mayor McEvedy is currently out of the country, and Mr Davey asked that this matter be followed up at the next meeting.

Before proceeding with the agenda, the Chairperson Cr Sue Wells advised the meeting that she would be adding an item of General Business later in the agenda: Hurricane Katrina.

4. CANTERBURY CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2004-2005

John Fisher presented this report. He noted a net annual over-expenditure of \$4,947. He highlighted several reasons for this (all reported on during the year), including under-budgeting for the Group Controller position, less revenue received from the Ministry than budgeted, and additional interest received.

He went through the sections of the budget one by one, highlighting particular issues, and answering questions. Particular points raised included:

- It is possible that the Polytechnic funding may not continue at its present level in years to come. Both major political parties have noted this as an area that will be reviewed following the election.
- In reply to a question about ongoing recruitment for the rescue teams, staff confirmed that future efforts would concentrate on strengthening existing teams (rather than forming new teams).
- While the Reduction Committee has not met recently, the risk register has been maintained and kept up to date.
- It was noted that Waimakariri District Council has carried out an abridged Engineering Lifelines project based around their major infrastructure. This is seen as the way ahead over the next year or so for some districts. It was emphasised that the work done in the individual districts must be linked to the utilities.

Mayor Gerard said that it was very pleasing to note that the Group had come a long way in a short time.

The Chairperson said it is important to be able to use this report to identify the gaps and, if necessary, amend the Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the EMO. She noted a particular issue of concern in the communications area - the lack of clarity in roles of the Joint Committee, the CEG, Environment Canterbury, and territorial authorities. She also felt that targets for the next twelve months must be clearly defined.

Staff spoke about the timing of negotiating the SLA, noting that there had been problems in the past when the SLA was brought before the Joint Committee late in the year, when the main focus is on the budget. This year it was considered earlier in the year. The Christchurch City Council is currently looking at its CDEM arrangements, and this could impact on the next SLA. It was also noted that Environment Canterbury's Wilma Falconer was preparing a paper to address the issue of clarity in communications.

Resolved

That the Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Annual Report 2004-2005 be received.

Cr Wells – Cr Burke

5. GROUP PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS

A report on this issue was considered by the CEG at its meeting in August. It was agreed that there is a need for a clear distinction between high-level governance issues, and administration issues.

Three options were presented for consideration:

The first option was the status quo option, whereby the Joint Committee must approve every amendment to the plan. The second option provided for "significant" amendments to be approved by the Joint Committee, following referral from the EMO to the CEG. The third option provided for amendments of a more minor nature to be approved by CEG, with more significant amendments coming to the Joint Committee for approval.

There was wide discussion on the merits of each option. It was considered important to retain accountability and transparency and it was noted that very substantial amendments (those which "affect the rights and obligations of individuals") would trigger the public consultation process (Section 56).

There was some discussion about the options available to the Joint Committee if they felt a change approved by the CEG was unwise. Staff noted that this matter had been discussed at length at the CEG meeting, and it was agreed that the onus is on CEG members to communicate with, and seek direction from their elected members. It was thought that if responsibility is delegated to the CEG for particular decisions, then they should be able to make those decisions without referral to the Joint Committee. It was noted that the CEG does not have to exercise its delegations and could, if appropriate, refer a particular issue to the Joint Committee.

There was unanimous support for Option 3.

This option would be brought into effect by way of the addition of a new s3.10.1 c. to the Group Plan, as follows:

- I. Proposed amendments to the Plan shall:
 - i. Be made by member organisations of the CDEM Group or CEG*
 - ii. Be addressed to the Canterbury CDEM Group, care of the EMO*
 - iii. Outline the reasons for the proposed amendment*
 - iv. Include reference to supporting consultation and/or information*
 - v. Include the proposed amendment in detail.**
- II. The CDEM Group Joint Committee retains the power to approve all amendments to the Plan that relate to:
 - i. Group strategic direction*
 - ii. Group governance and administrative arrangements*
 - iii. Obligations of member local authorities – including amendments to Local CDEM Arrangements that relate to such obligations*
 - iv. Financial implications for either the CDEM Group or its member local authorities.**
- III. All proposed amendments to the Plan referred to the CDEM Group Joint Committee will be accompanied by recommendations from the Coordinating Executive Group and shall not occur more often than six monthly, unless urgent.*
- IV. The CDEM Group Joint Committee delegates to the Coordinating Executive Group, pursuant to s18 CDEM Act 2002, the power to approve proposed amendments to the Plan that relate to:
 - i. Ongoing enhancement of the hazard register*
 - ii. Operational arrangements of local authorities and other emergency response organisations*
 - iii. Roles and obligations of CDEM partner organisations, other than local authorities - including the approval of additional partner CDEM arrangements*
 - iv. Clarification of parts of the Plan where the intent is clear but the wording should be enhanced, including factual and typographical corrections.**
- V. All amendments approved by the CEG, shall be referred to CDEM Group Joint Committee members for information within 10 working days.*
- VI. All amendments to the Plan will be communicated to all levels of the CDEM Group organisation within 10 working days.*

The Chairperson sought confirmation that making this change to the plan would not trigger the public consultation process. Staff confirmed that legal advice had been received that any decision by the Joint Committee at this meeting would come into effect immediately; that it would not significantly affect the rights of individuals and therefore would not trigger the public consultation process.

Resolved

That the CDEM Group Joint Committee adopt the plan amendment process outlined in Option 3 of this report.

Cr Nelson – Cr Burke

6. OVERLAP OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF DISTRICT AND REGIONAL COUNCILS FOR HAZARDS UNDER THE CDEM ACT, RMA AND OTHER LEGISLATION

This report (prepared by Andrew Willis, Environment Canterbury's Policy Officer) was presented to the Joint Committee by John Talbot. The matter had been fully discussed by the CEG.

The report was prepared following questions raised at earlier meetings in relation to project initiation and funding responsibilities for research projects, such as the Kaikoura tsunami study and the Engineering Lifelines meteorological studies.

Included in the report (as Appendix I) were details of natural hazards responsibilities of Canterbury territorial authorities. This report showed that natural hazard investigation and management is not the sole responsibility of Environment Canterbury, but that the RMA clearly gives responsibilities to both territorial and regional councils. This means that there could be a range of options available to the Joint Committee when a natural hazard must be dealt with. It is the CDEM Group that has responsibility to monitor to ensure that hazards are being addressed appropriately.

The Chairperson suggested having informal discussions about hazard identification, identifying which hazards have not made it onto the "to do" list. Cr Nelson said there is a need to identify hazards, and to determine who benefits and who should pay. It was felt that this workshop should take place before a funding policy is adopted.

There was some discussion about whether to hold a separate workshop or whether to incorporate this discussion into the next scheduled meeting. It was agreed that rather than trying to schedule a new date, it would be preferable to make the meeting set down for 5 December longer to incorporate this discussion.

Resolved

- (a) That the report be received.*
- (b) That further discussion be held on this matter at the Joint Committee meeting on 5 December 2005.*
- (c) That following the 5 December meeting, the EMO develop a draft CDEM Projects Funding Policy to be considered by the CEG, and for recommendation to the Joint Committee.*

Cr Wells – Mayor Gerard

7. PROPOSED NATIONAL CDEM PLAN

Staff noted that the consultation period for the National Plan closes on 14 October 2005. All members were provided with a copy of the plan.

Issues identified by staff include:

- The proposed plan takes a narrow approach to hazards (consistent with the 1983 Civil Defence Act).
- The roles of territorial authorities and regional councils are not defined. (Cr Burke noted that a report being prepared for Environment Canterbury by Mr David Collins may address this matter. The report is due at the end of September.)
- Roles and responsibilities of some partner organisations are not well described.
- The application of CIMS to the management of emergencies at the national level has been inadequately addressed.

Resolved

- (a) That the EMO develop a CDEM Group submission to the Proposed National CDEM Plan in consultation with Canterbury CDEM partners.
- (b) That the CDEM Group Joint Committee Chair approves the final CDEM Group submission to the Proposed National CDEM Plan.

Cr Nelson – Mayor Gerard

8. CDEM GROUP WORK PROGRAMME REPORT

Jon Mitchell presented the report, and confirmed that all but one of the projects is on target at present. The Training Programme is running behind schedule because exercises are taking priority at the moment. It is expected that the Training Programme will catch up during the year.

Cr Wells asked that an overview of all projects be included in future, including those projects not yet commenced.

Resolved

That the report be received.

Cr Wells – Cr Lyon

9. CDEM GROUP CONTROLLER'S REPORT

Mr Bob Upton presented his report.

Noting the comment on the difficulties being experienced identifying and convincing Environment Canterbury staff with the right skill sets to become involved in CDEM, the Chairperson said that this requirement was part of all CCC job descriptions. It was noted that councils must be aware of the need to have staff trained to the correct level in the event of an emergency. Mrs Parfitt noted that this whole issue has been taken up at a executive level at the CCC, with a view to ensuring priority is given to proper training. The Chairperson asked that the next Controller's Report provide an update on this important matter.

The difficulties in having one-on-one meetings with some key utilities were noted. Staff assured the Joint Committee however that all these utilities are very clear on their roles in the event of an emergency.

Cr Macnab suggested that On Track should be included in the discussions with utilities, not Toll Rail.

Resolved

That the CDEM Group Controller's Report be received.

Cr Burke – Cr Nelson

10. GENERAL BUSINESS

10.1 Exercise Pandora 2005

The aims and objectives of Exercise Pandora were outlined. Important dates are:

3 September	EOC exercise
10 September	"Northern" EOC's (including Christchurch, Kaikoura, Hurunui, Waimakariri, Christchurch and Banks Peninsula)
16 September	Southern EOC's (excluding Waimate)

The first of these exercises had been held two days prior to this meeting. It was felt that the overall objectives were achieved. Several matters were identified for further consideration: improvement of master record system; length of the exercise (four hours is too short); and need for training and practice for unit managers.

Members were invited to attend any of the remaining exercises as appropriate.

Resolved

That the report be received.

Cr Wells – Cr Lyon

10.2 Hurricane Katrina

There was some discussion about how New Zealand, and Canterbury in particular, would cope with a disaster on a scale similar to Hurricane Katrina.

John Lovell reported that the New Zealand government has made an initial offer of assistance to the United States. It is possible that John Titmus, the Ministry's Auckland-based Emergency Management Adviser, will travel to the United States in the next few days as an observer. It was felt that there would be a huge amount of lessons to be learned.

The United Nations website reports that there is still no effective co-ordination after five days. Law and order issues will need to be resolved before any other progress can be made. It was noted that phone and cellphone systems were out, radios were overloaded, and satellite phones were inoperable.

It is possible that sometime further down the track a team might be put together to travel to the United States. Terms of reference would need to be prepared first.

Cr Wells was interested in anything that territorial authorities may have done to assist. CCC had done nothing to date. She suggested a possible area of assistance could be to offer displaced persons space in local communities (rather than sending aid overseas).

10.3 Ministry Update

John Lovell provided several oral updates:

- Following on from the Minister's visit to Christchurch, he noted that the growth process (following the large budget increase) has slowed right down. It was agreed that there is an urgent need to look at the structure of the Ministry, including the management structure.
- A key project for the Ministry is sector support. Most TA's in New Zealand would not have the organisational capacity to sustain an EOC long-term. It is important to have trained personnel in the country who can be called upon to help when necessary. This arrangement needs to be formalised, including cost issues.
- The GNS tsunami report prepared for the government is currently with the Ministry in Wellington. Decisions need to be made regarding the release of the report (hopefully by end of September).

11. NEXT MEETING – 5 DECEMBER 2005

12. CLOSURE

The meeting concluded at 12.03 p.m.

CONFIRMED

Date: _____ **Chairperson**