

31. FACILITIES REBUILD PLAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Property Consultancy Manager
Author:	Angus Smith

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - Inform the Council of the Facilities Rebuild Plan project.
 - Set out the proposed assessment and occupancy approach for adoption by Council.
 - Present a governance and decision-making proposal with supporting delegations in respect of assessment and occupancy, insurance, repairs, rebuilds and demolitions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This report presents the following detail in respect of the Facilities Rebuild Plan:
 - Outlines the Facilities Rebuild Plan project process, paragraphs 13 - 21
 - Explains the assessment and occupancy approach for Council's facilities, paragraphs 22 - 36.
 - Explains the insurance arrangements on Council's Facilities and the process for loss adjusting and negotiating with insurer, paragraphs 37 - 50.
 - Sets out the repair, rebuild and demolition process, issues and decisions, paragraphs 51 - 59.
 - Describes the proposed approach to communication, paragraphs 60 - 65.
3. The report also sets out the decision issues in association with these matters and seeks a set of delegations to support a governance and management proposal.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The building assessment work that is required to inform the Facilities Rebuild Plan is generally funded from insurance monies where the buildings are damaged and result in a successful insurance claim. Where the building is not damaged the costs will be proposed as part of the 2012/13 Annual Plan process. Any enhancement (betterment) above total insured value, would also require a Council resolution to proceed. The Facilities Rebuild Project will be resourced through internal Council resources with the use of external engineering consultants for Detailed Engineering Evaluations.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with LTCCP budgets?

5. No. The purpose of this report is in response to the series of earthquakes that have recently struck Christchurch to inform future LTCCP and Annual Plan processes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Not applicable.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

7. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

8. No. The purpose of this report is in response to the series of earthquakes that have recently struck Christchurch to inform future LTCCP and Annual Plan processes.

31 Cont'd

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the LTCCP?

9. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Yes the purpose of this report is to deliver a revised set of strategies in terms of service delivery and supporting facilities plans to assist with the rebuild of Christchurch.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Yes, refer above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Not applicable. Communication and consultation will be a project workstream.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Receive the information in this report.
- (b) Delegate the decision(s) to close and reopen buildings for staff and public use to the General Manager of Corporate Services and the General Manager of Community Services subject to the following framework:
 - (i) The assessment and occupancy approach as set out in paragraphs 22 - 36 and **Appendix 2** of this report.
 - (ii) In the event of DEE assessments that staff and/or public are able to occupy buildings as follows:
 - Buildings with a capacity of 33 percent New Building Standard (NBS) or less will not be occupied.
 - Buildings with a capacity between 34 percent NBS and 66 percent NBS inclusive can be occupied where engineering advice confirms that there is a moderate to low risk exposure (based on building strength, occupancy levels and occupancy duration) and/or a high cost (financial or otherwise) of not using the building. This assessment is made on a case-by-case basis.
 - Buildings with a capacity of 67 percent NBS or greater can be occupied without restriction.
- (c) Delegate to the General Manager Corporate Services the authority to accept progress and partial insurance payments on behalf of the Council on the condition that they are not full and final, nor commit the Council to a settlement.
- (d) Delegate to the General Manager Corporate Services the authority to accept insurance payouts for facilities which we insure but do not own, and distribute the payout to the appropriate party(s).
- (e) Delegate to the General Manager Corporate Services the authority to settle claims less than or equal to \$5,000 that are to be settled globally based on the estimated cost to repair ie "category 1" claims as set out in paragraph 41 below.
- (f) Agree that all other insurance settlements outside the delegations in (c), (d), (e) and g(ii) are referred to Council for consideration and resolution.

31 Cont'd

- (g) Delegate to the General Manager Corporate Services and General Manager Community Services, jointly, the authority to:
 - (i) Approve the demolition of buildings for safety reasons, ie act on Section 38 Notices from Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA).
 - (ii) Repair an existing facility/structure within insurance proceeds where the work will cost less than \$1 million and the cost of the work is less than 50 percent of a building's total insured value and to accept the insurance settlement for the work completed.
 - (iii) To undertake urgent stabilisation and weather-proofing work, including heritage buildings.
- (h) Council approval is required for:
 - (i) Work and demolitions of heritage buildings not covered by staff delegations. A list of the earthquake-affected heritage buildings is contained in **Appendix 4**
 - (ii) Recommended demolitions (not for safety reasons or ordered by CERA)
 - (iii) Recommended repairs exceeding more than \$1 million or more than 50 percent of the total insured value of the building
 - (iv) Enhancement (betterment) of a facility above total insured value
 - (v) Rebuilds.

31 Cont'd

BACKGROUND

Facilities Rebuild Plan – project process

Outline

13. A single project has been initiated to deliver the Facilities Rebuild Plan (Plan). The intention of the Plan is to establish a future decision-making framework to assist Council in its opportunity to consider and resolve what facilities will best meet the needs of our community long term. To achieve this, the high-level outputs of the project are:
 - (a) The creation and/or review of various business strategies for the delivery of services to the community. These strategies will be key to informing future asset decisions particularly around matching assets to business needs.
 - (b) Development of the Plan to Council that supports the various service delivery strategies will be informed by:
 - Building assessments,
 - Demolitions,
 - Rebuild options,
 - Suitability for occupancy,
 - Acquisition and disposal options and opportunities,
 - Utilisation of Council's assets,
 - Funding and insurance issues,
 - Relevant Facility Strategies.
 - (c) That the plan informs future LTCCPs, budgeting and a Capital Works Programme.

Key High Level Steps

14. *To date - reactive and ongoing*

Since the 4 September 2010 and 22 February 2011 earthquake events in particular there has been and continues to be a process of attending to demolitions, dealing with insurance issues and assessing buildings. This has been a crisis response approach, the framework for which is set out below in paragraphs 22 to 36 "Structural Assessment and Occupancy Approach". A summary of the buildings currently under assessment and those demolished is scheduled below in paragraphs 51 to 53 "Repairs, Rebuilds and Demolitions".
15. *Looking forward - proactive with commencement of the Facilities Rebuild Project*
 - Step 1: Establishment of facilities data, review and categorisation - *underway*.
 - Step 2: Business Units review service delivery strategies and facilities for completeness of data and prioritisation - *underway*.
 - Step 3: Council consider strategies and the project phasing – *February 2012*.
 - Step 4: Reframe assessment work based on phase 1 priorities established through Council – *post February 2012*.
 - Step 5: Collate all information and options into a plan – *timing to be planned*.
 - Step 6: Deliver a phase 1. Facilities Rebuild Plan – *timing to be planned*.
 - Step 7: Workshop and report future phase plans – *timing to be planned*.
 - Step 8: Integrate Facility Rebuild Plans into Council's planning processes ie LTCCP, budgets, capital works programmes.
16. There are issues that will run continuously and concurrently with this project that will require constant resourcing and decisions. These are communication, demolitions, assessment, insurance and occupancy issues. Proposed decision frameworks for these are set out in each section below.

31 Cont'd

Scope and Scale

17. The Council owns more than 1600 buildings comprising 952 "commercial" buildings and 699 housing buildings. The facilities are categorised at **Appendix 1**. Using a separate process, many of these buildings are the subject of a Detailed Engineering Evaluation (DEE) process to assess their remaining seismic capacity.
18. Due to the large size of the Council portfolio, complexity of the issues, risk of continued events and resourcing constraints it is expected to take at least two years to complete the full assessment process for every property. Consequently in addition to the strategy review work the Business Units are also being asked to review and prioritise their list of facilities for Council consideration. The purpose of this is to establish prioritisation of the portfolio into a set of categories for staged assessment and planning. It is proposed to set these out as; "deliver now" (only requiring basic repairs) for which a framework and delegation is proposed in this report; a manageable list of phase 1 properties that a plan can be delivered on in a reasonable time frame; and future phasing for the balance. For these "deliver now" buildings, a DEE assessment will follow later but our profiling does not highlight the likelihood of any issues arising. These will be reported to Council for sign off in February 2012.

Approach

19. For the purpose of this project the Council's facilities portfolio has been categorised into work streams as follows:

Group	Workstream	Total Buildings In Scope from Salesforce
City Environment	Greenspace	591
	Transport	18
	City Water & W	28
	Heritage	29
Community Services	Libraries	31
	Community Facilities	95
	Sport & Rec	97
Corporate Support	Corporate Accom	18
Total Commercial	VBASE	4
	Miscellaneous	39
		952
Total Residential	Housing (units) (699 Buildings)	2649

20. Further to paragraph 15, the project is at step 2 where the Council business units have been asked to review existing strategies to see how they fit with our changed circumstances, identify gaps, additional needs and key principles. There are a number of existing facility strategies that have been developed after public consultation and are informing this process. These include: Libraries 2025 Facilities Plan; Aquatic Facilities Plan; Metropolitan Sports Facilities plan; Social Housing Strategy; Strengthening Communities Strategy. Other key related strategies included: Central City Plan; Suburban Centres Programme; LTCCP and various Area Plans.

31 Cont'd

21. In parallel work across the portfolio has been underway since the September 2010 earthquake and continues around assessments, occupancy, insurance, demolition, rebuild and repair issues. The process, status, issues and future actions for attending to each of these matters is outlined below.

Structural Assessment and Occupancy Approach

Assessments

22. To date the application of the assessments has been evolving as we have worked through the earthquake events, and as thinking has been developed by CERA, engineer's approaches, insurer's responses etc. An approach to structural assessment of facilities and future occupancy has been developed in conjunction with John Hare of Holmes Consulting, an overview of which is attached at **Appendix 2**. To date DEE assessments have been initiated on the list of properties at **Appendix 3**.
23. Due to the large number of buildings to be assessed, to date a risk-based profiling approach to determine the priority order in which DEE assessments are carried-out. This takes into account a number of variables such as criticality or importance of the activity, the number of and time spent by occupants and the likelihood of structural failure eg considering age, material, design, ground conditions etc. As mentioned above staff are currently undertaking a review to reframe the prioritisation for future assessments. This will be presented to Council in February for its consideration and approval.
24. Level 2 Rapid Assessments have been carried-out following all major earthquake events as follows:
- 4 September 2010 – all buildings
 - 22 February 2011 – all buildings
 - 13 June 2011 – 284 buildings*.
- * Following these events on June 13 the trigger for determining which buildings to assess to a higher level was based on an analysis of peak ground acceleration data by an experienced engineer as the damage and impact of the shaking was more localised in close proximity to the epicentre.*
25. These Level 2 Rapid Assessments were carried-out by experienced assessors following the earthquake events. That is, for most structures we used chartered engineers and for simple Greenspace buildings eg toilets, shelters, we used park rangers to make the assessment. Any concerns or identified issues were escalated to a chartered engineer.
26. Beyond Level 2 Rapid Assessments, a damage investigation was undertaken for selected buildings depending on the circumstances, however these are now being employed less often. We are now undertaking DEE assessments as it is recognised that these provide a much improved measure of a buildings capacity, expressed as a percent of the New Building Standard (NBS) and therefore indicate whether strengthening may be required, in addition to the repair of earthquake damage. (Typically where a building was closed following the Level 2 Rapid Assessment without the possibility of a quick repair, we moved to the development of a design solution or options).
27. To appropriately resource this significant stream of work we have completed a contestable tender process to establish a panel of engineering consultants to support this, achieving our target of having the panel in place by 1 December 2011.

31 Cont'd

Occupancy

28. The following process is in place to clearly identify and communicate the status of Council facilities when aftershocks occur:
 - The decision to evacuate and close Council facilities is triggered by a M5.0 or greater earthquake
 - A Level 2 Rapid Assessment is then carried-out for all buildings unless the analysis of ground acceleration data by an experienced engineer highlights that it is not required for specific buildings in specific locations. This analysis is made through the use of a risk-based approach as detailed above
 - If the earthquake is of less than M5.0 but triggers an evacuation (eg the M4.9 aftershock on 26 December 2010) the building is checked for visible damage (or any change in damage status) by a designated person responsible for each facility before reopening. In addition, a Level 2 Rapid Assessment is carried-out for specific buildings (eg Emergency Operation Centre (EOC), Welfare Centres)
 - Rapid communication to staff, users and the wider community follows as to the open/closed status of all buildings using telephone trees, email/intranet and information posted on the Council website.
29. The framework and hierarchy of opening Council's facilities post earthquake is focused on facilities which are open at the time an event occurs. Specifically the priority ranking is currently:
 - Emergency Operations Centre – Rexel/Kathmandu building will fulfil this function for the foreseeable future
 - Welfare Centres (eg Pioneer Stadium)
 - Call Centre – now back operating from the Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street
 - Staff occupied facilities (includes libraries, parks facilities – at Botanic Gardens, Burwood, Victoria Park, temporary offices in specific community centres, eg Avic Hill, Metro Refuse Centres, Wastewater Treatment facility)
 - Early Learning Centres
 - Remaining Recreation and Sport, Community Support and Reserves facilities, and commercial premises.
30. It should be noted that following a satisfactory outcome from the Level 2 Rapid Assessment by an engineer, that before a building can re-open, service checks and health and safety checks are also completed.
31. All social housing facilities will be visited by Housing Officers who will complete a rapid welfare check and any identified damage concerns are immediately escalated to our Asset Team for a follow-up assessment by an engineer. If our early reconnaissance highlights actual damage to specific facilities or locations or if our analysis of peak ground acceleration data indicates likely damage in specific locations, we will give a high priority to getting an engineer to complete a Level 2 rapid assessment for those facilities. As our housing portfolio is insured, EQC then undertake their own damage assessments.
32. A further decision point around occupancy occurs when DEE assessments are progressively received. The approach to date has been to close buildings immediately where the percent NBS is assessed as less than 34 percent.
33. The current application of the assessment process has resulted in 656 facilities being open on a prudent, risk managed basis (69 percent of the portfolio). An approach that has a zero tolerance to risk would see practically all these facilities closed until DEE assessments were completed with a satisfactory outcome. At this time it is expected that this could take more than two years.

31 Cont'd

34. Although the assessment of buildings has been an evolving body of work in the market place, the practices adopted by council staff to date have been founded on an approach that considered the following attributes: conservatism, risk, health and safety, life protection and Council's role as a good corporate citizen to public and staff. Council staff have used their internal networks and those with other public organisations and insurers to ensure the practices adopted in this space are prudent and as a minimum equal to, if not leading and exceeding the general market approach. A review of our procedures by John Hare, a Director of Holmes Consulting Group, has confirmed that "The operating procedures set out a sound and appropriate approach..." (see **Appendix 2**).

Decision Recommendations:

35. Decisions will continue to be required in respect of returning facilities to staff and public use. Taking into consideration the assessment and occupancy processes outlined in this report, the current approach is that staff and/or public are able to occupy buildings as follows:
- Buildings with a capacity of 33 percent New Building Standard (NBS) or less will not be occupied
 - Buildings with a capacity between 34 percent NBS and 66 percent NBS inclusive can be occupied where engineering advice confirms that there is a moderate to low risk exposure (based on building strength, occupancy levels and occupancy duration) and/or a high cost (financial or otherwise) of not using the building. This assessment is made on a case-by-case basis
 - Buildings with a capacity of 67 percent NBS or greater can be occupied without restriction.
36. The recommendations in this report seek to clarify that a decision to reopen buildings for staff and public use under the occupancy guidelines noted above be made jointly by the General Manager of Corporate Services and the General Manager of Community Services.

Insurance

37. Prior to 30 June 2011 all Council facilities were insured under the material damage policy other than the Composting plant which had been omitted in error. Facilities were insured for replacement value other than a few buildings such as those around the new temporary bus exchange site which were insured for demolition or indemnity value. The Council's above-ground insurance programme totalled \$1.9 billion.
38. There is no material damage cover in place from 1 July 2011 onwards other than that detailed below but all damage incurred prior to 30 June 2011 is covered by the insurance policy in place at the time of the events.
39. Under the existing policies, 2,239 Residential Housing Units are insured at replacement value for \$413,869,294 for fire and earthquake under the EQC cover which is capped at \$100,000 per housing unit. Certain housing units that have been badly damaged are not covered. CBS Arena is also insured for replacement value at \$59,560,495 for defined perils only (fire excluding natural disaster). No other Council buildings are currently insured.
40. In order to maximise efficiency of the claims process, the loss adjusting process and approvals required will be tailored according to the quantum of repair/reinstatement costs. Outlined below is a summary of the proposed approach from our insurers:

Category 1: Less than or equal to \$5,000:

41. Such claims will be settled globally based upon the estimated cost of repair. No pre approval will be required from Insurers before incurring actual costs of repair. Council will however, preserve its right to claim actual costs in excess of estimate where like for like repair costs exceed the estimate.

31 Cont'd

Category 2: Greater than \$5,000 but less than, or equal to \$100,000:

42. Within this loss category it is anticipated that any damage will be considered to be economically repairable. A scope of works would need to be developed and presented to the Loss Adjuster for approval in anticipation of undertaking the proposed repairs. Following Council or delegated approval, the works would then be undertaken against the scope and the associated costs would be claimed as and when incurred.

Category 3: Greater than \$100,000

43. Losses in this category are likely to involve both repairable damage and non-repairable damage. Repairable damage would follow a similar process to that highlighted for Category 2 above. However, non-repairable damage would involve the following process below:
- Scope of damage is agreed with the Loss Adjuster and a case is presented to confirm the uneconomic nature of repairs;
 - Agreement is reached with the Loss Adjuster as to need to replace the damage (ie not repairable);
 - Council preserves the reinstatement value by confirming its intent to reinstate/replace the damage in one form or another;
 - An interim claim is made immediately for the equivalent indemnity value;
 - Where the decision is made to reinstate the building (like for like) then the scope of work is developed and presented to the Loss Adjuster for approval prior to the commencement of works, and actual costs are claimed in excess of the Interim Indemnity payment received;
 - Where the decision is made not to replace like for like then a valuation is obtained on a like for like basis to determine the insurance entitlement under the policy;
 - The Loss Adjuster is presented with the proposal to reinstate the damage in some other form (ie not like for like) demonstrating that the proposed costs will be equivalent to or in excess of the like for like valuation. Actual costs to be claimed in excess of the Interim Indemnity payment received.
44. Currently there is ongoing uncertainty over the time it will take to gain the agreement of Council's insurers to claim settlement and this poses a risk to the overall rebuild programme. In terms of any overall timeframes which are committed, we will seek to secure the insurers buy-in to those overall timeframes.
45. Consideration of this process is reflected in the decision making proposals of this report.
46. It should be appreciated that following a significant aftershock event, it may be necessary to 'reset the assessment clock' – for all or part of the portfolio, which brings a significant resource challenge in itself. If this event occurred now, our non-housing portfolio is almost entirely uninsured so any additional or new damage, as well as the cost of the re-assessment of our facilities, would be at Council's expense. For our housing portfolio, we come under the EQC process.
47. There are currently opportunities to get some up-front payments through insurance and technically there is no delegation to staff to accept these. It is therefore proposed as set out in the recommendations of this report that the General Manager Corporate Services be authorised to accept progress or partial insurance payments, so long as the Council is not committed to a full and final settlement.
48. Council has historically insured a small handful of properties which it does not own but has a strong relationship with the owner eg Riccarton House, Music Centre, Sydenham Methodist Church, Mt Pleasant Community Centre. We therefore also seek delegation for the General Manager Corporate Services to accept insurance payouts for these facilities which we insure but do not own and then distribute the payout to the appropriate party(s).

31 Cont'd

49. The Category 1 claims as outlined in paragraph 41 above, ie those less than or equal to \$5,000, are proposed to be settled globally based upon the estimated cost of repair. No pre-approval will be required from Insurers before incurring actual costs of repair. Council will however, preserve its right to claim actual costs in excess of estimate where like for like repair costs exceed the estimate. Due to the minor nature of these claims a delegation for the General Manager Corporate Services to settle these is sought and contained in the recommendations of this report.
50. Other insurance-related claims and settlements falling outside the scope of the above three categories and other staff delegations will be referred to Council for consideration and resolution.

Repairs, Rebuilds and Demolitions

51. The Council has already made some "owner initiated" demolition decisions for its facilities:
 - Sumner Community Centre/Museum – 9 June 2011
 - Godley House – 9 June 2011
 - Two grandstands at Rugby League Park to support a temporary rugby/rugby league facility – 8 September 2011
 - Several buildings at temporary bus interchange site – 17 August 2011
 - Buildings to allow Temporary Bus Interchange to progress
 - Ex Brush and Palette building, 50 Lichfield Street
 - Ex Hertz building, 46-48 Lichfield Street
 - Ex Mico Wakefield building, 133-141A Tuam Street
 - Ex YMCA Office building, 48 Lichfield Street.
 - The Mt Pleasant Community Centre, McCormacks Bay Road has also been demolished (not owned by Council but insured by Council)
52. Civil Defence and CERA have also ordered the demolition of a number of other Council-owned buildings:
 - Ex Para Rubber building, 94A Manchester Street (ordered by CD)
 - Ex R and R Sport building, 54 Lichfield Street (ordered by CERA)
 - Redcliffs Volunteer Library, 91-93 Main Road (ordered by CERA)
 - Redcliffs Pumping Station, Main Road (partial, ordered by CERA)
 - St Albans Community Centre, 1049 Colombo Street (ordered by CERA)
 - St Martins Volunteer Library, 122 Wilsons Road (partial, ordered by CERA)
 - Sydenham Methodist Church, 343 Colombo Street (ordered by CD, not owned by but insured by Council)
 - Woolston Volunteer Library, 689 Ferry Road (ordered by CERA).
 - Christchurch Convention Centre, 95-115 Kilmore Street (ordered by CERA)
 - Lyttelton Museum, 1 Gladstone Quay (ordered by CERA)
 - Ex Penny Cycles building, 113-125 Manchester Street (113-119 ordered by CERA)
 - Plunket Society Rooms, 211 Oxford Terrace (ordered by CERA)
 - Bus Exchange façade, 71 Lichfield Street (partial, ordered by CERA)
 - South Brighton Community Centre, 74 Beatty Street (partial, ordered by CERA)
 - Ex Electrolux building, 36 Welles Street (partial, ordered by CERA)
 - Lyttelton Service Centre, 35 London Street (partial, ordered by CERA)
53. Properties under assessment that could result in demolition include:
 - Aranui Community Centre, 305 Breezes Road
 - Farmers Carpark, 194A Oxford Terrace (Council are a part owner as a member of the Body Corporate)
 - Christchurch Music Centre, Barbadoes Street (not owned by but insured by Council)
 - QE2 Stadium/Pool, 193 Travis Road
 - Centennial Leisure Centre, Armagh Street
 - Shirley Community Centre, 10 Slater Street
 - South Brighton Community Centre, 74 Beatty Street
 - Sumner Library, 16-18 Wakefield Avenue

31 Cont'd

54. Repairs have been initiated and completed on the Papanui Library and Rexel/Kathmandu buildings, and recently initiated on the Fendalton Library, on the basis that the repairs were minor, covered by insurance and essential to maintaining business continuity.
55. The Council has a very large portfolio that has a wide range of building types and nature of damage. The decision making around the portfolio accordingly ranges from simple and pragmatic to more complex and strategic. As set out above this has necessitated the phasing of the project and rebuild plans.
56. In considering the phasing process it has been identified that there are a number of properties at the simple and pragmatic end of the scale that could and logically should be progressed immediately in terms of repair or demolition. The framework for dealing with these properties is set out as follows and reflected in the recommended delegations for resolution.

Decision recommendations:

57. Council approval is required for:
 - Work and demolitions of heritage buildings not covered by staff delegations. A list of the earthquake-affected heritage buildings is contained in **Appendix 4**
 - Recommended demolitions (not for safety reasons or ordered by CERA)
 - Recommended repairs exceeding more than \$1 million or more than 50 percent of the total insured value of the building
 - Enhancement (betterment) of a facility above total insured value
 - Rebuilds.
58. Staff to have delegations for:
 - Demolition approval for safety reasons (Section 38 CERA notice)
 - To repair an existing facility/structure within insurance proceeds where the work will cost less than \$1 million and the cost of the repairs is less than 50 percent of the building's insured value
 - Urgent stabilisation/weather proofing, including heritage buildings.
59. In the context of above "repair" shall mean reinstating a damaged but still existing building to its original or similar condition. Whilst "rebuild" shall be taken to mean replacing a building that has been demolished or undertaking work on an existing building that exceeds "repairs" ie creates betterment in comparison to the original facility.

Status Reporting and Communication/Consultation

60. Once projects are established by staff delegations, reporting on progress to the Council will be via a quarterly Facilities Rebuild Project report.
61. A communications update on the programme will also be included in the Chief Executive's monthly Council Update.
62. A number of Council facilities strategies in place have already undergone public consultation. These are currently being reviewed by Council staff and, as part of this review, staff have been engaging with key stakeholder groups around the future of Council facilities. Community consultation undertaken during the development of the draft Central City Plan is also informing this process.
63. An engagement framework for the Facilities Rebuild Project will be developed, which will provide guidelines around the level of community consultation/engagement required and when and how this should take place. It will include engagement with Community Boards.
64. A dedicated space on the Council website will contain an easy-to-access database of regularly updated information about the status of each facility in the Facilities Rebuild Project. This will include final engineering reports as they are completed and the decision which is made about a facility.

31 Cont'd

65. Media updates and briefings, updates in Council publications and on Council social media sites will be other key communication tools.