



250 Snodgrass Road, R D 4, Tauranga 3174 New Zealand

Phone: 07-552-5564

Mobile: 027-4999-408

E-mail: philip@pja.co.nz

Report on the independent investigation into the advice and background information received by the Tasman District Council about the Waimea Community Dam (from leadup to development of 2017 consultation proposal to decisions of November 2018)

Dated: 6 December 2021

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
Findings	4
Overall	4
Reporting and decision-making.....	4
Risk management.....	5
Procurement of Contractor.....	5
Peer reviews	5
Handling of conflicts of interest	5
Concluding comments	6
FORWARD	7
The Dam Project	7
REPORTING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS	9
Key reports to Council.....	9
Commentary on 27 July 2017 report to Council.....	10
Commentary on 14 December 2017 report to Council	11
Commentary on 28 August 2018 report to Council	11
Commentary on 30 November 2018 report to Council	13
Commentary on reporting and decision-making.....	13
Recommendations/learnings.....	14
IDENTIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT OF PROJECT RISKS	15
Approach to identifying and managing risks during the project.....	15
Commentary on risk management approach	16
Recommendations/learnings.....	17
RELEVANCE OF PROCUREMENT DECISIONS TO OTHER DECISION-MAKING ON WCD	18
Procurement of contractor.....	18
Commentary on the procurement approach	19
Recommendations/learnings.....	19
RELEVANCE OF PEER REVIEWS COMMISSIONED TO DECISION-MAKING ON WCD	20
Peer reviews commissioned.....	20
Commentary on commissioning and reliance on peer reviews.....	21
Recommendations/learnings.....	22
IDENTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	23
How conflicts of interest were addressed.....	23
Commentary on handling of conflict matters.....	23
Recommendations/learnings.....	23
APPENDIX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR REVIEW	24

APPENDIX 2 – REVIEWERS AND REVIEW PROCESS	26
Reviewers	26
Review process	26
APPENDIX 3 – CHRONOLOGY OF PROJECT	28
APPENDIX 4 – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THOSE INTERVIEWED.....	31
APPENDIX 5 – REVIEWER BIOS	32
APPENDIX 6 – SPREADSHEET - REPORTS AND OTHER INFORMATION ABOUT DAM (2011-2021)	36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Waimea Community Dam (WCD) is a very large and complex project for a local authority to undertake in New Zealand. We consider this complexity arises from the following factors:

1. The extended time from initial investigation to the final approval by the Council which covered a number of election cycles.
2. The scale of the dam and therefore the cost.
3. The number of parties involved.
4. The ownership model of the dam, including the construction and ongoing operations.
5. The funding arrangements.
6. The intention to deliver on three outcomes being;
 - (I.) Provide a long term urban water supply.
 - (II.) To provide sufficient water to reduce restrictions on consumptive water users, including irrigators.
 - (III.) To improve the dry weather flows of the Waimea River to improve environmental outcomes.

It should be clear from this that the project was not business-as-usual for the Council.

Findings

Overall

1. The reports and supporting information from 2012 to 2018 clearly demonstrated the need for the Dam, not just based on the economic impact if the local horticultural industry was unable to irrigate in times of low rainfall, but the need to provide a long-term solution to provide urban water and environmentally sustainable river flows.
2. There was due consideration of many options for achieving the desired outcomes during the course of the project. Because the preferred option (the Dam) was selected a significant time before the final decisions were made to proceed, those final decisions to proceed or not made in August, September and November 2018 were appropriate. The final decision(s) were appropriately made primarily on cost and impact on Council and ratepayers.

Reporting and decision-making

3. The summary and analysis of options presented at Council workshops and meetings were comprehensive and thorough, and we do not consider that more needed to be done.
4. Overall, in terms of the reports provided to elected members, we consider that while there could have been alternative ways of conveying the information more effectively to elected members, the information was generally robust and there was no evidence of bias in either the reports or approach by officers.

Risk management

5. Some risks that were identified, were reported to Council during the review period. This provided an avenue for elected members to consider the appropriateness of the approach to risk. The key risks for this project were around construction and the resulting financial result.
6. Construction risks were recorded, evaluated and mitigated through an extensive risk register during the Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) process, and we consider that these were managed in an appropriate way. However, there was no regular, structured, reporting of strategic risks to Council as part of this project. This reflected the widespread lack of maturity in risk management generally at the time, and should not be seen as a specific criticism of this particular project. There was no evidence of a formal risk register covering broader project risks.

Procurement of Contractor

7. External advice was obtained and followed before the ECI process began.
8. There was appropriate use of a Probity Auditor.
9. The appointment of the ECI contractor was robust and appropriate
10. The ECI process added significant value to the project before 30 November 2018, but potentially aligned the parties into a single focus interpretation of certain issues. Any risks in this respect could have been mitigated by obtaining an independent peer review.
11. Due to events that occurred after 30 November 2018, it has not been possible for us to assess the overall effectiveness of the ECI process.

Peer reviews

12. Those undertaking the peer reviews were suitably qualified to undertake that role.
13. It was reasonable for both officers and elected members to rely on the ECI process and Tonkin and Taylor design, because of the extensive peer reviews that had been undertaken over an extended period of the project by the significant number of recognised experts in their respective fields.

Handling of conflicts of interest

14. Elected members were well advised by Council officers and external legal advisers on conflict of interest matters.

15. Allegations about conflicts of interest were made and we note that the Office of the Auditor General responded on five occasions to concerns brought to it, but these concerns were found to be unfounded.
16. Despite the allegations that have been made, we have not seen anything in how conflicts of interest were identified and registered that negatively impacts the decisions made.
17. We have not seen any evidence that officers were pro-Dam or that the advice provided was influenced by any bias.

Concluding comments

18. The remainder of the report sets out in further detail the work undertaken and also considers key learnings for future projects based on current good practice, which may have not been good practice at the time the report(s) was prepared or the decision(s) made.
19. The subsequent sections do not in any way detract from the key findings expressed in the executive summary of this report.

FORWARD

This report has been prepared consistent with the terms of reference set out in appendix 1 and our engagement letter dated 7 July 2021, which was to review and comment on the quality of the advice and background information received by the Tasman District Council (Council) in making its decision to proceed with the Waimea Community Dam (WCD) project. This includes an assessment of the associated decision-making process up to and including the Full Council meeting of 30 November 2018, including the role of Council officers in providing advice and supporting information.

It is the intention of this report to identify recommendations or “learnings” that can be applied to other projects.

This review has, of course, been undertaken with hindsight. What is known now may not have been known before 30 November 2018. We have developed our findings, recommendations and learnings from the information available to us and what was good practice by local authorities at the time.

The following items were excluded from the scope of the review:

1. Project Implementation
Identify key events and risks that have adversely impacted project costs and the programme since 30 November 2018 when the project was transferred to Waimea Water Limited.
Contractual relationships relating to financing.
2. Value for money
Whether the selected Public Private Partnership procurement model has achieved value for money to date, taking into account project outcomes and key risks that have emerged.

Accordingly, our review has not examined decisions or actions after 30 November 2018 or attempted to identify reasons for the over-expenditure. However, we are very much aware that the total cost is now well in excess of the amount on which the Council made its decisions at the 30 November 2018 meeting.

The Dam Project

The Council began considering water augmentation options in 1991, in response to the water resource being overallocated in the 1980s. It made its final decision to commit to the WCD in 2018. A high-level chronology of events is set out in appendix 3.

This project was to build a major dam, which is unusual for a local authority and considering the last two¹ major dams in New Zealand were constructed over 20 years ago, this created significant challenges for both the community and the Council. Commensurate with the scale of the project was the level of public interest, and within the community, there was both support for and opposition to the project.

A significant part of the initial investigation was undertaken by the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC), and the Council was a partner and contributor to the project, including providing funding. As the project progressed it became apparent that the

¹ Opahu 1998; Clyde 1992.

Council was the only entity that could undertake specific actions and therefore the project became a joint venture between the Council, and the Waimea irrigators (at this stage unincorporated) who provided significant input. This led at that time, to the Council being the principal funder and therefore the ultimate decision-maker. As part of this joint venture, the Council was responsible for a number of key contractual and project obligations. Funding support was also ultimately provided by Crown Irrigation Investments Limited (CIIL), Waimea Irrigators Limited (WIL), the Ministry for the Environment and Nelson City Council. The Council relied on the capacity and expertise of external advisers, as well as its inhouse resource, to undertake the project.

The Dam is intended to deliver three outcomes, being:

- (I.) Provide a long term urban water supply.
- (II.) To provide sufficient water to reduce restrictions on consumptive water users, including irrigators.
- (III.) To improve the dry weather flows of the Waimea River to improve environmental outcomes.

These outcomes engage the different roles and purposes of territorial authorities and regional councils, which the Council, as a unitary authority, was required to address. The first outcome is to be addressed by a territorial authority. The second and third relate to regional council responsibilities; in the case of the second in relation to regulatory responsibilities, and the third as a response to environmental concerns exacerbated further by climate change (reduced rainfall over the summer period).

Disclaimer: This report has been prepared for Tasman District Council in accordance with the terms of reference/purpose of review set out in appendix 1, which includes that the review is focussed on decisions of the Council in the defined time period 2017 to 2018. The review's scope did not include identifying responsibility for or contribution to the matters on which we have identified learnings or specific reasons why the cost of constructing the Waimea Community Dam has increased beyond that on which the Council made its decisions in November 2018, and we make no findings or recommendations on these matters. Our findings are based on the information that was provided to us and the responses to questions at the interviews.

REPORTING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

In undertaking this part of the review, we have considered whether the decisions were robust in light of the advice received.

While the terms of reference only require the review to consider the information and decisions made between 2017 and 2018, a number of the decisions that were made prior to 2017 have an impact on the decisions of the period under review. These decisions are set out in the high-level chronology of the project in appendix 3.

It is usual for a project of this nature to take a significant period of time from investigation through until final approval. However, this project had added complexity in that it began as a community-led initiative, then was considered by Council together with WIL, and then transferred to a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) which was 51% owned by Council. There were a number of potential false starts after 2014 when the final decision making was the responsibility of the Council which added to the complexity to the decision-making process.

We note that of the three intended outcomes of the Dam, being, (I.) provide a long term urban water supply; (II.) provide sufficient water to reduce restrictions on consumptive water users, including irrigators; and (III.) to improve the dry weather flows of the Waimea River to improve environmental outcomes, that the focus of the reports appeared to be on the first two. The WCD provides the solution to all three objectives, and we consider that this bigger-picture view was sometimes lost in the reports.

Outcome one is the role of a territorial authority and the others are the responsibility of the regional council, which is in response to an over-allocation of the available resource. This dual responsibility was both an advantage and disadvantage. The advantage was that one entity was trying to create an efficient response to all three outcomes, the disadvantage relates to the fact that there are three competing objectives, which on their own could have been solved by a number of different options, and which could have been more or less palatable to different sections of the community. This added to the complexity of the decision-making process.

Key reports to Council

In our opinion, there are four key reports to Council in the period of our review.

Date of meeting	Intended resolution/Decision
27 July 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none">decided the WCD in the Lee Valley is the best solution for meeting the community's need for a good quality water supply
14 December 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none">appoints the FH/Taylor's contracting JV for the purpose of the ECI process
28 August 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none">sought to reconfirm WCD is the best solution for community's water needssought approval to fund Council's share of the cost increase and to proceed towards financial close

Date of meeting	Intended resolution/Decision
30 November 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agrees that it has considered all options • agrees it has got a good understanding of community views • agrees to proceed with WCD • agrees to reasons for supporting WCD • agrees Council's total contribution will be funded • authorised the signing of all supporting documents

Commentary on 27 July 2017 report to Council

Purpose of report – Status report; To confirm that the WCD in the Lee Valley is the best solution for meeting the community's need for a good quality water supply.

This report followed a workshop held by the Council on 13 July 2017 and contained attachments highlighting the various options that were discussed at that workshop. The purpose of the report was to provide an update to Council (it is the 15th status report) but it also asked the Council to confirm that the WCD is the best solution.

When compared with later reports, this report is very short (7 pages). It required decisions but most of the content reads as a status report. As such, it does not contain advice that we would expect to see supporting the decision-making (including discussion of the decisions required in recommendations 3, 4 and 5, analysis of options for the decisions, consideration of the Council's understanding of community views, and a discussion of significance).

While it does refer to the 13 July workshop, and it attaches a summary of the options that were considered at that workshop, it is not clear from the report itself if the updated options analysis was to take account of new information or changed circumstances, and therefore why the issue was before the Council. It would be appropriate for the matter to come back to Council if there was new information or changed circumstances.

While this report does not make reference to a report dated 30 May 2014 (highlighting progress to date and the issues that need to be addressed if the Dam was to be progressed), a number of decisions that were made as a response to that report are reflected in the 27 July 2017 decision. This was appropriate.

In the context of the overall history of the project, we consider that it was not necessary for the Council to confirm what it did at that meeting, and indeed revisiting past decisions can give rise to concerns that there are defects in earlier decision-making or a re-litigation of previously considered matters. However, we recognise that after the 2016 election, the matter was being considered by a newly constituted Council which needed to satisfy itself on the project given the decisions that would be coming before it later in 2017 and 2018.

There appears to have been a good analysis of the options identified from a policy analysis perspective – the overall project objective was clear, and the Dam and the alternatives were appropriately assessed against these objectives. The information was presented in a way that could be easily understood by elected members. We cannot comment on the identification and selection of options and those brought forward over time as it falls outside the timeframe of this review.

It is not clear from this report what the next steps would be having confirmed that the Dam was the best option.

There were a number of risks that were discussed in the body of the report, however, these tended to be underplayed as being potentially fully mitigated. In section 5 of the report titled contingent risk, the following statement is made:

Until the physical works are commenced and the subgrade is exposed, will more certainty be attached to this risk. If the subgrade is similar to what has been assessed then there is unlikely to be any major increase in cost. We will also need to confirm the assessment of the borrow material being used to construct the dam.

While this is factually correct, what is not stated or highlighted is that if the subgrade is not similar or is significantly different, then there is a risk of a major increase in cost.

Commentary on 14 December 2017 report to Council

Purpose of report – To appoint Fulton Hogan/Taylor's Contracting JV for the purpose of the ECI process

While this was a relatively brief report, it contains the relevant information to support the resolution. However, as noted elsewhere in our report, we consider that there should have been a section on the next steps for the project.

We discuss the appointment of the preferred contractor in detail later in our report.

Commentary on 28 August 2018 report to Council

Purpose of report – To reconfirm WCD is the best solution for the community's water needs and commit to funding some of the cost increase

This report is substantial in length (159 pages, including 75 pages of attachments). We understand that it included material that had been provided in reports prior to 2017.

It is worth noting that at this meeting the Council actually decided something different from the recommendations – that in principle it does not support the Waimea Dam proposal.

Given the length of the report, it is difficult to identify which information was new and which was directly relevant to the particular decisions before the Council. The minutes also record that elected members asked how much information was new (a fair question) and answers provided by officers did not directly answer the question. The executive summary of the report was not as useful as it could have been, reading more as an index than as a summary of the substantial content in the report.

Section 4.3 of the report states:

Council over the years has made numerous decisions to get us to the point we are today. Council has made those decisions following rigorous analysis and advice from staff, and numerous professional experts in their fields, along with input from various stakeholders and from the community

We consider that it would have been useful to summarise the previous decisions made by Council in getting to this point, to enable focus on the actual decisions sought from the report and the information actually required to advise on the options.

Some of the content appeared to be most relevant to the decisions made in 2014/15. As we commented in relation to the July 2017 report, it is unclear if there was new information or changed circumstances which meant this information was directly relevant to the decisions

before the Council at the meeting. The 2014/15 decisions are of course outside the scope of this review.

We found it difficult to isolate the decisions required of Council, its options, and the implications of the options, in amongst all the information provided. The minutes record why the information was provided – including reacting to elected member and community concerns about the Dam and providing a collation of the advice that had been given to the Council over the years. We consider that had officers and elected members had better processes in place to manage information relating to the project and its decision-making process, that better judgements could have been made about what information was actually required to advise on the options before the Council, including when officers were under time pressures to write reports.

We have comments about some of the recommendations.

The report first requests (recommendation no 2) that the Council "re-confirm its decision of 27 July 2017...that the WCD is the best option for meeting the community's need for good quality local water supply infrastructure" – the meaning of a resolution of this nature is potentially unclear. The decision to proceed with the Dam was made earlier and because it had not been revoked it continued to stand, and it is not clear why the Council was being asked to confirm or re-confirm its decision.

Essentially, the decision required was recommendation no 3 - whether to fund the cost increase. The implication of not funding the funding gap was that the Dam would not proceed, but the report does not clearly justify this (and therefore it appears to overstate some of the difficulties associated with giving effect to a no dam decision, for example at paragraph 9.5). It may be that officers were relying on earlier analysis, but the link to this was not made.

We consider that this flows through into the very little discussion about consideration of community views and the advice that officers didn't think the Council needed to re-consult (despite the impact of funding the funding gap being an approximately 45% increase in rating impact from what had been consulted on). If the options had been framed more clearly, we would have expected to see more advice about this (equivalent to assessing significant or material differences in proposed annual plan content from what is in an LTP).

In our view, recommendation 3, as written, does not capture the full decision being required of the Council – that the funding gap be funded in accordance with the funding policy decisions previously made. It intimates that there are no reasonable practicable alternative options, but we consider that the Council explored some of these in the 2017 SOP and we would have expected to see some discussion of these (including why they were no longer reasonably practicable if that was the case).

We also observed that the report gets into matters of operational detail, e.g. vegetation/detritus clearing (para 19.19) which is essentially a distraction from the matters on which the Council is actually required to make a decision.

Commentary on 30 November 2018 report to Council
*Purpose of the report - To proceed with dam (financial close).*²

This report followed the Council's rejection of the funding within the August 2018 report and subsequent rescinding of the August resolution in September 2018. It highlighted a significant change in funding and an increase in the estimated cost since the August report.

This report is predominantly about funding and the legal requirements to support a decision to proceed with the Dam. Much of the content reporting the complex nature of the funding was highly technical but necessary.

In section 4 of the report, there is significant background and discussion on the rationale for the Dam. In our opinion, this section could have been enhanced by reference to specific previous resolutions of Council and therefore reduce the risk of re-litigation of previous decisions and enable direct focus on the issues then before the Council. Attaching the August 2018 report as an attachment was not a reasonable substitute, given our earlier comments on that report. We found the executive summary of this report to be well written and helpful in understanding the overall report.

Commentary on reporting and decision-making

Because options and alternatives were considered very early in the project by WWAC, following which the Dam was selected as the preferred option, the Council did not consider options and alternatives in detail. Council only considered a summary of this information in various workshops and meetings (including in July 2017). This may have contributed to the uncertainty that the WCD was the best option.

The heightened public scrutiny of this project in our view at times heavily influenced the advice that was provided to elected members, both in terms of content and clarity. Some of the advice appeared to be provided by way of reaction to various interests and not necessarily as relevant to the particular decision options before the Council.

Particularly significant to the August to November 2018 decisions was the funding support that CIIL would commit. This funding support was conditional on the Council and WIL committing their own funding by December 2018. Loss of this funding was clearly a significant risk to the project. The funding provided by other parties was an external constraint on the decision-making which we have taken into account as a circumstance in which the advice was being prepared and provided to the Council, and a risk that had to be managed. One of the constraints we heard in the interviews was the limited time officers had to prepare the reports. While officers, consultants and contractors responded within these time pressures, we understand this meant the reports were often collated into the early hours of the morning. We expect that had Council had more time, that officers could have more selectively crafted the advice they provided.

We observed that Council would often reconfirm a decision that it had made at a previous meeting. While this may have advantages in terms of focussing the attention of Council onto the particular decisions sought from it, particularly following an election, it could have the

² A separate report discussing contract detail was considered with the public excluded. We only comment on the public report.

opposite effect of creating confusion about what decision is actually sought, and could lead to a re-litigation of the earlier decision. That is, reconfirming a decision is not the efficient tool that it might be perceived to be. Confirming a decision of a previous Council following an election may be considered appropriate, but there is no requirement to do so.

Having reviewed multiple reports, we consider there is overwhelming evidence contained in the reports received by the Council, particularly the reports of 28 August and 30 November 2018, that support the decision *that the proposed Waimea Community Dam in the Lee Valley is the best solution for meeting the community's need for good quality local water supply infrastructure.*

Recommendations/learnings

1. A plan or map of decisions required from elected members should be prepared, with elected member input, at the inception of projects of this scale and then maintained as a living document. Over time, it will provide a single reference point for elected members and officers to understand what decisions have been made, those currently needing to be made, and those anticipated in the future. It could be included in Council reports as context for the decisions required and to focus the advice provided, particularly where there are time pressures or heightened public interest in the decision. It should be referred to when framing options for each decision-making stage.
2. The Council should consider constructing a central repository of information on complex projects, accessible to officers and elected members. This could hold reports for and minutes of decisions on a project, and any other necessary information. It should be curated to ensure only up-to-date other information is included. This may eliminate the need to repeat information in subsequent reports when it is not strictly necessary for it to be included.
3. Where a project is intended to deliver multiple outcomes, the reports (and decisions) on the project should explicitly address all of the outcomes. This goes to substantiating and justifying the decisions made.
4. Recommendations asking elected members to confirm previous decisions should be used sparingly and the reason for asking for reconfirmation should be clear from the report itself (for example, responding to new information).
5. Executive summaries to reports, particularly for reports that are likely to be long and contain complex information, or for significant projects, should be drawing from the map or plan of decisions, provide a substantive summary of:
 - the previous decisions made by the Council in relation to the project;
 - any change to the information/circumstances on which Council based its previous decision;
 - the options and options analysis for the decisions arising from the report; and
 - the next steps in the process.

IDENTIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT OF PROJECT RISKS

Approach to identifying and managing risks during the project

During the ECI process, an extensive construction risk register was created and construction risks were evaluated depending on the risk appetite of the Project Governance Board, allocated and mitigated through that process, but not reported to Council in a structured manner. This risk register was created jointly with the designer JV contractor, construction project manager and Council staff. Accordingly, it was a collaborative effort involving many of New Zealand's leading dam consulting companies. It was also peer-reviewed by Damwatch.

The risk register was based on a risk register developed for roading projects as the best available template as there had not been any major dam construction projects since the 1990s.

While the risk register contained over 155 different risks, some of the financial allocations put against those risks were very minimal. The risk register also appears to be based on a bell-shaped risk profile and experience from large construction projects indicates the risk profile is almost always right-skewed. This point was emphasised in both the Oxford University paper (referred to in the August 2018 report and of which a summary was provided as an attachment to the report) and in a letter from PwC, received in December 2018 after Council's major decisions.

Damwatch acting for CIIL independently reviewed the risks and there was evidence of robust and well-documented two-way conversation to get agreement on the correct interpretation of these risks and the appropriate approach.

Major risks were modelled and the outcome of those models was reported back to the Project Governance Board who decided whether they were prepared to take the risk or place the risk on the contractor for a price. This approach obviously became problematic when the project transferred from the Project Governance Board to WWL because the change in structure also meant a change in risk appetite.

The then Chief Executive acted as the project manager and sponsor. It became apparent through the course of our review that the Council relied significantly on in-house resources to undertake the project until the preferred contractor was appointed. We are aware that additional resources were engaged after the engagement of a preferred contractor, and the Council set up a project delivery office.

While risks were not formally identified, they were often mitigated by the use of experts.

However, there was no evidence of a formal wider risk register covering broader project risks that might be seen under today's best practice standards.

The Office of the Auditor General has made the following comments:

2016 - "In our view, risk management is one of the two least mature elements of governance in the public sector. We see few examples of excellence"

2021 - “The councils we looked at are still largely using basic risk management practices”

Commentary on risk management approach

By definition³³, the risk is the effect of uncertainty on objectives, therefore at a high level, the Council should have clearly identified the objectives of the project. We are of the opinion while these objectives were generally known, they were not clearly acknowledged in the reports.

Without clear objectives, it becomes difficult to identify strategic risks or top-down risks. The risks considered by this project were more focused on operational or specific construction risks.

A formal risk register is essential for a large project like the Dam. In our opinion, the key risks for this project were around construction and the resulting financial impact. We also consider that because the Council had not built a dam before, the initial risk rating should have been very high, and over time as risks were assessed and mitigated, the overall rating could have been reduced.

Risk appetite as well as the type of risks will change over the timeframe of a project of this type. This needs to be explicitly considered and agreed upon by the Council and reported accordingly. Risks other than construction and cost should be considered, that is, the register should have covered all foreseeable risks. For a project of this nature, we would have expected risks related to recharge performance, contractual relationships, interest rates, amongst others, to be included.

While risks were noted in various reports, there was no consistent structure to either the risk or reporting. The reporting that occurred appeared to be from a bottom-up approach. We consider the reporting should have been made from a top-down as well as a bottom-up approach.

As there was no structured reporting of all strategic risks throughout the project, there was no ability for Council to consider its overall risk appetite for this project. Regular risk reporting to Council and other stakeholders would have added value in terms of transparency.

We consider that the construction risks were clearly identified and documented in the risk register that was prepared. Those involved with the risks table were seen as experts in their field and therefore it is understandable why report writers and decision-makers placed a lot of confidence in this outcome.

A broader risk management approach may have anticipated some of the transition risks, for example, that arising from the contemporaneous formation of WWL and the appointment of directors to WWL's board in November 2018.

It is not uncommon for local authorities to rely on in-house resources to deliver complex projects, however, it comes with a number of potential risks. Staff members are expected to contribute significant time to the project, over and above their normal duties or business-as-

³³ ISO 31000:2018 Risk management - Guidelines

usual projects. The business-as-usual projects are therefore not given the normal level of resourcing.

It is our opinion that this project would have been better managed by the Council if, in addition to the project sponsor, there had been a separate project management office. This is different from the project delivery office the Council set up later in the process. While this may have been an expensive option initially, it would have reduced cost risks later on. The function of the project management office should have included the identification and tracking of milestones, decisions, risks, contracts and finances, ensuring continuity in the project over election cycles, and being led by a permanent project manager. One of the responsibilities of the project manager would have been to ensure the smooth transition from Council to the CCO - WWL. As the transfer of the project from Council to WWL predominantly occurred after 30 November 2018, we do not comment specifically on the transfer and interaction with the CCO Board.

Recommendations/learnings

1. At the beginning of any future major project, the objectives should be clearly identified, and that subsequent strategic risks are recorded consistent with the Council risk management policy (or equivalent).
2. Strategic risks should be reported to Council through the Audit & Risk Committee on a regular basis.
3. Operational risks should be considered against strategic risks, and again reported to Council through the Audit & Risk Committee on a regular basis.
4. A project management office should be established and resourced at the inception of projects of this scale. The office should be led by a project manager with suitable expertise, and be separate from the project sponsor.

RELEVANCE OF PROCUREMENT DECISIONS TO OTHER DECISION-MAKING ON WCD

Procurement of contractor

In September 2015, the Council engaged Beca Limited together with Bond Construction Management Limited (Bonds) to develop a procurement strategy. It was their recommendation that:

- the WCD project should be delivered through a single contract including vegetation clearance, rock extraction, river diversion and roading works;
- the design of the dam should be completed by Tonkin and Taylor; but
- contractor input to the design, particularly in respect of the river diversion works, would be of significant value for risk reduction.

They also recommended a staged process comprising:

- Registration of interest from contractors
- Shortlisting
- Request for proposal
- Appointment of a preferred contractor under Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) process
- Price agreement
- Construction

In December 2017, Council was asked to approve the Project Governance Board entering into negotiations with Fulton Hogan/Taylor's Contracting to finalise the ECI contract. This process, while under confidentiality for commercial reasons, was an open and transparent process that was undertaken with the necessary probity controls and audits.

Within the 9 August 2018 report to Council, details were provided of the process and outcomes from the ECI appointment process. Key statements within this report indicated that the ECI contract was designed amongst other things to determine the construction risks, mitigation to those risks, allocation of the risk and provide a robust construction price.

In the report were details regarding the conclusion of the methodology required to deliver the design criteria and how these had been incorporated into each schedule price.

In the report of 30 November 2018, there was significant reliance placed on the ECI process. It included a statement that the ECI process delivered significant certainty in the construction cost component of the project. This not only incorporated the robustness of the construction cost component of the price but also covered the risk identification and allocation.

The report goes on to analyse the various pricing structures within the contract and talked about the specific risks relating to each component. This incorporates discussion on measure and value items and provisional sums.

Commentary on the procurement approach

The ECI process is an excellent process to collaboratively work through risks and costs, including the allocation of both as appropriate. It is clear from our review that a significant element of assurance was developed through the ECI process.

However, it can become a process where collective intelligence potentially provides a single point of view. Experts in certain fields can influence the collective group and this can remove an element of impartiality.

Because of the transition of the project to WWL after 30 November 2018, we have not been able to assess the overall effectiveness of the ECI process.

Recommendations/learnings

1. A peer review should be obtained of ECI outputs to ensure the benefits of the ECI process are fully realised.

RELEVANCE OF PEER REVIEWS COMMISSIONED TO DECISION-MAKING ON WCD

Peer reviews commissioned

There have been a number of peer reviews undertaken on different aspects of the project, since its inception. The more salient reviews include:

- 2004 GNS peer review of hydraulic modelling of concept performance
- 2005 Landcare peer review of GNS work
- 2011-2018, Opus/WSP 10 peer reviews of various aspects of the Dam including design and investigation features
- 2014 Beca peer review of estimates
- 2015-2018 Bond peer review of costings
- 2017 Opus peer review of seismic risk
- 2018 Mott McDonald review covering design aspects of the dam
- 2018 WSP review covering design aspects of the Dam
- 2018 Damwatch as a reviewer for CIIL

GNS was appointed as the peer reviewers for the hydraulic modelling in 2004 by WWAC. GNS confirmed the hydraulic modelling, particularly that the recharge of the aquifers was going to operate appropriately and effectively throughout the life of the dam. This element was also peer-reviewed by Landcare Research. Landcare Research's peer review was based on the GNS report and additional information supplied by Aqualinc and indicated that the WCD was fit for purpose in relation to recharging the appropriate aquifers.

The Council commissioned Beca in 2014 to undertake an independent cost review of the project. Bonds were engaged in 2015 to also independently review estimates on behalf of the Council. While Beca made comments regarding disagreements at the detailed level they aligned that the estimates were in the right ballpark.

In 2017, Ian Walsh from Opus provided a peer review of the seismic risk in relation to the design of the WCD. This peer review appears to have been undertaken at the draft design stage but raises no concerns. It should be noted that large dam standards changed significantly in 2015, partly as a result of the Christchurch earthquakes, therefore, making this review particularly relevant.

Geotechnical work was undertaken by Tonkin and Taylor. Tonkin and Taylor's design specifically incorporated features and methodology that they considered suitable for the rock and foundations they found during their geotechnical investigations. No peer review found these lacking.

Tonkin and Taylor set up various design committees responsible for key elements of the design such as the dam foundations. These committees are responsible for approving the final design of the foundations including methodology and construction. Some members of the committee came from outside Tonkin and Taylor. As part of the quality assurance

process, Tonkin and Taylor were proposing two full-time site engineers with geological expertise to ensure construction methodology was strictly adhered to. The importance of this aspect was confirmed in a number of peer reviews with some reviewers emphasising the need for these site engineers being highly qualified and experienced.

Damwatch undertook a detailed review of Tonkin and Taylor's investigations and design in 2018 before the Council's final decisions were made. This review also incorporated construction methodology. The parties involved in this review included TDC, WWL, Tonkin and Taylor, Mott McDonald and CIIL. The outcome of this peer review was submitted to Tonkin and Taylor who provided further detailed comments regarding the specifics. These comments were also reviewed and resubmitted to Tonkin and Taylor by Damwatch and again Tonkin and Taylor replied. This process appears to be very thorough and provided some assurance to staff regarding the technical outputs and the appropriateness of the geotechnical investigations.

The most comprehensive review of the geotechnical information was undertaken by Damwatch in 2018. The review was based on the risk register generated through the ECI process. Damwatch's peer review, while critical of some of the findings, principally critiqued the risk allowances made and found no major fatal flaws. The information from this review was integrated into the risk register and project costs.

Building consents often operate as an independent peer review but due to the size and complexity of the dam and the involvement of multiple engineering companies, the building consent process was substituted by the production of appropriate producer statements. Tonkin and Taylor for example produced their PS1 for the design of the Waimea dam in October 2018. Independent PS1s were supplied by Mott MacDonald and WSP covering different aspects of the design where they were the lead designers. This practice is often undertaken for large projects.

While not a formal peer review, the chief executive, Janine Dowding, requested an independent examination of the engineering and pricing of the Waimea Dam construction project from KA Smales. This review was received on 29 November 2018. This review found no fundamental flaws but did highlight weaknesses particularly with contracts between the designer and the principal, and between the engineer to the contract and the principal.

[Commentary on commissioning and reliance on peer reviews](#)

The project appears to have engaged with some of the most experienced practitioners with large dam experience in New Zealand.

However, it is difficult to separate the roles of the various experts and to identify those with a pure peer review commission. Damwatch appears to have had the most independence in the process and therefore it is understandable the Council and staff placed a lot of confidence on their peer review. As this was based on the work undertaken as part of the ECI it appeared to be a very comprehensive review, noting however that it only covered the design and construction risks based on the T&T design and ECI construction methodology.

For a project of this scale and nature we would have expected to see key decision points identified and then alongside those key decision points there would be a well-documented

peer review. This does not mean that for the WCD the peer reviews were not done but reflects on the lack of clarity and identification of the same.

The significant issue that is beyond the scope of this review is if the design and/or the construction methodology changed significantly, the value of these reviews and the producer statements become null and void.

Recommendations/learnings

1. For a project of this scale, key decision points should be identified and peer reviews obtained at those points. There should be a strong process for recording the peer reviews that are obtained. This links to our recommendations about mapping or planning decisions, recording relevant information relating to a project, and employing dedicated project management expertise for complex projects.

IDENTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

How conflicts of interest were addressed

We understand from our review of the documents and from our discussions during the interviews that there was not a central register of conflicts of interest in relation to the project.

Elected members were provided with detailed advice in relation to conflicts of interest in the August 2018 report, and legal advice was provided to elected members directly by solicitors with particular expertise in local government decision-making and governance in 2017 and 2018.

Conflicts during the timeframe of our review were recorded by elected members when they arose and the appropriate action was taken, with the conflict being recorded in the minutes and the member stepping away while the particular item was considered.

Allegations about conflicts of interest were made from time to time as the project progressed. We note that the Office of the Controller and Auditor-General responded on five occasions to concerns brought to it, but these concerns were found to be unfounded.

Commentary on handling of conflict matters

The advice provided by officers and external advisers on conflicts of interest was appropriate and we do not consider that more needed to be done in this regard.

Managing conflicts of interest in decision-making processes of this complexity can be difficult. What might be perceived to be a conflict of interest may not legally be so. Whether a conflict exists in part relies on elected member judgement and proactivity, which is sometimes not well understood by the public. However, we note that we have not seen anything in this regard that could have impacted the decision-making.

Nor have we seen any evidence that officers were pro-Dam or that the advice provided was influenced by any bias.

Recommendations/learnings

1. In future, for complex decision-making processes like these, we recommend that the Council keep a centralised register of conflicts of interest in addition to its register of interests. This will help manage the perceptions that elected members are conflicted as well as provide a demonstration of the integrity of the decision-making process.

APPENDIX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR REVIEW

The Tasman District Council on 4 June 2021 approved the investigation with the following terms of reference:⁴

To review and comment on the quality of the advice and background information received by the Council in making its decision to proceed with the project. This includes an assessment of the role of the Council officers in providing advice and supporting information.

The review would comprise reviewing the technical and other information commissioned by and presented to both the Project Governance Board and the Council over the period until November 2018. This should also include the associated decision-making process up to and including the Full Council meeting held 30 November 2018. The information that would be considered includes the following:

- The technical reports commissioned by and presented to WWAC and the Council covering all the key design aspects and risks associated with the project;*
- Any peer reviews are undertaken (sic) on the technical reports commissioned and presented;*
- All the Project Governance Board and the Council reports up until 30 November 2018 including:
 - Assessment of all practical options that WWAC considered for water storage prior to identifying the current dam site;*
 - Assessment of all the decisions made by the Council whilst WWAC was overseeing as the project progressed;*
 - Assessment of how the various estimates evolved during the course of the project;*
 - The various estimates developed over time for the project;*
 - Assessment of the “P95” confidence levels derivation;*
 - Assessment of the alternative storage (all practical) options including the pricing and risk. This assessment will also consider the confidence or likelihood of those options meeting the objectives in the long term.**

The review will assess the overall quality of the advice received and whether the decision was robust. The information in the Council reports is likely to be highly technical. Whilst it is important to note the level of technical input, the focus of the review will be based on how that information was presented in a way that could be understood by decision-makers.

In addition to the above, the following will be considered as part of the review and final report.

Risk Management

How the project risks were identified, appropriately allocated, communicated and considered during the development of the proposal including reporting of outstanding risks as at 30 November 2018. This should include an assessment of key events and risks that have or could have adversely impacted project costs and programme.

One of the risks that faced the project was the time constraints on the availability of Crown funding to the project, and an assessment of this should be considered as to the effect on the timing and the information available to inform decisions.

Procurement processes

The investigation would cover the Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) process, including the interaction with the Project Governance Board and the Council.

This should not be a detailed assessment of the procurement process, but more of a review as to what procurement decisions were made and the relevance to the decision-making.

⁴ Resolution CN21-06-11.

Peer reviews

This should consider how the peer reviewer(s) were engaged relevant to the decision-making rather than the quality of the peer reviewers' work. This will include the peer reviews and due diligence work carried out by CIL as project funders.

Conflicts of interest

How any conflicts of interest were registered.

The following items were excluded from the scope of this review:

Project Implementation

- Identifying key events and risks that have adversely impacted project costs and the programme since 30 November 2018.
- Contractual relationships relating to financing.

Value for money

Whether the selected Public Private Partnership procurement model has achieved value for money to date, taking into account project outcomes and key risks that have emerged.

APPENDIX 2 – REVIEWERS AND REVIEW PROCESS

Reviewers

Philip Jones – Philip led the review, including liaison with the Council on the engagement of this review, access to information for the reviewers to review, review of information, consideration of risk management for the project, and presentation of the report to the Council. Philip coordinated the preparation of this report.

David Adamson – David applied his experience to reviewing the contract process, peer review and risk management aspects of the project, and assisted with drafting those sections in the report.

Lizzy Wiessing – Lizzy’s role in this project was to apply her policy and legal understanding of decision-making processes to the Council’s reports and other information provided, to understand the Council’s process and how it measured up to general sector practice and good practice. She also assisted with review structure and process matters and assisted with the preparation of this report.

Bios for Philip and David are contained in appendix 5.

Review process

Four broad stages were identified to the Council when it approved this review. These stages and our approach were:

1. Review of reports to 30 November 2018.

Significant technical and other information commissioned by and presented to both the Project Governance Board and the Council was provided to the reviewing team.

The project team was provided with a spreadsheet listing from September 2011 to 4 June 2021 the reports and other advice given to the Council in relation to the Dam at meetings and workshops, and documents relating to consultation processes. This is included as appendix 6 of this report. We were provided by Council senior managers with copies of documents identified as relevant to the decisions made in the period 2017-2018. We also requested and were provided with other documents that we could identify as existing and which we considered were relevant to the review.

In addition, Philip Jones spent two days at the Council’s head office and was given unfettered access to both corporate and individuals’ files relating to the project.

2. Interviews with key staff, contract staff and decision-makers.

On 7, 8 and 11 October 2021, members of the project team interviewed some of the participants in the WCD project. The purpose of these interviews was broadly to better understand the information contained within the reports and relevant documents, identify missing information/reports and examine further information. A description of the roles and responsibilities of those interviewed is set out in appendix 4.

We thank all the interviewees for their time, cooperation and the information they provided us. In addition, we were provided, without hesitation, with all information that we asked for and had unlimited access to Council's records relating to this project.

3. Development of a draft report for consideration by the Audit and Risk Committee.

This draft report is provided to the Audit and Risk Committee on 3 December 2021. This was to allow for any inadvertent errors of fact to be identified and corrected and to give the committee early notice of the likely findings.

4. Presentation of the final report to the Council.

The final report will be presented to the Council on 16 December 2021.

APPENDIX 3 – CHRONOLOGY OF PROJECT

A brief summary of the history of the project before it was transferred entirely to the Council follows.

This project began in 1991 with the Agriculture New Zealand (MAF) Report – Water Augmentation Options Waimea Basin. This was followed by the 2003 Tasman Regional Water Study. This then led to the formation of the WWAC.⁵

Between 2004 to 2007 – the Phase 1 Feasibility Study was completed, from which 18 sites were identified. From this, the Lee Valley Dam was selected as the preferred option.

2007 to 2010 - Phase 2 Detailed Investigation – Lee Valley Dam (Site 11).

Inclusion of the Lee Valley Dam in 2012-22 Long Term Plan (LTP).

2011 to 2014 – Phase 3 Detailed Design.

At this stage, the project was transferred to the Council. CIIL become involved in 2013.

The chronology of the project from May 2014 was as follows.

Council in **May 2014** advises the WWAC that the structure for the proposed dam company referred to in the 2012-2022 LTP is now **not** supported because that structure and its funding places undue risk and liability on the ratepayers of the district for the capital sought, is **not** commercially sound and may not result in prudent stewardship of the district's resources; and declines to sign the Funding and Support Deed pending its review, including obtaining legal advice and a review of the dam company structure.

October 2014 Council issued a Statement of Proposal (SOP) on funding and governance, approved for consultation. Estimates cost at \$60-\$80m.

December 2014 Decision on the SOP consultation results. Funding proposals (full rates funding) as set out in the SOP are **not** affordable for the Council and the community. Neither funding proposal will be included in the 2015-25 LTP.

March 2015 Includes WCD in LTP. Council contribution is proposed at \$25m, and external funding and governance through a CCO is contemplated. The project will only proceed if substantial external funds are available to contribute to the remaining costs of the Dam.

June 2015 Adoption 2015-2025 LTP, includes WCD with Council funding of \$25m based on a cost of \$75m to complete. Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP) required the Council to make a decision by 30 June 2015 on the provision of a dam. Including WCD in LTP avoided "no-dam" provisions in the TRMP being triggered.

⁵ WWAC was set up by the Council and comprised a range of parties. The Council was represented as both water supplier and environmental manager. The project manager was a Council employee.

March 2016

Council authorises the Chief Executive to execute and serve Notices of Desire under section 18 of the Public Works Act for the purchase of the land for the proposed Dam, including access to the site.

Agreement with Waimea Community Dam Limited (WCDL) for conducting the procurement and tendering process. WCDL is still to be capitalised and is still to be fully resourced to deliver its obligations to the Joint Venture (JV).

June 2016 The procurement of a contractor is put on hold.

November 2016 Establishment of the CCO is on hold. A limited partnership model is being evaluated. WIL is incorporated to replace WCDL.

March 2017 Council authorises the Chief Executive to sign the Heads of Agreement and commence the procurement process.

July 2017 Council confirms, having sought and considered further advice about alternative urban water supply augmentation options, that the proposed WCD in the Lee Valley is the best solution for meeting the community's need for good quality local water supply infrastructure.

September 2017 Council confirms the recommended funding and investment proposal of \$75.9m as the basis for a SOP on funding (contributions from CIIL, WIL and Council including through rates and water charges) and governance for consultation.

December 2017 Appoints Fulton Hogan/Taylor's Contracting JV as the preferred contractor for the purposes of the ECI contract.

February 2018 Decisions following consultation on governance and funding proposal. Approves establishment of a CCO for the WCD.

April 2018 Waimea Community Dam - CCO Formation commences. Council approves workstreams to form Waimea Water Ltd (WWL), the CCO.

June 2018 WCD included in LTP 2018-28 at a cost of \$75m (excluding sunk costs to date).

28 August 2018 Council makes a decision **not** to proceed with the Dam project under the current funding allocation model (resolution CN18-08-26). The meeting occurs in the context of a cost increase for the WCD from the LTP budget (\$75.9m) to \$102.2m.

6 September 2018 Council received a revised funding offer received from CIIL and WIL. Council revokes resolution CN18-08-26 made at its meeting on 28 August 2018. It decides to proceed with the WCD funding 51% of the \$23m increase, for the purpose of continuing funding and JV negotiations.

27 September 2018 Funding Agreement for the Waimea Dam Project (Commitment Phase - Part 3) entered into between CIIL, WIL and Council.

8 November 2018

Council approves WWL constitution (as amended).

Council makes appointments to WWL's Board.

30 November 2018 Council formally decides to proceed with the WCD, at a total cost of \$105.9m.

APPENDIX 4 – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THOSE INTERVIEWED

The interview panel selected who they wanted to interview, and those people made themselves freely available without exception.

The panel interviewed:

- The former and current mayors of the Tasman District.
- The former and current chief executives of the Council.
- Senior managers at Council who were involved in the project at some stage and who have or had responsibility for finance, engineering, and policy and planning.
- A specialist policy analyst who advised on consultation and decision-making on the process.
- The former project engineer.
- Chief Executive of WWL.

APPENDIX 5 – REVIEWER BIOS

Philip Jones CA of PJ & Associates

Philip Jones has been consulting to a variety of Local Government related organisations since June 2007.

Philip specialises in financial management and strategy, risk and asset management, financial policies and financial governance. He sits on a number of local authority's Audit and Risk Committees as an independent chair.

Between 1993–2007 Philip was the Chief Financial Officer and Group Manager Revenue and Finance for Western Bay of Plenty District Council (WBOPDC), Tauranga.

Prior to joining WBOPDC, he was a Business Services & Audit Manager with Coopers & Lybrand (now PricewaterhouseCoopers) in Tauranga, London and Hamilton.

Areas of expertise

Philip has a wide range of financial skills and because of his deep understanding of asset management, financial management and risk, he brings a unique view to what can be complex issues. Key areas of expertise include:

Asset Management Plans (AMP): a review of financial requirements of asset management plans and the linkage to other processes and documents.

Audit & Risk Committees

Development and review of Funding & Financial policies including Treasury, Revenue & Financing, Rating and Development & Financial Contributions Policies

Development and review of Financial Strategies which are unique to each particular Council

Funding evaluations for various capital expenditure requirements

Long Term Plans (LTP) development: from the planning stages to the detailed knowledge of the financial & reporting requirements

Review of finance functions

Risk Management Strategies

Details of experience prior to 2007

Since 1993, Western Bay of Plenty District has seen a considerable amount of growth, (population increased from 28,000 to 42,000). During this time Philip was the senior manager responsible for all finance functions. He was responsible for the development of funding models and sat as a member on project management groups for four new or upgraded sewage plants, and three water expansions.

Also, in 2005/2006 he led the development of the JIGSAW guide on development of **Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP now Long Term Plan or LTP)**. This guide which is best practice, was a joint venture between SOLGM (Society of

Local Government Managers (Now Taituarā — Local Government Professionals Aotearoa)) NAMS (Now New Zealand Asset Management Support, previously National Asset Management Steering Group) bringing together all the requirements of an LTCCP including asset management, financial reporting and policy development.

With the Local Government Act 2002, he has been a member of the **Know How Working Party** on planning and reporting for the implementation of the Act.

Whilst working for WBOPDC, Philip has undertaken **funding policy** review work for other councils in New Zealand and assisted a large council in South Australia with the **integration of financial and asset management**.

Philip has been the Project Manager for the review and amendment of **Financial Contributions** under the Resource Management Act that were made operative in 2003 without challenge.

RESUME OF DAVID ADAMSON QSM, CP Eng., FEngNZ, FNZIM

M: +64 0274341861 E: the.adamsons@xtra.co.nz

PROFILE

A high calibre engineer and executive with an extensive career in the local government sector, most recently with Christchurch City Council. As a chartered professional engineer who has developed into senior management roles, including Chief Executive positions, I offer strong project, technical and people leadership as well as a focus on delivering sustainable infrastructure solutions to complex problems.

KEY AREAS OF EXPERTISE / ACHIEVEMENTS

- **Project Leadership.** Proven leadership for large complex projects and multidisciplinary teams resulting in capital project delivery to time, scope and budget
- **Capital project and programme delivery.** Developed the processes, controls and monitoring to lift capital delivery from \$200mil to \$500mil per annum
- **Contract Management.** Delivery of a myriad of large projects, complex maintenance contracts and professional services via NZS and NEC contract conditions.
- **Asset Management.** Championed AM internationally, nationally and locally including life cycle planning, risk management, levels of service, financial planning and defining AM enablers.
- **Relationship management with broad range of stakeholders.** Managed complex relationships with business, iwi, the community, contractors and consultants via proactive actions
- **Strategy development and execution.** Multiple strategies developed and implemented including drinking water, land drainage, active travel, road safety, waste minimisation
- **Visible and engaged people leader.** Lead a team of 450 people increasing its net promoter score by 29 points over 2 years, ranking it the top performing group in Council
- **Strong customer focus.** Matched customer expectations and messages with Council's ability to respond, prioritise and resolve matters of concern
- **Operational planning, delivery and control.** Many years' experience balancing needs against resources as well as determining the most cost-effective method of delivery.
- **Functional and Service Delivery.** Lead the full suite of local Government functions including 3 waters, transport, finance, regulatory, solid waste, parks, libraries and recreational
- **Statutory duties.** Established and ensure compliance with a myriad of consents, legislation and regulations including landfill, drinking water, planning, stormwater, wastewater and H&S
- **Emergency Management.** Undertaken role of controller plus reorganised local civil defence and rural fire into regional organisations. On review panel for NZ Fire Service

RECENT EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Director and Principal Consultant	Adamson Partners	2021-Present
Consulting to local Government re Capital delivery, project delivery, strategy, engineering services, contract management, risk and management.		

General Manager City Services	Christchurch City Council	2016-2021
Responsible for leading and managing the delivery (construction, maintenance and operation) of the city's public services including council's major infrastructure, 3waters, solid waste and transport.		

Director of Facilities & Infrastructure Rebuild **Christchurch City Council** **2014-2016**

Responsible for management of Council's capital rebuild programme, involving responsibility for allocated funding of \$3.5 billion over 10 years.

Chief Executive **Southland District Council** **2004-2014**

Responsible for implementing the decisions of Council, providing sound advice and delivering effective and efficient management across all services and functions.

Group Manager, Asset Management **Southland District Council** **1995-2004**

Responsible for leading and managing the council's infrastructure assets and services including roads, 3 waters, waste, property, SIESA and township facilities

QUALIFICATIONS / EDUCATION

- CP Eng., 1985 to present
- Post Grad. Paper, Financial Management, Massey University 1991
- University of Canterbury B.Engineering. (Agricultural) 1980

APPENDIX 6 – SPREADSHEET - REPORTS AND OTHER INFORMATION ABOUT DAM (2011-2021)

	Report Name	Report Author	Date	Notes
	Note: Lee Valley Dam was not included in the 2009 LTP. At that time a water augmentation solution was in the TRMP.			
1	Chief Executive's Report	Paul Wylie, Chief Executive	22-Sep-11	Progress on Lee Valley Dam Proposals
	Council Workshop		7-Dec-11	
2	Mayors Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	15-Dec-11	WWAC meetings
3	Proposed Lee Valley Community Dam	Dennis Bush-King Acting CEO	26-Jan-12	Inclusion of the Lee valley Dam in the 2012-22 LTP. The Council has previously agreed to pursue water augmentation options to redress over-allocation of the water resource in the Waimea Plains.
4	Receipt of Audit Report and Adoption of the Draft Long Term Plan 2012-2022 for Release for Public Consultation	Susan Edwards	23-Feb-12	Some amendments have been made, particularly to the Lee Valley Dam section.
5	Mayors Report March/April 2012	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	3-May-12	Public Consultation on Lee Valley Dam
6	Submission to Nelson City Council Draft Long Term Plan 2012-2022	Mark Tregurtha	24-May-12	NCC Funding for Lee Valley Dam. (Joint approach to Central Government).
7	Report to adopt the Long Term Plan 2012-2022 (Note Under Lee Valley Dam is a key issue in the LTP)	Susan Edwards	27-Jun-12	In response to submissions - Agreeing to retain the Lee Valley Dam project in the Long Term Plan, but noting that the Council will work with the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee, and consult with other interested parties, to refine the funding model and costs of the project. Estimated Cost \$41.6m in 2010 Co-operative Co model not a CCO Council contribution 50% or \$6.2m Environmental flow (General Rates) Plus water charges via extractive user costs. The other 50% of Environmental Flow costs to come from NCC and or Central Govt.
8	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	6-Sep-12	WWAC has sought advice about which body or person should be the applicant for the resource consents that the Lee Valley Dam. Also council expecting WWAC to request the Council proceed to purchase the land
9	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	18-Oct-12	WWAC request for funding
10	Proposed Lee Valley Dam - An Update	Lindsay McKenzie	29-Nov-12	Project support to WWAC. Land Acquisition . Draft Plan Change. ongoing project management and servicing support to the WWAG. CEO to prepare a budget
11	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	29-Nov-12	Meetings with WWAC
12	Lee Valley Community Dam	Lindsay McKenzie	21-Feb-13	Request from the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC) for additional resources. Agrees to transfer \$150,000 from the Urban Water Account to WWAC. 3) agrees to include in the Draft Annual Plan 2013/2014: \$190,000.
13	Adoption of Draft Annual Plan 2013/2014 for Public Consultation	Mark Tregurtha	14-Mar-13	Includes Funding for WWAC
14	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	9-May-13	Details of meetings on the Lee Valley Dam
15	the Annual Plan Report Covering Submissions and Decisions for Inclusion in the Final Annual Plan 2013/2014	Mark Tregurtha	5-Jun-13	Lee Valley Dam 11 Submissions received. Funding \$190k confirmed
16	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	8-Aug-13	Details of meetings on the Lee Valley Dam
17	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	19-Sep-13	Management of Council Resources - Processes for dam funding
18	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	31-Oct-13	Update of the Economic Impact Report on the Lee Valley Dam proposal. S101 of the LGA considerations.
19	Lee Valley Dam Funding and Compliance Issues	Lindsay McKenzie	5-Dec-13	The purpose of this report is to brief Council on the matters that it will need to address and the process it will need to follow if rates and water user charges are to be relied on to substantially fund the Lee Valley Dam and its operating costs.
20	Lee Valley Dam Memorandum of Understanding	Lindsay McKenzie	5-Dec-13	Entering into MOU Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC) and the Waimea Community Dam Company (DamCo) and TDC
	2014			
21	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	6-Mar-14	Section: 5.2.4 - 5.2.4 Representatives from Price Waterhouse Cooper spoke about Risk Assurance and Public/Private Partnerships (PPPs)

	Report Name	Report Author	Date	Notes
22	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	6-Mar-14	Twice in Section: 3 . Waimea Water Augmentation Committee draft timeframe for the necessary activities, consents, considerations and consultations that will take us through to the 2015 LTP process
23	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	17-Apr-14	Waimea Community Dam Project briefing Green MP Eugene Sage
24	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	17-Apr-14	The Waimea Water Augmentation Project update
25	Annual Plan Report Covering Submissions and Decisions for Inclusion in the Final Annual Plan 2014/2015;	Mark Tregurtha	30-May-14	Funding \$190k for ongoing work. Including consultation on funding options
26	Waimea Water Augmentation Project - Governance and Funding Considerations)	Lindsay McKenzie	30-May-14	Advises the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee that the structure for the proposed Dam Company referred to in the 2012-2022 Long Term Plan is not now supported because that structure and its funding places undue risk and liability on the ratepayers of the district for the capital sought, is not commercially sound and may not result in prudent stewardship of the district's resources. Declines to sign the Funding and Support Deed pending its review on legal advice and the review of the dam company structure.
27	Report to Adopt the Annual Plan 2014/2015	Mark Tregurtha	30-Jun-14	Includes funding for WCD project work \$190k
28	Waimea Water Augmentation Project - Governance and Funding Considerations)	Lindsay McKenzie	30-Jun-14	Registration of Interest CIIL, \$75K funding from Environmental Information Monitoring and Investigation budget
	Workshop with NCC		15-Jul-14	Waimea Water Augmentation Project
29	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	7-Aug-14	Sections: 1.3, 4.2, WWAC agreement to form WCDL as a CCO rather than a Co-Operative Company. WCDL Funding and Support Agreement drafted
	Council Workshop		27-Aug-14	Funding Proposal
	Council Workshop		10-Sep-14	Governance and Funding Proposal
30	Waimea Water Augmentation Project - Governance and Funding Considerations)	Lindsay McKenzie	18-Sep-14	Approves WCDL funding and support agreement. Approves project brief. Approves budget to 30 June 2015 of \$1.4m
	Council Workshop		17-Sep-14	Governance and Funding Proposal
31	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	18-Sep-14	Cross references WCDL Funding and support agreement
32	Statement of Proposal for Funding and Governance of the proposed Waimea Community Dam	Lindsay McKenzie	9-Oct-14	SOP approved for Consultation. Cost estimates \$60-\$80m. S101(3) analysis. All Rates Funding Model. Consultation from 13 October to 14 November 2014.
33	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	30-Oct-14	Minor reference to WCD time commitments
34	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	30-Oct-14	Sections: 1.5, 5.1, 6.7, 8.1.3 1.5 The Directors WCDL have all now signed the funding and support agreement.
35	Waimea Community Dam (SOP) Submissions Hearing	Eva Lawrence	24-Nov-14	Summary of responses to SOP. 350 submissions received. Two new reports from NZIER. 4.10 Waimea Dam Economic Assessment: Review and update of economic impact assessment of Waimea Community Dam, and How to pay for a dam: The public and private benefit and payment instrument options for the Waimea Community Dam.
36	Council Workshop - (Draft SOP report)		2-Dec-14	
37	Proposed Waimea Community Dam - Funding & Governance Options (SOP)	Lindsay McKenzie	11-Dec-14	Decision on the SOP consultation results. Funding proposals as set out in the SOP are not affordable for the Council and the Community. Neither funding proposal will be included in the 2015-25 LTP.
38	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	11-Dec-14	Acknowledgement of work done for SOP (summary only).
39	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	11-Dec-14	WCD and Development Contributions Policy
	2015			
40	Waimea Community Dam	Lindsay McKenzie	19-Feb-15	2015-2025 LTP considerations maximum Council contribution \$25M
41	Adoption of the Consultation Document for the Long Term Plan 2015-2025 report	Maxine Day	5-Mar-15	Includes WCD in LTP. The Council contribution \$25m .The project will only proceed if substantial external funds are available to contribute to the remaining costs of the Dam.

	Report Name	Report Author	Date	Notes
42	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	5-Mar-15	Resource Consent. Review of Construction Cost Assumptions. WCDL reporting
43	Waimea Water Augmentation Project - UPDATE	Lindsay McKenzie	16-Apr-15	TDC to meet WCDL costs in responding to appeals on the Resource consent. The decisions that the Council made on 11 December 2014 signalled a significant change in direction for this project and the roles and responsibilities of the parties. (report includes those decisions)
44	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	16-Apr-15	I've reported separately on the Waimea Water Augmentation Project. Staff appointment to project
	Workshop		13-May-15	
45	Waimea Community DAM Decisions for the Long term plan 2015-2016	Mike Drummond / Lindsay McKenzie	28-May-15	Consolidates the decisions required on the Waimea Water Augmentation Project following consultation on the Long Term Plan 2015-2025 Consultation Document. WCDL funding. P95 estimate in budget
46	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	28-May-15	Details on the Project Steering Group which provides a high level relationship forum between the Council and WCDL
47	Long Term Plan Report Covering Submissions and Decisions for Inclusion in the Final Long Term Plan 2015-2025	Mark Tregurtha	28-May-15	Feedback from submitters 161 submitters most against the dam
48	Adoption of Long Term Plan 2015-2025 and Annual Plan 2015/2016	Mark Tregurtha	25-Jun-15	Adoption 2015-2025 LTP.Includes WCD \$25m page 35. TRMP requires the Council to make a decision by 30 June 2015 on provision of a dam. If no dam then water restrictions come into effect.
49	Waimea Water Augmentation Project - Financial Update	Russell McGuigan / Matthew McGlinchey	30-Jul-15	Financial update on the Waimea Water Augmentation Project Workstreams. Estimated costs to go/no go decision in September 2016
50	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status Update	Lindsay McKenzie	30-Jul-15	1st Status Report update. The project is governed by a Project Steering Group (PSG). Work stream updates
51	Waimea Community DAM Project - Funding and Support Confidential	Lindsay McKenzie / Mike Drummond	30-Jul-15	Funding and Support Deed was entered into with Waimea Community Dam Limited (WCDL) on 3 October 2014. The Agreement expired on 30 June 2015. WCDL was required under the Deed to transfer all consents to the Council or its nominee at no charge on expiry of the Deed. WCDL contests this obligation
52	Supplementary Report to RCN15-07-15 - CONFIDENTIAL	Lindsay McKenzie	30-Jul-15	Alternative resolution to put all work on hold
53	Procurement Workshop-	Beca, Bond Co, Nick Patterson and Council staff.	6-Aug-15	A preferred procurement option was recommended to the PSG
54	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status Update	Lindsay McKenzie	10-Sep-15	2nd Status Report update - WCDL resource consent matters
55	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	10-Sep-15	Chamber of Commerce Members Briefing on the WCD
56	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	10-Sep-15	Mentioned only as CCO Provisions and mention on decision to revoke building dam safety regulations 2008
57	Supplementary Report - Waimea Water Augmentation Project - Confidential	Lindsay McKenzie	10-Sep-15	Contrary to the Project Status Report , WCDL has not agreed to the joint holder status (Consent), Put WCDL funding support on hold
58	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	22-Oct-15	Minor cross reference on resourcing
59	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status Update - Confidential	Lindsay McKenzie	22-Oct-15	Consents , JV structures
60	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status update	Lindsay McKenzie	3-Dec-15	Fourth of the regular Status Report updates.
	2016			
61	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status Update	Lindsay McKenzie	18-Feb-16	Fifth of the regular Status Report updates. The Council Officers' response to the WCDL investment proposal was presented in November 2015. The Project Steering Group (PSG) has met since and agreed that an alternative approach be modelled
62	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	18-Feb-16	References Nick Patterson Passing WCD work
63	Workshop- Councillors		18-Feb-16	Funding model WCDL put to its stakeholders prior to Christmas and on an alternative funding model staff recommend
64	Annual Plan 2016/2017 Briefing and Engagement Material report	Maxine Day, Russell Holden Mathew McGlinchey Dwayne Fletcher	3-Mar-16	Further funding and governance decisions have yet to be made on the Waimea Community Dam
65	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status report including Council response to WCDL Funding Proposal	Mike Drummond / Lindsay McKenzie	31-Mar-16	Sixth regular Status Report update. Funding Gap Position and Negotiation position for the Council
66	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	31-Mar-16	Short cross reference to other reports on Agenda

	Report Name	Report Author	Date	Notes
67	Land and Access in the Lee Valley for the purposes of the Waimea Community DAM Project - Confidential	Lindsay McKenzie / Russell McGuigan	31-Mar-16	The Council authorises the Chief Executive to execute and serve Notices of Desire under Section 18 of the Public Works Act.
68	Procurement and Tendering Process	Lindsay McKenzie	31-Mar-16	Agreement with WCDL for conducting the procurement and tendering process. WCDL is still to capitalise the company, WCDL is still to fully resource up to deliver its obligations to the Joint Venture.
69	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status Report	Mike Drummond / Lindsay McKenzie	12-May-16	Seventh regular Status Report update .Extends project time line for work streams. Consultation on TRMP change to extend water management transitions
70	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	12-May-16	Waimea Water Augmentation Project update. No decisions in regard the dam
71	Waimea Community DAM - Proposed Agreement on Joint Procurement - Confidential	Lindsay McKenzie	12-May-16	Confirms that the draft agreement with WCDL provides for the matters Council wishes to be covered in the proposed Joint Contractor procurement arrangements with the Waimea Dam Company Limited
72	Waimea Community Dam Status Report	Lindsay McKenzie	30-Jun-16	The procurement (of a contractor) put on hold
73	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status Report	Lindsay McKenzie	11-Aug-16	Eighth regular Status Report update. Review of the WCDL constitution
74	Waimea Community DAM - Project Status Report	Lindsay McKenzie	22-Sep-16	Ninth regular Status Report. The Council has requested an update report from MWH on the "100-year water demand projection for the Council Supplies in the Waimea basin".
75	Waimea Water Augmentation Project - Status Report	Lindsay McKenzie	10-Nov-16	Tenth regular Status Report. Establishment of the Council Controlled Organisation is on hold. A limited partnership model is being evaluated. WIL being incorporated to replace WCDL
76	Waimea Water Augmentation - Project Funding - Confidential	Lindsay McKenzie	10-Nov-16	Target rating and proceeding with procurement
77	Supplementary Information Paper	Lindsay McKenzie	10-Nov-16	TDC underwrite of the CIIL loan to WWL (Irrigator Capacity) Target Rating
	2017			
78	Waimea Community DAM - Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie, Kate Redgrove	2-Feb-17	11th Status Report , Overall Project Cost Summary p95 \$82.5m. Ltd Partnership model.
	Workshop		8-Feb-17	Waimea Water Augmentation Project
	Workshop		16-Feb-17	
80	Waimea Water Augmentation Project - Chief Executive's Overview	Lindsay McKenzie	2-Mar-17	Project Time Line attachment
81	Waimea Community DAM Consultation	Sharon Flood	2-Mar-17	Two-stage consultation process. The Council consulted on the proposed Waimea Community Dam in October 2014 and again in early 2015 as part of the Long Term Plan 2015-2015 (LTP) process.
82	Waimea Community DAM - Joint Venture Agreement	Lindsay McKenzie	2-Mar-17	Appoints Councilor King and Mike Drummond (Corporate Services Manager) to the Waimea Dam Joint Venture Working Group;
83	Waimea Community DAM - Joint Venture Negotiations - Confidential	Mike Drummond	2-Mar-17	Negotiating position JV Working group
84	Waimea DAM - Procurement - Confidential	Russell McGuigan	2-Mar-17	Authorises the Chief Executive to sign the Heads of Agreement and commence the procurement process
85	Waimea Community DAM - Notices of Intention to take Land (PWA) - Confidential	Russell McGuigan	2-Mar-17	Acquire the Land Interests listed in Schedule 1 for the Waimea Community Dam Project
86				
87	Waimea Community DAM - Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	23-Mar-17	12th Status Report - 2 Workshops since 2nd February
88	Council Update on Waimea Community DAM Joint Venture Working Party Negotiations - Confidential	Mike Drummond	23-Mar-17	Application \$7m FIF funding. Approves ongoing work to develop a proposal for consultation.
89	Waimea Community DAM - Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	11-May-17	13th Status Report . The Project Board has agreed to recruit a person as an Interim Project Director to set up the project office. The JV Working Group is paying close attention to operating costs.
	Council Workshop		17-May-17	Financials
	Council Workshop		31-May-17	Financials
90	Waimea Water Augmentation Project - Next Steps	Lindsay McKenzie	14-Jun-17	Requests staff to commence work on a Statement of Proposal for community consultation
91	Delegations for Waimea Dam - Land Acquisition	Lindsay McKenzie	22-Jun-17	Authorises CEO re PWA processes for land
92	Waimea Community DAM - Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	22-Jun-17	14th Status Report. Limited Partnership CCO model still in play

	Report Name	Report Author	Date	Notes
	Council Workshop		13-Jul-17	Water Supply for Waimea Plains
93	Waimea Community DAM - Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	27-Jul-17	Confirms, having sought and considered further advice about the alternative urban water supply augmentation options, that the proposed Waimea Community Dam in the Lee Valley is the best solution for meeting the Community's need for good quality local water supply infrastructure; R & F Policy review to provide for funding
94	A procurement workshop was held in late July.			
	Council Workshop		17-Aug-17	Cost allocation
	Joint Workshop with NCC		30-Aug-17	
95	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	7-Sep-17	
96	Waimea Community DAM Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	7-Sep-17	Sixteenth Status Report . \$7m FIF funding approved. 10.1 The Interim Project Director's contract has been extended to March 2018.
97	Waimea Community DAM - Joint Venture Funding Proposal - Confidential	Mike Drummond	7-Sep-17	Confirms the recommended funding and investment proposal \$75.9m as basis for SOP
	Council Workshop		5-Sep-17	Funding and Governance
	Council Workshop		14-Sep-21	Waimea Dam Rates
	Council Workshop		28-Sep-17	Public consultation and SOP
	Council Workshop		6-Oct-17	Waimea Dam SOP
98	Adoption of Consultation Document Containing the Proposal on Waimea Community Dam Governance and Funding Options	Sharon Flood	19-Oct-17	
99	Waimea Community DAM Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	19-Oct-17	Seventeenth Status Report. signed the process/commitment letter on 21 September 2017
100	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	19-Oct-17	Issues raised with the Office of Auditor-General (OAG) into members' interests and the Waimea Dam
101	Mayor's Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	19-Oct-17	Change to the Constitution of Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd (CIIL). Councillors will be aware that this change allows CIIL to provide concessionary loans to local authorities for irrigation and community projects that directly lead to environmental benefits.
102	Waimea Community DAM - Joint Venture Funding Proposal Update-Confidential	Mike Drummond	19-Oct-17	Council sunk costs \$2.9m, \$1.3 Provision is being made in the draft Long Term Plan (2018-28) (LTP) to include these costs with project capital costs and loan fund them. Notes Process Letter and related Term Sheets. Approves the loan funding of up to \$1,957k for 2014 - 2017 project support costs
103	Waimea Community DAM Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	16-Nov-17	Eighteenth Status Report . Variation of Heads of Agreement (copy attached) and its supporting Terms of Reference establishes a Project Governance Board to take the project forward to the point in time when the proposed Joint Venture Company is formed and takes over the project.
104	Mayor's and Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	14-Dec-17	Work on the Waimea Water project . OAG response to complaints
105	Adoption of Supporting Information, Financial Limits and Confirming Directions for the LTP 2018 - 2028 Consultation Document		14-Dec-17	No Cross reference to WCD project
106	Appointing a Preferred Contractor to Construct the Waimea Community Dam		14-Dec-17	Appoints Fulton Hogan/Taylor's Contracting JV as preferred contractor for the purposes of the Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) contract and subsequent ECI process
	2018			
107	Proposed Waimea Community Dam - Report on Submissions to the Statement of Proposal Governance and Funding Oct 17	Sharon Flood	1-Feb-18	Summarises and analyses the key points and themes covered by submitters
108	Decision on Waimea Community DAM Consultation Document - Statement of Proposal for Governance and Funding Arrangements	Sharon Flood	22-Feb-18	Approves establishment of CCO
109	Waimea Community Dam Project Report	Mike Drummond / Lindsay McKenzie	22-Feb-18	19th Status Report . transitioning to the Project Office, Heads of Agreement, ECI is a priority
110	Mayor's Report to Full Council	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	22-Feb-18	Waimea Community DAM SOP Hearings
111	Provincial Growth Fund	Lindsay McKenzie	5-Apr-18	Waimea Dam Financing
112	December 2017 Quarterly Financial Update	Matthew McGlinchey, Kelly Kivimaa-Schouten	5-Apr-18	Mention of Financing
113	Waimea Community DAM - CCO Formation	Mike Drummond	5-Apr-18	Approves work streams to form Waimea Water Ltd
114	Waimea Community DAM Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	5-Apr-18	20th Status Report
115	Mayor's activity Report to Full Council	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	5-Apr-18	Mention in 1.17
116	Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Deliberations Report	Alan Bywater, Sharon Flood Matthew McGlinchey	4-May-18	

	Report Name	Report Author	Date	Notes
117	Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (LTP) Council Directions report	Sharon Flood	24-May-18	Section 7 Waimea Community Dam
118	Waimea Dam Project Report	Lindsay McKenzie	24-May-18	21st Status Report . Alex Adams employed as the project's Stakeholder and Risk Manager .
119	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Lindsay McKenzie	24-May-18	Waimea Water Project / Waimea Water Augmentation Project
120	Mayor's activity Report to Full Council	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	24-May-18	Waimea Water Augmentation project
121	Waimea Community DAM Term Sheet Disclosure to Councillors	Mike Drummond	28-Jun-18	Non Disclosure agreements required
122	Waimea Community DAM - Hydroelectric Power Generation	Richard Kirby	28-Jun-18	Business Case & JV negotiation position
123	Waimea Water Augmentation Scheme - Local Bill - Confidential	Dennis Bush-King	28-Jun-18	Approves the introduction of a Local Bill
	Council Workshop		1-Aug-18	Financial Matters
124	Waimea Dam Project Report	Janine Dowding	9-Aug-18	23rd status report on the Project
125	Waimea Community DAM Project	Janine Dowding / Mike Drummond/Susan Edwards/Richard Kirby/Rob Smith	28-Aug-18	Information to make a decision on whether to proceed with the Dam Project. Increase from the LTP budget(\$75.9m) to \$102.2m. Makes a decision not to proceed with the dam project under the current funding allocation model.
126	Waimea Community DAM - Confidential	Janine Dowding / Mike Drummond	6-Sep-18	Revised funding offer received from CILL and WIL. Council revokes resolution CN18-08-26 made at the Full Council meeting on 28 August 2018;
127	Mayor's activity Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	27-Sep-18	Sections 1.32 & 2.2 proceed to Financial Close and a final decision to proceed to build the dam
128	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Janine Dowding	27-Sep-18	4.10 The Tasman District Council (Waimea Water Augmentation Scheme) Bill and work stream update
129	Funding Agreement for the Waimea Dam Project (Commitment Phase - Part 3) Between CILL, WIL and Tasman District Council - Confidential	Janine Dowding / Mike Drummond	27-Sep-18	Funding of project development costs
130	Waimea Community DAM - Negotiations Update - Confidential	Janine Dowding/ Mike Drummond	23-Oct-18	Compensation regime , Ngāti Koata Land, WWL CCO loan
131	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Janine Dowding	8-Nov-18	Advice and Reporting - Waimea Dam Inc. Local Bill
132	Waimea Water Ltd Constitution - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	8-Nov-18	Approves WWL Constitution subject to specified amendments
133	Proposed Waimea Community Dam - Nelson City Council \$5m Project Contribution	Mike Drummond	8-Nov-18	NCC funding Term Sheet and Negotiations
134	Tasman District Council Appointments to the Waimea Dam CCO Board	Richard Kempthorne - Mayor	8-Nov-18	Ken Smales, Karen Jordan, Doug Hattersley and Daryl Wehner
135	Waimea Community DAM Project	Janine Dowding, Dennis Bush-King, Susan Edwards, Mike Drummond, Richard Kirby, Lucy Clark	30-Nov-18	Decision to proceed with the dam \$105.9m
136	Confidential Waimea Community DAM - Projects Agreements - Confidential	Janine Dowding / Mike Drummond	30-Nov-18	Final Agreements subject to any further minor edits or changes recommended by the Council's Legal Advisors
137	Tasman District Council - Appointment of Fourth Director to WWL	Richard Kempthorne - Mayor	30-Nov-18	Appointment of John Wright
138	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Janine Dowding	13-Dec-18	Mention in section 6, continuing to work towards Financial Close
	2019			
139	Chief Executive's Activity Report	Janine Dowding	14-Feb-19	Advice and Reporting. PDU funding declined
140	Waimea Community DAM - Project Report	Mike Drummond	14-Feb-19	
141	Waimea Community DAM Final Project Agreements Report - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	14-Feb-19	Receives and Notes, copies of the documents required to be executed to give effect to the financial close of the project on 21 December 2018.
142	Waimea Water Limited - DRAFT STATEMENT OF INTENT 2019/20	Mike Drummond	28-Mar-19	
143	Mayor's Activity Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	28-Mar-19	Drought in Tasman District
144	Chief Executive's Report to Full Council	Janine Dowding	9-May-19	Section 6 Project Status Update
145	Waimea Community DAM - Ngati Koata Partnering Deed and M.A.K Stuart Agreement to Acquire Land - Confidential	Mike Drummond	9-May-19	Extension of Time & purchase of MAK Stuart land
146	Ngati Koata Partnering Deed and M.A.K Stuart Agreement to Acquire Land - Supplementary information;	Mike Drummond	9-May-19	PWA
147	Waimea Water Ltd - Six Monthly Presentation	Mike Drummond	20-Jun-19	
148	Waimea Water Ltd - Final Statement of Intent 2019/20	Mike Drummond	20-Jun-19	
149	Chief Executive's Activity Report to Full Council	Janine Dowding	20-Jun-19	Final SOI and WWL presentation
150	Mayor's Activity Report	Mayor Richard Kempthorne	1-Aug-19	Mention in section 1.28 & 1.33 Dam Visit and Dry Weather Task Force
151	Waimea Water Ltd - Inaugural Annual Report 2018-19	Mike Drummond	12-Sep-19	
152	Waimea Community DAM - Ngati Koata Partnership Agreement, Provisions for Hydro power - Confidential	Mike Drummond	12-Sep-19	Hydro-power provisions
153	Chief Executive's Update to Full Council	Janine Dowding	12-Dec-19	Mention only in 4.3.4 Renewable energy investigations

	Report Name	Report Author	Date	Notes
	2020			
154	Waimea Water Limited - Board Director Vacancy - Confidential	Mike Drummond	13-Feb-20	Decision to appoint a replacement director for Karen Jordan
155	Waimea Water Ltd 2019/2020 Mid-Year Report and Project Update - Confidential	Janine Dowding / Mike Drummond	21-Feb-20	
156	Mayor's Activity Update	Mayor Tim King	26-Mar-20	Sections 1.6, 1.7 (Golden Bay Community Board Resolution)
157	Waimea Community DAM - Estimating Review	Richard Kirby, Mike Drummond	21-Apr-20	Review the scoping and pricing, given increases
158	Waimea Water Ltd - Draft Statement of Intent 2020-2023	Mike Drummond	21-Apr-20	
159	Waimea Community DAM - Funding of Projected Cost Increases and Other Matters	Mike Drummond, Richard Kirby, Dennis Bush-King	21-Apr-20	
160	Waimea Community DAM - Contractor Advance Facility - Confidential	Mike Drummond, Richard Kirby	21-Apr-20	COVID-19 early payment to the contractor (Fulton Hogan and Taylors Joint Venture)
161	WAIMEA WATER LTD - UPDATE Presentation	Mike Scott, David Wright	25-Jun-20	
162	Appointment of Director, Waimea Water Ltd - Confidential	Tim King, Dana Wensley,	25-Jun-20	
163	Waimea Water Ltd - Final Statement of Intent 2020/23	Mike Drummond	30-Jul-20	Agrees to Final Statement of Intent
164	Waimea Community DAM - Nelson City Council Funding Agreement - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	30-Jul-20	Continuing Negotiations
165	Waimea Community DAM - WWL Share Subscription Agreement - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	30-Jul-20	Acknowledges the execution of the Subscription Agreement
166	Presentation , Waimea Community Dam - Project Update from Waimea Water Ltd	Mike Scott	10-Sep-20	
167	Waimea Community DAM - Project Update - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond, Richard Kirby	10-Sep-20	
168	Waimea Community DAM - CIIL Funding Request - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	10-Sep-20	Proposed \$18m Facility
169	Waimea Community DAM - CIIL Loan Facility - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	1-Oct-20	Approval \$18m Facility
170	Waimea Community DAM - Funding of Cost Overruns - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	22-Oct-20	
171	Revenue and Financing Policy Proposals for Funding the Water Supply Activity (Waimea Community Dam)	Mike Drummond	3-Dec-20	
172	Waimea Community DAM - Project Update - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	3-Dec-20	Includes PWA land acquisition
	2021			
173	Waimea Community Dam Ltd Update - Presentation CONFIDENTIAL	David Wright and Chief Executive, Mike Scott	25-Feb-21	
174	Waimea Community Dam Ltd Update - Presentation Public	David Wright and Chief Executive, Mike Scott	25-Feb-21	
175	Late Item - Waimea Community Dam Cost Overruns Funding for Inclusion in Long Term Plan Consultation Document Report	Mike Drummond	25-Feb-21	
176	Waimea Water Ltd 2020 Mid- year Report	Mike Drummond	18-Mar-21	
177	Waimea Water Ltd - Draft Statement of Intent 2021/22	Mike Drummond	8-Apr-21	
178	Waimea Community DAM - Nelson City Council Funding Agreement - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	8-Apr-21	
179	Waimea Community DAM - Project Update - CONFIDENTIAL	Mike Drummond	8-Apr-21	
180	Tasman's 10-Year Plan Deliberations	Mike Drummond	17-May-21	
181	Supplementary Report 1 - Long Term Plan Deliberations	Mike Drummond	17-May-21	Consultation results - revised options
182	Supplementary Report 2 - Long Term Plan Deliberations	Mike Drummond	17-May-21	Full Agreements
183	Chief Executive's Update to Full Council	Janine Dowding	20-May-21	Waimea Community Dam inquiry/ review
184	Waimea Community Dam - Investigation Options	Janine Dowding	4-Jun-21	Waimea Community Dam inquiry/ review
185	Waimea Water Ltd - Quarterly Report to Shareholders	Mike Drummond	4-Jun-21	
186	Waimea Water Limited - Final Statement of Intent 2021-2022	Mike Drummond	4-Jun-21	
187	Waimea Community Dam - Funding & Negotiations Outcome	Mike Drummond	4-Jun-21	Final Agreement Approval
188	Waimea Community Dam - Nelson City Council Funding Agreement - Confidential	Mike Drummond	4-Jun-21	Final Agreement Approval
189	Waimea Community Dam - Cost Overrun Agreements - Confidential	Mike Drummond	4-Jun-21	Final Agreements