

Report	15.603
Date	15 December 2015
File	CCAB-12-86
Committee	Te Kauru Upper Ruamahanga River Floodplain Management Subcommittee
Author	Alistair J N Allan, Senior Projects Engineer

Rural Options Development Update

1. Purpose

To update the subcommittee regarding the development of options for the rural reaches within the Te Kāuru Upper Ruamahanga Project.

2. Background

The development of rural focused flood risk management options recommenced in October 2015. This focuses on areas outside of the Masterton urban area and will develop a range of structural and non-structural tools for flood risk management.

The subcommittee held five workshops to develop rural options between March and June 2015, and in October 2015 held a workshop to develop a multi criteria analysis tool to assess and improve the further developed options being worked on by the project team.

3. Multi Criteria Assessment Tool

This tool has been developed to allow the subcommittee and community to guide the development of options in a continuous, positive feedback loop. It has been structured based on the vision and aims set by the Subcommittee, and provides a measure of how well recommended options perform against the vision and aims.

The workshop to develop these was held on the 20th of October 2015. The subcommittee will be invited to use the tool at future workshops to provide guidance to the project team regarding the refinement of options for flood and erosion risk management.

Reference material for the MCA tool, its use and its development is included as **Attachment One** to this report.

4. Option Development

The development of options has been carried out on a reach by reach approach. This has meant that reach specific issues have been addressed, but also that common ways to address issues across a wide range of reaches has been rolled up into options common across all reaches.

The initial draft of options was developed in workshops with the Subcommittee. These have been collated and work is underway to add detail to these options, and develop policies that will enable their implementation.

These options will be reported to the subcommittee at a future meeting, and further workshops will be arranged to review and refine the options using the MCA tool.

A brief summary of this will be provided in a presentation at the meeting on the 15 December 2015.

The options have been separated into two forms within the draft document, those options which apply catchment wide and those options which apply only to a reach or specific location. The options have also been categorised into who is the lead implementer, what approach they take to risk management and where this is appropriate to include (avoid, manage, control, accept).

4.1 Catchment wide options

Catchment wide options include items ranging from district plan controls to flood forecasting systems and emergency management. They respond to issues and aims that affect many reaches.

Key tools being developed include:

- River bed level envelopes and methods to achieve these envelope targets
- Revision of the design fairway and buffer strip lines to establish lateral erosion envelopes
- Pool, Riffle, Run envelopes
- Strengthening of the isolated works fund for outside of scheme landowners
- Policy guidance for gradual improvement toward mixed exotic and native buffer zone planting
- Planning and development controls
- Emergency Management provisions
- Flood forecasting and warning systems

4.2 Reach or location specific options

Reach or location specific options include targeted recommendations specific to a certain issue. Within this category sit:

- Capital works projects
- Community led initiatives
- Sites of specific value or significance
- Code of practice notes

- Locations where a policy response may require interpretation guidance

5. The decision-making process and significance

No decision is being sought in this report. The purpose of this report is to update the Subcommittee on the development of options for within the rural reaches of the Te Kāuru Upper Ruamahanga Project and is for information only.

5.1 Engagement

In accordance with the significance and engagement policy, no engagement on the matters for decision is required.

6. Recommendations

That the Subcommittee:

1. *Receives the report.*
2. *Notes the content of the report.*

Report prepared by:	Report approved by:	Report approved by:	Report approved by:
Alistair J N Allan Senior Projects Engineer	Mark Hooker Team Leader, Investigations, Strategy, Planning	Graeme Campbell Manager, Flood Protection	Wayne O'Donnell General Manager, Catchment Management

Attachment One: Multi- Criteria Analysis Tool