

**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE EMERGENCY SERVICES SPECIAL
COMMITTEE TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE,
LINCOLN, WAITAKERE CITY, ON TUESDAY, 2 APRIL 2002,
COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1 APOLOGIES	1
2 URGENT BUSINESS	1
3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	1
4 INTRODUCTION TO CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT "ROADSHOW" PRESENTATION	2
5 AUCKLAND REGION CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP - GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS AND FUNDING	3

**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE EMERGENCY SERVICES SPECIAL
COMMITTEE TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE,
LINCOLN, WAITAKERE CITY, ON TUESDAY, 2 APRIL 2002,
COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM.**

1 APOLOGIES



2 URGENT BUSINESS

Section 46A(7) and (7A) of the Local Government Official Information Act and Meetings Act 1987 provides that where an item of business is not on the agenda, it may only be dealt with at the meeting if:

- (i) the item is a minor matter; and
- (ii) the Chairperson has explained at the beginning of the meeting (when open to the public) that the item will be raised for discussion, why the item is not on the agenda, and why it cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting; and
- (iii) the Committee resolves to deal with the item.

No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer the item to a subsequent meeting for further discussion.

NOTE: Urgent Business need not be dealt with now and may be delayed until later in the meeting.



3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Ordinary - Tuesday, 5 February 2002

RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Emergency Services Special Committee held on Tuesday, 5 February 2002, as circulated, be taken as read and now be confirmed.



4 **INTRODUCTION TO CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT “ROADSHOW”
PRESENTATION**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to introduce a presentation on the new Civil Defence Emergency Management concept.

BACKGROUND

The Central Government review of civil defence began in 1991 with the Law Commissions “Report on Emergencies”. Ten years later the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group is a reality in advance of the new legislation, which it is hoped will become law this year.

At a recent meeting of the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Co-ordinating Executive Group, it was agreed that a “Roadshow” would be set up and offered to the seven new local Councils within the region as a way of briefing them on

- Local arrangements arising out of the coming Civil Defence Emergency Management legislation
- Budgetary matters of this new structure
- Management options

A1 - A2

A background briefing paper is attached at pages A1 to A2.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Currently Waitakere City Council has a responsibility under the Civil Defence Act 1983 to plan for civil defence. Under the new Civil Defence Emergency Management Act, this responsibility for local civil defence emergency management measures will continue, although the arrangements will be changed to a more region-wide structure.

ISSUES

The Civil Defence Emergency Management Bill currently awaits its second reading. There have been protracted delays in having this occur, because of the priority being accorded to other pieces of legislation. Government is committed to the Civil Defence Emergency Management legislation being enacted in the present term.

Regardless of legislative timing, councils in this region have agreed to continue implementing and refining the new local arrangements, and to fund key work programmes that improve the region’s preparedness to withstand significant disaster events. These Work Programmes include:

- Drafting a regional Civil Defence Emergency Management Plan for the region
- Enhancing the capabilities of, and consistency between, Emergency Operations Centres across the region
- Creating a region-wide “whole of community” public education and awareness strategy
- Adopting an “all hazards” approach to risk identification and risk reduction.

Today’s presentation to the Emergency Services Special Committee will provide the Councillors who have a special responsibility for civil defence emergency management matters, with the opportunity to gain a better understanding of the way in which this region is working towards setting up the structure required for the coming Civil Defence Emergency Management legislation.

RESOURCES

In the 2002/2003 Financial year, Council has set aside \$20,000 to support the Civil Defence Emergency Management projects.

CONCLUSION

In summary, today's presentation by a member of the Auckland Co-ordinating Executive Committee of the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, will present an opportunity for this Committee to receive up-to-date knowledge of the direction in which this new structure will take this Council.

RECOMMENDATION

That the information be received.

Report prepared by: Heather E Smith, Manager, Emergency Services Section.



5 AUCKLAND REGION CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP - GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS AND FUNDING

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to enable the Emergency Services Special Committee to consider and take a position on matters relating to the organisation of the Auckland Region Civil Defence Emergency Management Group. Council is required to take a view, due to the provisions of the proposed Civil Defence Emergency Management Bill which is currently awaiting its third reading before the House.

BACKGROUND

The Committee considered a number of these issues at its February 2002 meeting. In response to a report from officers on Regional Civil Defence Emergency Management arrangements, the Committee resolved:

“That the Emergency Services Special Committee confirm Council’s position as follows:

- Support for the Joint Committee approach;*
- Support for contribution from Territorial Local Authorities toward regional Civil Defence Emergency Management work programmes, with a majority proportion (in line with current levels) coming from the Auckland Regional Council;*
- Support for three Emergency Response Zone’s and four Emergency Operations Centres in the region with Auckland City Council hosting the lead Group Emergency Operation Centre;*
- Support for budget levels for 2002/2003 being in line with 2001/2002 levels;*
- Support for the Emergency Response Controller role being filled by either the Manager of the Emergency Management Office or by appointment of a staff member from one of the region’s authorities to act as controller in an emergency event.”*

34/2002

Since that time, arrangements have also been considered by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee, which is currently a Committee of the

Auckland Regional Council. The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee resolved:

“That before the Committee take a position on the issue outlined in the report, the issues be reported to each Council, with each Council asked to indicate its position on these issues, with the result being reported to the May Committee meeting.”

A8 - A11

Given this resolution, it is timely for Council to consider the report that went to the Regional Committee and formally indicate its views on the issues raised. A copy of the report to the Regional Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee is attached at pages A3 to A7. A copy of the report Council considered at its February 2002 meeting is attached at pages A8 to A11.

ISSUES

From a staff perspective, the advice given to the Committee in February 2002 remains unchanged. This Council has previously supported the joint committee structure for the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group and the proposed legislation is in line with Council's position.

In terms of funding arrangements, the Auckland Regional Council has signalled that it may stop funding its current regional Civil Defence undertakings should the joint committee structure be adopted in legislation due to concerns with the governance arrangements. This Council has indicated that it does not agree with this position, and believes that the Regional Council should continue to fund work associated with the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, given its regional nature.

Waitakere City Council may not be able to convince the Auckland Regional Council in this regard. However, it would be appropriate for it to confirm its position on regional organisational matters for the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, and write formally to the Auckland Regional Council, setting out its position and requesting the Regional Council to continue funding on the present basis. It would also be appropriate to confirm that should this step not be taken, the Council would be seeking a detailed review of the current administrative, support and operational resources employed on a regional basis to ensure greatest effectiveness, efficiency and the removal of any duplication. Recommendations in line with this commentary are set out below.

CONCLUSION

An earlier agenda item provides for a presentation to the Committee on regional Civil Defence emergency matters. Council has been asked to establish its position on a number of Regional Civil Defence Emergency Management organisation matters, and the Committee is now in a position to take decisions on behalf of Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That Council confirm its previous position in relation to organisational arrangements for the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group.
3. That in response to the request for feedback from the Auckland Region Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee, the Committee take the following positions:
 - That each Council represented on the joint committee have one vote
 - That this Council's preference is for the Emergency Management Office to be domiciled with the Auckland Regional Council

- That this Council's preference for the basis of funding be based on the status quo, with each Council making a contribution to costs, but with the majority of regional costs being funded by the Auckland Regional Council from regional rates, recognising the existing local and in kind contributions made by territorial local authorities.
4. That the Chairman write to the Auckland Regional Council, communicating Council's preference and the rationale behind it.

Report prepared by: Ross McLeod, Director: Corporate & Civic Services.



X.1 GENERIC COMMITTEE ITEM FOR TLAS E099-01

TJ: 5 March 2002

X.1.1 BACKGROUND TO CDEMG FORMATION

Over the past decade central government has promoted a review of civil defence and emergency management (CDEM) arrangements at national and local level. Local Government has been strongly represented in the review process. In 1997 Government created an Emergency Management Establishment Unit within the Department of Internal Affairs, to drive the introduction of new civil defence and emergency management arrangements across the country. This would involve the reconstruction of the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management.

In 1997 councils in the Auckland region agreed to participate in a national pilot programme, wherein the councils would work collectively to apply new CDEM frameworks and refine them to ensure high levels of functionality, and a desirable alignment of roles and responsibilities.

The Auckland pilot was steered by a working party comprising senior officers from each council and the emergency services. Project coordination was provided through a project manager retained specifically for the purpose, with project costs shared amongst participating organisations.

In December 1998 the CDEM steering group recommended to CEOs that the pilot arrangements be adopted as the new CDEM arrangements for the region. In general terms the recommended new arrangements met with widespread, but not unanimous support across councils. Key issues relating to local autonomy, funding, and response coordination could not be resolved until draft legislation was tabled in early 2000, that provided direction and clarity.

In the period 2002 to the present, CDEM participating organisations have worked to implement the regional and local arrangements developed in the pilot phase, and to create strong linkages to other agencies (volunteer sector, utilities, government departments, private sector), statutory tools (district plans, building codes, standard operating procedures) and the general public (through education initiatives in schools, households, and businesses). This has been achieved comfortably in advance of new CDEM legislation, by building on the separate empowerments contained in the Local Government Act, Resource Management Act, and Civil Defence Act.

X.1.2 PLANNING IN ANTICIPATION OF LEGISLATION BEING ENACTED

The Civil Defence Emergency Management Bill currently awaits its second reading. There have been protracted delays in having this occur, because of the priority being accorded to other pieces of legislation. Government has committed to the CDEM legislation being enacted in the present term. Regardless of legislative timing, councils in this region have agreed to continue implementing and refining the new local arrangements, and to fund key work programmes that improve the region's preparedness to withstand significant disaster events.

These work plans include:

- Drafting a new regional Civil Defence Emergency Management Plan

- Enhancing the capabilities of, and consistency between, Emergency operations Centres (EOCs) across the region
- A region wide, 'whole of community' public education and awareness strategy
- Adopting an 'all hazards' approach to risk identification and reduction

X.1.3 KEY ORGANISATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Since 2000, some significant changes have been introduced to the way in which CDEM is administered and delivered in this region. This includes the creation of a regional political committee (CDEM Committee) to provide governance, formalising the officers' steering group as a Coordinating Executive Group (CEG), and establishing a regional Emergency Management Office (EMO).

This has been achieved through strong cooperation and good will, and an acceptance by participating organisations of the need to fund the change process. However, the new assignment of roles and responsibilities, including the assumption of new responsibilities to be imposed by new legislation, does mean that councils need to revisit the manner in which costs are borne across the region.

The regional CDEM Group political committee recently agreed that changes to cost sharing arrangements should be deferred until the 2003-04 financial year, to allow councils a further twelve months in which to plan.

Today's presentation will set out the new CDEM arrangements, focussing on:

- A brief local CDEMG history
- New legislation
- New local arrangements
- Budgetary matters
- The region's risk profile, and management options

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received.

**B.2 CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP
ORGANISATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS
E097-01**

Tim Jago, Manager Hazards and Emergency Management: 30 January 2002

B.2.1 BACKGROUND

Under proposed new civil defence emergency management legislation 'consortia' of local councils will be required to group together around existing regional council boundaries, to form CDEM Groups.

Governance of this consortia of councils is to be vested in a CDEMG Committee, which is to be established under s114.S of the Local Government Act as a joint committee of all the councils.

Regional Councils must assume the role of 'administering authority'. This does not imply that regional councils are the principal CDEM agency. Rather, it establishes that regional councils are responsible for providing secretarial support to the political committee.

The consortia must also establish a Coordinating Executive Group (CEG) comprising of senior officers of councils and emergency services in the CDEMG jurisdiction to oversee CDEM policy development, planning, and implementation. The manner in which the CEG is established and operated is a matter for local determination.

At their discretion, CDEM Groups may also choose to establish an Emergency Management Office (EMO). An EMO has been established for the Auckland CDEMG, and is tasked with providing professional advice and support to the CEG and CDEMG, and for coordinating activities across the region that give effect to new CDEM arrangements.

The EMO is presently domiciled with the ARC, as this provides an effective link to the CDEMG secretariat provided by the ARC as administering authority, and also provides close links to the natural hazards management undertaken by the ARC to satisfy Resource Management Act obligations.

B.2.2 OUTSTANDING ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Throughout the CDEMG development period, commencing in 1997, councils have addressed many matters, but have awaited legislative clarity before making final decisions on the issues of:

- appropriate governance structures
- cost apportionment
- equity in representation
- provision of administrative and EMO functions

**AGENDA
8 FEBRUARY 2002
CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP COMMITTEE**

As the CDEM bill has been reported back from the Select Committee and passage through the second reading is unlikely to result in any substantive change, the CEG is recommending to the CDEMG Committee that it now determine these issues, in order that officers can draft the administrative sections of the draft CDEM plan.

It is to be noted that the CDEM plan is not required to be operative until 24 months following enactment of legislation. Therefore, the CDEMG Committee can determine these issues now, but wait until the 2003/04 year to invoke the changes required by the legislation and make changes to the way in which CDEM delivery and costs are apportioned amongst councils. This will allow individual councils a suitable period of time to plan for any changes to cost share and responsibilities.

B.2.3 GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE NOW PRESCRIBED

Proposed legislation has removed the ability for CDEMGs to determine the manner in which the governance function will be provided.

Proposed legislation will require each CDEMG to be established as a joint committee of all the councils in the region, under s114.S of the Local Government Act. The ARC, as the regional council, is statutorily made the administering authority responsible for providing the committee with secretarial support.

B.2.4 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The balance of this report expands upon the three remaining issues (cost apportionment; equity in representation; and provision of administrative and EMO functions). The CDEMG Committee is asked to consider the options available to it in order that:

- arrangements can be put in place to allow planning for the 2002/03 year and complete drafting of the CDEM Plan.
- existing momentum in developing the CDEMG is maintained prior to new legislation being enacted.

Issue 1: Adequate Funding and Resourcing

The Governance Committee needs to have confidence that it has the resources available to achieve the outcomes it seeks. There are two key functions to be funded and resourced:

1. Administration of the Governance Group and the work undertaken by the CEG
2. The activities and projects undertaken regionally by the Emergency Management Office (EMO) to implement and sustain the EMG

A number of funding arrangements have previously been considered, whereby councils contribute to the cost of regional projects and activities. This consideration focussed on commonly used formulae, namely:

- Value of capital improvements
- Equalised capital land value

**AGENDA
8 FEBRUARY 2002
CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP COMMITTEE**

- Per-capita apportionment

and on the development of a CDEMG specific formula:

- By hazard rating (requiring considerable research and debate)

These have been well canvassed by the CDEMG working party and the CEG, who have not moved beyond the concept of a per-capita contribution basis for the CDEMG. The capitation formula is seen to overcome the wide disparities that would be introduced if funding was levied on the basis of land or capital values, while there was no practical way found of correlating the region's hazard profile to a funding system.

Importantly, early working parties identified that regional migratory patterns (for work and leisure purposes) saw urban and rural communities interchanging on almost a daily basis. This meant individuals were regularly exposed to a range of hazards located within other territorial council areas. Similarly, it was identified that in the event of a major disaster in a rural area there would be dependence on emergency resources from the cities for supplementation, whilst urban communities would look to the rural districts to relocate initially in the event of substantial devastation or disruption to housing etc. The assumption being that meeting the costs of CDEM arrangements on a per-capita basis is the most equitable and effective approach.

As the ARC rates across all council areas, it is necessary to reasonably calculate the share the ARC should contribute to CDEMG funding. Working parties explored this issue, and concluded that the system used for several other regional forums at the time, whereby the ARC pays 16% of the total cost, was appropriate. The 16% is calculated as the ARC's share of total local government spend in the region.

It will be incumbent upon the CDEMG Committee each year to thoroughly work through the annual planning process and develop a regional budget that all councils are comfortable contributing to in a fair and equitable manner.

Issue 2: Equity in Representation

New legislation will quite clearly specify that each participating council has representation on the Governance Committee of the CDEMG to which it affiliates.

The issue to be resolved is whether this representation should be on the basis of one vote per council, or if a weighting should be applied to the voting structure to reflect the fact that some councils will contribute significantly more resources to the CDEMG than others. Legislation is silent on this issue.

From an emergency management perspective, some councils have a larger population exposed to risk, some have a larger land area, and others have a higher capital value exposed to risk. Some score low on all counts.

Under a joint committee arrangement, it is difficult to determine how councils could be politically represented in an equitable manner. Consideration has been given to a proportional voting system along the lines of the electoral college for Infrastructure Auckland, or alternatively to some councils having more representatives than others.

**AGENDA
8 FEBRUARY 2002
CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP COMMITTEE**

Previous workshops have addressed this issue, and concluded that it seems more logical and acceptable for each council to have a single representative, with one vote each.

Issue 3: Provision of Administration and EMO functions

The ARC currently provides and houses the EMO function. As the CDEMG is no longer one of its committees, this is a matter that should be reviewed.

The ARC's current position is that if the Governance Committee were to be a Joint Committee, the ARC would continue to undertake its regional hazards and risk assessment work and continue to discharge its regional civil defence obligations under current legislation. The ARC would also meet the cost of administering the CDEMG Committee as required under new legislation.

However, the ARC is not likely to assume all the responsibility for funding the CEG and EMO activities. These costs will need to be apportioned amongst participating councils.

As the ARC would only be one of several funding partners, the possibility is introduced that the EMO can be domiciled within one of the partner organisations if this can be demonstrated to be effective and desirable.

As already stated in the introduction to this report, there is logic in locating the EMO in proximity to the secretariat that supports the CDEMG Committee, and logic in maintaining the close links to the ARC's hazards management unit.

However, the Committee will ultimately need to consider where the EMO should reside. It makes sense for the costs of the EMO to be ring fenced to make any movement of it more transparent.

B.2.5 SUMMARY

New emergency management legislation will require all the councils within a region to participate in a Joint Committee that will provide governance to new civil defence emergency management groups.

Some councils in the region, including the ARC, do not hold the joint committee approach to be the most desirable and effective means of establishing the governance committee, as it is perceived to offer less than satisfactory accountabilities.

The ARC is willing to continue to house the EMO and to make available its administrative systems to support EMO operations, but may only contribute an equitable share of EMO costs rather than assuming sole funding responsibility.

As the ARC is not obliged to house the EMO, the potential exists for another partner organisation to act as host. However, there is a compelling argument for the EMO to remain domiciled with the ARC, which has statutory responsibility for servicing the governance committee and also undertaking natural hazards management assessment and mitigation planning.

If the CDEMG Committee recommends that the EMO should remain with the ARC, it will be necessary to also determine the manner in which the EMO and the activities it

AGENDA
8 FEBRUARY 2002
CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP COMMITTEE

coordinates are funded. CEG believes that a per-capita apportionment across the eight councils is the most equitable. The ARC could consider, if this arrangement was chosen, to establish the EMO as a separate unit with costs ring-fenced for transparency.

The issue of voting rights on the CDEMG Committee should also be resolved with permanency at this time, so that clarity can be provided in the administrative section of the new CDEM Plan which statutorily must record these arrangements. The practice of one vote per council has proved very satisfactory over the past three years, and is recommended by CEG.

It needs to be noted that while direction is required on these issues now for the CDEM Plan, the arrangements may not come into effect for some time. The timing will be determined by the passing of the new legislation, and also by the region's eight councils. Councils will have two years from the passing of the legislation to deal with these issues. In the meantime, the region can stick with the status quo for these arrangements if it so agrees.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the report be received.
- b) That the Committee's position on these issues, for inclusion in the Emergency Management draft be:
 - 1. That each council represented directly on the Joint Committee has one vote.
 - 2. That the EMO be domiciled within the ARC, and the ARC be asked to consider ring-fencing the EMO costs.
 - 3. That the basis of funding CDEMG Committee approved activities undertaken regionally is through the annual planning process of each council, with the ARC paying 16% of CDEMG activity costs and the balance by way of a per-capita levy on all other councils.
- c) That these resolutions be reported to each council, with the request that representatives be given direction on how to determine these issues at the May Committee meeting.

6 CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT - REGIONAL ISSUES

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report provides the Emergency Services Special Committee with a briefing on regional arrangements for civil defence and emergency management. It also provides the opportunity for the committee to provide guidance to Council's representative on the Auckland Region Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee in relation to a number of issues that are likely to arise in the next few months.

BACKGROUND

As committee members would be aware, successive governments have been working on a reorganisation of Civil Defence and Emergency Management arrangements nationally for a number of years. This work has resulted in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Bill, which is currently awaiting its third reading before the House.

The Bill has an impact on Civil Defence Emergency Management arrangements at all levels. The Bill provides for the establishment of Civil Defence Emergency Management Groups to operate at the regional level. These are seen as the main planning and administrative structures for civil defence and emergency management below national level. Under each regional grouping territorial authorities still have responsibilities in respect of local planning and response.

The legislation has been developed over a number of years. This has allowed local authorities to plan in advance for the new arrangements. In the Auckland region, the Auckland Regional Council and the seven Territorial Local Authorities have worked together to establish Civil Defence Emergency Management arrangements prior to the new legislation coming into effect. This has seen the establishment of an Auckland Region Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee under the auspices of the Auckland Regional Council and a number of regional initiatives undertaken. Generally, the regional structure has worked well, allowing for cooperation between Territorial Local Authorities and the Regional Council on a number of issues and initiatives, a regional approach to regional issues and a solid base for immediate operation when the new proposed legislation becomes law.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Civil Defence and Emergency Management are an integral part of Council's Eco City strategic direction. Outputs provided in the areas of civil defence and emergency management support objectives in the area of community well being and safety. Readiness, Response and Recovery initiatives provide for an efficient and effective response both by Council and by other emergency services should any significant emergency events affect the City. Reduction initiatives help reduce risks and hazards to the City and are linked to a wide range of Council operations and other activities in the City. For instance, the natural hazards provisions of the Proposed District Plan (among others) help reduce hazards that would likely contribute to or exacerbate Civil Defence events.

ISSUES

The proposed legislation will effect a number of changes to current and previous arrangements in Civil Defence and Emergency Management within the region. While significant progress has been made on establishing appropriate regional arrangements, a number of issues still require to be resolved among the seven Territorial Local Authority's and the Auckland Regional Council.

The principal forum for resolving these issues is the Auckland Region Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee. This committee is currently a committee of the Auckland Regional Council with one representative from each of the seven territorial local authorities, one from the Auckland Regional Council as well as representation from Police, Fire Service and the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management. Councillor Battersby is Council's representative on the committee, with Councillor Dallow serving as alternate.

The work programme of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group is supported in two ways. The Auckland Regional Council currently has, as part of its organization, an Emergency Management Office. This group supports, commissions and undertakes a number of regional emergency management projects as well as providing the principal reporting function to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group and the support function with respect to the Co-ordinating Executive Group. The Co-ordinating Executive Group is the other means by which the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group is supported. It comprises senior staff from each of the Territorial Local Authorities and the Regional Council, and representatives from the Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management and the Emergency Services. It co-ordinates the regional work with the individual work of each Territorial Local Authority and the Emergency Services, oversees the work of the emergency management office, and formulates advice to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group.

The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee is likely to be considering a number of issues over the forthcoming months, and this committee's guidance to Council's representative on these issues would be appropriate.

Form of Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee

As stated above, the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee is currently a committee of the Auckland Regional Council with the membership established to provide representation from the other territorial local authorities. This is appropriate under the provisions of the existing Civil Defence Act. The proposed new legislation currently provides for Civil Defence Emergency Management Group to be joint committees of the local authorities involved. This would mean that rather than the Auckland Regional Council being statutorily the lead agency, it would be an equal participant with the other local authorities. The legislation provides that the Regional Council would be the administering authority for a Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, but the scope of this role is not clearly defined.

The Auckland Regional Council has been opposed to this approach right through the development of the legislation, and are now signalling that should the legislation be enacted in its current form they will withdraw much of their funding and work programme in support of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group (i.e. no longer fund the Emergency Management Office from regional rates) and take a very narrow interpretation of the administrative role (i.e. Committee Secretary type services only).

Waitakere City Council has always supported the concept of a joint committee. This view is based on the notion that role or service in question should be carried out by the body most appropriate to do so, based on whether it is regional or local in scope, the nature of the role, and who it impacts or effects (and how). The role of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group envisaged in the new legislation appears to be focussed on regional governance and co-ordination for readiness, reduction, and response and recovery planning. This involves regional work undertaken by the Emergency Management Office, regional work undertaken by a number of authorities and organisations jointly, and co-ordination of regional work with that done by individual authorities and organisations. This governance role is one that involves and impacts on the regional council and the Territorial Local Authorities jointly. The co-ordination role also requires joint input. On this basis a joint committee structure can be viewed as most appropriate.

In terms of the management and funding of the Emergency Management Office, Waitakere's view has been based on the same principle – that role or service in question should be carried out by the body most appropriate to do so, based on whether it is regional or local in scope, the nature of the role, and who it impacts or effects (and how). The Emergency Management Officer role is principally around conducting regional work either directly or by commissioning for the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group. The work is regionally focused, which would seem to suggest it is best undertaken by one organisation. The co-ordination role at this management level is carried out by the Chief Executive. On this basis the Regional Council seems the most appropriate body to undertake the function, with the regional ratepayer the most appropriate funder.

The Committee's direction on this issue is sought. The Auckland Regional Council does not appear to be persuaded by this Council's reasoning and would seemingly like a late change to the legislation at its third reading to provide for a Committee of the Regional Council to be the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group. Staff from the Auckland Regional Council have indicated that their Council may feel that they should only fund activities for which they have decision making authority. Were there a joint committee structure in place they may be inclined to only fund a share of the cost (alongside the Territorial Local Authorities). The Committee may wish to take account of the possible significant reduction of Auckland Regional Council funding and resourcing for regional emergency management work programmes should the legislation be enacted as currently proposed with its associated increased demands on Territorial Local Authorities for funding. Given Auckland Regional Council priorities for spending in other areas such as transport there is unlikely to be any reduction in the Auckland Regional Council levy should emergency management funding be reduced.

The committee may wish to reconsider Council's position on this basis. Alternatively, the committee might wish to confirm Council's existing position that it supports the joint committee structure but also sees as necessary continued Auckland Regional Council funding and resourcing of the regional emergency management work programme.

Number and Location of Emergency Operation Centres

One issue that has been discussed at length through the Co-ordinating Executive Group is the number and location of emergency operation centres in the region. The Auckland region Civil Defence Emergency Management Group has been developed based on three response zones, Northwest (incorporating North Shore, Rodney and Waitakere), Central (comprising Auckland City), and Southern (comprising Manukau, Papakura and Franklin). Original proposals from the region saw one Emergency Operation Centre within each response zone, and proposed to not recognise Waitakere's Emergency Operation Centre as one of the regional facilities.

Council's position at that time was that this was unacceptable given the size of the north-west zone and the Council's own responsibilities, and staff have worked with colleagues from around the region to change this approach. The position that has now been reached is that there will be three response zones, but four regionally recognised Emergency Operations Centres with two within the Northwest zone (being Waitakere and North Shore). While this position has been agreed at officer level, it is yet to be formally ratified by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee and it is appropriate for this committee to reaffirm the position taken by the previous Council. Council's alternative position was to push for four response zones, with separate northern and western zones, each with their own Emergency Operations Centre.

Subsequent work has seen regional agreement on Auckland City being the lead Emergency Operations Centre for hosting the regional Group Emergency Operations Centre (for region wide response activity), with each of the other three Emergency Operations Centres (Manukau, North Shore and Waitakere) being equipped to provide an alternative location.

The Committee's confirmation of this position is sought.

CONCLUSION

The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group is working through a number of issues in relation to regional arrangements for civil defence emergency management in preparation for the passage of the proposed legislation. The Committee's views on some of the key issues are sought, in order to provide direction for Council's representative.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That the Emergency Services Special Committee confirm Council's position in respect of the following issues:
 - Structure and status of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group
 - Location and funding of the regional work programme for Civil Defence Emergency Management
 - Number of Response Zones and Emergency Operations Centres in the Auckland Region Civil Defence Emergency Management Group.

Report prepared by: Ross McLeod, Director: Corporate and Civic Services.

