

Attachment Two - Local Board Resolutions

September 2016

The following are resolutions and/or feedback provided by this local board to inform the Request for Proposal document.

Great Barrier and Waiheke (joint feedback)

Community Facilities Maintenance Contracts 2017

Resolution number GBI/2016/149

MOVED by Chairperson IM Fordham, seconded by Member CA Spence:

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) delegate authority to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson, in discussion with other board members, to provide the board's feedback on the proposed service specifications, local outcomes and the overall structure for new Community Facilities maintenance contracts by 23 September 2016.

CARRIED

Community Facilities Maintenance Contracts 2017

Resolution number WHK/2016/185

MOVED by Chairperson PA Walden, seconded by Member S Brown:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) delegate authority to the Chair and Deputy Chair to provide the board's feedback on the proposed service specifications, local outcomes and the overall structure for new Community Facilities maintenance contracts, and report back to the 22 September 2016 board meeting.

CARRIED

Community Facilities Maintenance Contracts - Feedback from the Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards

Introduction

The following feedback from the Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Board chairs is provided under delegation from both Boards and has been prepared in discussion with other board members. Our two boards have prepared this joint feedback as both have issues, concerns and aspirations in common.

We commend officers for providing local boards with the opportunity to provide feedback into proposed contract structures. We see this as an excellent first step and would like this open relationship to continue. While we accept that in terms of the Auckland Council model local boards do not have a specific role in contracts per se, we see such a relationship as critical for the success of future contracts, particularly as both our boards are very involved in what happens locally and generally understand our communities well.

Support for a dedicated delivery model for the Hauraki Gulf Islands

The Waiheke and Great Barrier Local Boards both strongly support the officer's option for a Hauraki Gulf Islands specific contract model. We are pleased to see recognition of the differences between our communities and many of those on the mainland, and don't want to be "lumped in" with mainland approaches.

Our reasons for supporting this approach are:

- It creates the sense of "ownership" of what's happening contract wise in our communities, something both boards have been seeking for six years
- It maximises opportunities and chances for local contractors to successfully obtain contracts which is something our contractors have also been telling us they have trouble achieving
- It enables people who live and work in our communities, and who understand them, to have a greater say in how our community facilities are managed. We expect this will create greater pride and ownership in the work and consequently better standards
- It provides more local high-value employment and greater economic development opportunities for these local providers and our local communities
- It improves community capacity and resilience and strengthens developing industries
- It enables up skilling for local providers e.g. Health & Safety, understanding of council systems and processes etc
- It enhances local capacity that can be relied on to respond in an emergency
- It supports training, apprenticeships and skills development

Support for direct local contract management

We also support having a local contract manager who reports directly to Community Facilities, managing contracts for each of our islands, and based locally. Being based in these communities' builds knowledge, connections and buy in" to these communities. It may be that either or both positions are part time, depending on the workload.

This could be either an officer/contract manager or a community trust, or both, depending on what the situation is and what might work best and we would like to further explore mechanisms around these further with Community Facilities.

This is consistent with the Empowered Communities Approach council is embarking on. Both boards have some experience of the challenges this approach presents for council and are happy to assist officers in making this workable.

The key in both cases is that these are local.

Removal of the "middle man" i.e. a subcontractor which then employs local contractors is seen as essential for this approach to work smoothly.

We recognise that in some cases local contractors are currently unable for a variety of reasons to obtain contracts and would see the local agent as having a key role in providing support and assistance to contractors to work through council's service methodology, administration processes, health and safety requirements etc. It is these processes, such as procurement, health and safety etc that have tripped some of our contractors up in the past and discourages them from seeking contracts.

We thank Council for leading on local procurement discussions for our contractors and we believe this has given both Council staff and island contractors a better understanding and insight into each-others needs and perspectives.

We would like Community Facilities to further consider options for the HGI City Parks contract(s) to be either opened up to local contractors, or if this is already partly the case, further opportunities being investigated. We have been provided with information that suggests that the majority of the total community facilities maintenance opex budget is allocated to the City Parks contract and we consider it appropriate that this contract is in the mix. It may be that there is good reason for much of this to stay in that arena, or there may not and we would support a different timetable or staging approach if needed to achieve this. As a principle we wish to see City Parks contract work, where possible and practicable, included in the above approach.

The approach we have signalled above supports the Local Community element of Council proposed Smart Procurement approach, which we support in this regard.

Service specifications

We are not sure that all the baseline or enhanced service levels that apply on the mainland are either necessary or right for our island communities, and would like to discuss these further. For example the frequency and height of berm mowing in urban Auckland may not be necessary in our villages and we would like to understand the implications and opportunities to set levels that work best for us.

Equally there may be enhanced levels that need to be tailored to our needs. For example, Waiheke during the summer visitor season needs service levels around toilets and rubbish bins that are higher than many mainland suburban Auckland levels.

Regardless, standard service levels must be of a quality our communities expect; if standards differ, it should be because our boards agree this is appropriate.

Contracts should be designed to allow for enough flexibility to accommodate minor changes to levels of service without the need for this to require locally driven initiative funding.

We also request that contracts for our islands have sufficient flexibility to enable core community values to be accommodated; in particular:

- Herbicide free weed management methods. It is critical that our communities strongly held views on this matter be accommodated. We would like to work with Community Facilities to understand the particular challenges, opportunities and alternatives that could be available to achieve a “win win”
- Volunteering. Our islands have a strong history and philosophy of community led action and we wish to ensure that where appropriate or sought, contracts have the ability to involve community groups and individuals where this makes sense. We realise this presents real challenges for Council but would like to explore opportunities which make sense, add value and are workable

Reporting, advice and ongoing support

We are sure that the above approaches can work and will work well if Community Facilities officers commit to working with our boards and our local board services support teams. This will require meaningful and genuine engagement, reporting and advice via workshops, local board quarterly reports and during the annual planning process. The better informed we are, the better able we will be to assist with quality outcomes for our communities.

Paul Walden and Izzy Fordham

22 September 2016