Pros & Cons of Opting IN to FOSAL

4 June 2024

Pros		Cons	
1.	Central Government will contribute half of the costs of Category 3 buyouts.	1.	Council must establish & fund a team to administrate the FOSAL Programme.
2.	Long-term savings as managed retreat will cost more in the future.	2.	 Council must pay an equal portion of the cost of buyouts with Central Government. Some cost is met by insurance & the property owner.
3.	lwi & Hapu can access recovery funding.		
4.	Proactive district assessment of exposure & vulnerability to risk prior to next extreme weather event.	3.	Large initial outlay may not identify any affected properties.
5.	Intolerable risk to human life from extreme weather events is identified.	4.	The extent of property affected is unknown therefore extent of funding is unknown.
6.	Councils' reputation is enhanced.	5.	Research may identify numerous
7.	Avoids risk of legal liability following future events.		Category 3 properties & Council may be unable to afford the buyouts.
8.	Informs land use planning, guides investment, reduces exposure of	6.	Council is responsible for demolition & removal costs.
9.	infrastructure including roads. Assists pre-event planning (Readiness) and informs decisions and investments in Civil Defence.	7.	Council may need to rely on funding from NRC on community level interventions. For example, flood protection works.
10.	Removes people from harm's way.	8.	lwi & Hapu may reject Council involvement in Whenua Māori.
11.	Proactive resilience building (Readiness) in at risk communities (Category 2P &	9.	Council may be unable to opt-out once it opts-in.
12.	2C). Reduction of risk to well beings (social,	10.	Affected owners may decline to opt-in to the voluntary buyouts.
	cultural, economic & environmental).	11.	Displacement of communities, disrupting social networks, cultural ties, and local identities.
13.	Building of social capital with communities.		
		12.	Could reinforce socio-economic disparities.

Pros & Cons of Opting <u>OUT</u> of FOSAL

5 June 2024

Pros		Cons	
1.	Council does not need to fund the establishment of a FOSAL Programme.	1.	No funding support from Central Government for voluntary retreat.
2.	There is no financial impact on the LTP.	2.	lwi & Hapu are unable to access recovery
3.	Avoids immediate substantial expenses associated with relocating communities and infrastructure.	3.	funding. The costs of managed retreat will be more expensive in the future due to rising costs.
4.	Preserves existing social networks, cultural ties, and community identities.	4.	assessment of the district prior to next extreme weather event. 5. Unplanned retreat may occur causing
5.	Protects the investments people have made in their homes and properties.	ties. 5.	
6.	Bypasses the significant political, legal, and social resistance. Avoids the immediate complexities of planning and implementing voluntary retreat.	6.	maladaptation. Council has no visibility on at risk property in the district.
7.		7.	Future harm to residents from severe weather events.
		8.	Potential for future liability from negligence.
		9.	Loss of reputational standing.
		10.	Repeated and possibly severe damage to infrastructure and homes, increasing the burden on individuals and communities.
		11.	Ongoing expenditure on repairs, emergency responses, and disaster recovery.
		12.	Rising insurance premiums or loss of coverage.
		13.	Vulnerable and low-income populations may suffer more severely from repeated disasters.