

Report of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Meeting 25.5.17

5-9pm at Mungavin Hall, Porirua

Summary

Contents

Overview	1
Meeting notes	2
Session 2 – Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua timeline update	2
Session 3 - Policy in Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua	3
Session 4: Wellington Water’s network improvement strategy	6
Session 5 – Regular update on conversations.....	7
Session 6 - Modelling & Analysis update	7
Session 6 – Any other Business	8
Appendix 1: “bucket” ideas mapped onto the policy package framework.....	10
Appendix 2 – breakout groups’ strengths and weaknesses of existing policy approach & preferred ideas	12

Overview

**Workshop/
meeting
Attendees** **Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee:**
Barbara, Dale, Diane, David, Jennie, Larissa, John G, John M, Richard, Sharli-Jo,
Stu (Chair), Warrick
Welcome: Hikitia Ropata

Project Team:
Alastair (Project Manager), Brent, Grace, Hayley, Jon, Kara, Keith, Murray,
Nicci, Suze

Facilitator: Isabella

Visitors:
Ned Norton, Land Water People Ltd
Steve Hutchison, Wellington Water Limited
Stewart McKenzie, Wellington Water Limited

Members of the Public:
Jenny Brash
Kate Pascall (WCC)

Meeting purpose The purposes of this meeting were to:

1. To build a sound base of understanding about Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua policy context as relevant to Committee’s work
2. To set the stage for upcoming policy work
3. To hear about and understand the implications of Wellington Water’s new strategic approach in the whaitua, and give feedback

The purposes were achieved.

Committee Decisions and actions to do

Committee Decisions This meeting did not involve any decisions by Committee

Actions:

- Project team send out:
 - Tech Team Minutes document
 - Jennie’s comments on consensus decision-making document
 - date for the next Tech Team meeting.
- Project Team ask WWL for updated wastewater overflows map which shows overflows “live” versus fixed
- Committee: send any comments on the consensus decision-making document to Suze by the next meeting.

Meeting notes

After the karakia, Stu welcomed the visitors and members of the public. He expressed his regret at missing the last meeting, and shared some tidbits from the Stormwater Conference before starting off the meeting.

Session 2 – Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua timeline update

(Alastair Smaill, GWRC)

Alastair spoke to the updated Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua timeline, which will be attached to all future agendas and kept updated.

Points to note from his run-through and the brief discussion:

- The CMP will not do their substantive reporting until July, though there may be some minor reporting before then. Note we can’t identify draft objectives without the information from the scenario modelling.
- Timing is tight to deliver the WIP by the end of the year, but we’ll get there (failure is not an option).
- GWRC are about to start a study of the whaitua process, which will be looking at what can be learnt and what can be done better. Consultants will be running interviews and workshops, expected to start in June, and they will contact this Committee so there will be opportunities to feed in.

Session 3 - Policy in Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua

(Hayley Vujcich, GWRC)

See presentation [Parts of a Policy Package](#) and the [Management & Policy Options not tested in scenarios](#) on Whaitua Committee webpage.

Session purposes:

- To develop our understanding of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua policy context as relevant to our task, setting us up for starting the process of identifying our policy preferences.

This was a two-part session, where each presentation was followed by Committee activity.

Please refer to Hayley's presentation – slides 1-7

The presentation took Committee through the following processes:

- Re-familiarise ourselves with the policy package framework (noting a broad interpretation of what 'policy' means – anything we can do)
- Revisit the key policy context for managing land and water: the RMA context, the LGA context, and Ngāti Toa Rangatira Claims Settlement Act and other mana whenua-related context

Following this part of the presentation, Committee then did a brief exercise to strengthen understanding of the policy framework.

People took ideas that had been generated over the last 18 months but which couldn't be incorporated in scenario modelling (the "Bucket document"), and placed these on the policy framework where they thought most appropriate.

Appendix 1 has photos of the wall with the "bucket" ideas mapped onto the framework.

- There was lots of conversation about where ideas sat in the vertical layers of the framework (e.g. from objective down to specific policy actions).
- There was also lots of conversation about what kind of policy tool could be used to achieve the behaviour change people had in mind when they came up with the idea. (In some cases it wasn't clear what someone had been aiming at, so we used a best guess.)
- There was an obvious skew in where policy ideas were put, with most being placed under the "regulation" tool. There was lively debate about this, with people noting that:
 - Regulation seems the most straightforward method to implement many policy types
 - This may be due to our perspective (a GWRC initiative working drawing its power from the RMA)
 - Leaving everything up to a rules-based, "thou shalt" approach will not work (not least because we cannot resource the corollary enforcement)
 - Practices can be placed in many of the boxes, indicating that there's many ways of delivering on a policy position. This requires some better explanation in the next policy package discussion.
- There's still some understanding to develop about the way institutional (and other) players in a catchment can / do / should exercise different powers.

The second part of the presentation involved a brief presentation by Hayley to familiarise Committee with the policy tools available, and the current “settings” these tools are at in our whitua. Please see slides 8-16.

Following this, Committee broke into two groups with the Project Team, for a free-range discussion with people who have operational experience designing and implementing policy in local government.

The aim was:

1. To inform Committee on the real-world strengths and weaknesses of current policy settings and the policy context, and
2. Start to identify some areas that Committee thinks are priorities for attention as we start to create the draft policy preferences for the whitua.

The groups spent close to 35 minutes in lively discussion, with a quick sharing of the outputs before dinner. Key themes from the discussion included:

- Legacy**
- There was a theme of discussion around how we have got to the stage where untreated stormwater discharge in Porirua is happening as a permitted / not controlled activity.
 - Decisions made in previous decades – including 20 years ago – where it was decided that this was acceptable practice.
 - Other elements of the legacy include decisions not to fund monitoring / maintenance / upgrade of wastewater infrastructure to a level that would mean less than ~12 overflows / year
 - Regulatory regime is lopsided in Wellington: there’s a clear limits and allocation regime for water quantity but a real gap around water quality, with no limits in a regional plan.
- Legislation & policy: approaches & interactions between**
- There were observations that a lot of our regulation is activity based (managing inputs) or effects based (managing outputs) rather than outcome based, which can mean the big picture deteriorates
 - Alastair explained that because of lack of water quality rules in the regional plan the main regulatory tools are often based on individual activities – instead of saying “this is the outcome we want” and making strategy & policy (including rules) to achieve that.
 - Risky or priority activities might need both outcome management and input / effects management, via rules and other tools. E.g. saying This is what you need to achieve and if there is risk this won’t be reached you may need regulation as well
 - An example of an instrument under Ngati Toa Settlement Act could be the creation of a Poutiaki Plan for significant coastal areas to mana whenua – Plimmerton across Cook Strait (whole maritime rohe). This would be similar to

an iwi management plan and, once written, need to be considered in RMA planning processes.

- The law says that a District Plan can't be inconsistent with the Regional Plan, but DPs often are in reality. This is where a really well-written WIP won't do much good without the relationships being right with TAs and WWL – and those organisations wanting to make it real.

Committee's task

- There was a question about whether Committee's recommendations shouldn't be in the district plans as well, noting the potential for loss in translation and intent being weakened/lost through loose interpretation as they go down the diagram (slide 9).
- Alastair clarified that Committee's job is to work on the regional plan. You can make suggestions to the TAs about what they might want to put in the District Plans, but can't go any further than this. District plans can't be inconsistent with the Regional plan, and so the WIP will inevitably influence the district plan.
- WWL's Asset Planning – is there a new approach here too?
- This is a different type of instrument but the impacts of the management and operation of those assets (e.g. stormwater network, wastewater network) must still be in accordance with the RMA and Regional Plan. Asset management planning articulates where and how TAs have agreed money will be spent, and, more strategically, can link up short and long term asset planning with natural resource objectives.
- Committee's job is to work on the regional plan and get the text that will be in it on Porirua water quality – the WIP – as good as possible.
- There were several observations on the theme of the need for it to be unambiguous between regional and local levels – so reduce wriggle room to get it wrong.
- Alastair stated that objectives need to be specific and there must be line of sight between objectives, limits, policy tools and settings. Objectives and limits must be detailed – how much better do we want water quality to be, where and what?

Additional comments & next steps

- There were additional comments from Committee members, noting that one of the tools we often don't use is a good evidence base – this is missing from this chart (policy tools). Evidence enables telling of good stories about water quality. Also enables transparency in why we picked something to do and not something else.
- Alastair and Hayley acknowledged the complexity of the material, and the fact that we will be building on each meeting's content means Committee need a basic grasp of the main concepts. The Project Team is happy to support anyone from Committee who would like it – Alastair offered one-on-one tutorials, phonecalls anytime, or small group support.

- The next step is Project Team taking the material from tonight’s breakout groups and developing a policy package “straw man”. This will incorporate different policy options and potentially several policy approaches. Committee can kick around / pull apart the straw man at the next TAOPWC meeting

Photos of the two groups’ outputs are at Appendix 2.

The Project Team will take this material to inform a policy package ‘strawman’ to discuss at the next TAOPWC meeting.

Introducing: Hikitia Ropata

During this session the Committee was able to meet the new TAOPWC member, Hikitia Ropata representing Te Upoko Taiao. (Hikitia had had a prior commitment til 6pm). She introduced herself and expressed her pleasure at being part of the Committee.

Session 4: Wellington Water’s network improvement strategy

(Steve Hutchison - Chief Advisor, Wastewater. Wellington Water Ltd, and Stewart McKenzie – Principal Advisor - Consenting and Environment WWL)

Session purposes:

- To hear about and understand the implications of Wellington Water’s new strategic approach in the whitua, and give feedback.

Steve and Stewart spoke in turn, with questions from Committee during and after each presentation. Refer to the presentation on the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whitua webpage.

- **Steve Hutchison** refreshed Committee on the status quo of wastewater infrastructure in the whitua, including the current weaknesses in the system and current rate of overflows, which WWL sees as unacceptable.
- He also noted that WWL’s wastewater consent expires in 2020 and the current system performance is not able to be consented.
- He then talked through the four options that WWL has been considering in its planning work, for reducing the number of overflows from around 12 per year to 2.
- There were questions from Committee and project team about the components of the different options, how they would work in practice, the return on effort from addressing issues “upstream” vs “downstream”, and the potential for zero-infiltration / zero leakage from new subdivisions.
- **Stewart Mackenzie** spoke to the change in WWL’s wastewater master planning which is now broadened beyond being a strictly technical exercise to proceed in tandem with the consenting work.
- He spoke to the challenges for water quality from decisions outside WWL’s control. These included:
 - councils’ permissiveness of lower-quality wastewater and storm water provision in new subdivisions
 - traditionally low development contributions in Wellington region
 - lining up regulatory measures into clear direction, to maximise the return on investment.
- There were questions from Committee and project team about the potential for funding the various options, the penalties for WWL breaching its wastewater

consent, and whether good-practice techniques for storm water management were being used in greenfield developments.

- Stewart expressed his and WWL's desire to work closely with the whitua projects as an important vehicle for making infrastructure planning, funding, and consenting more strategic and better contributing to well-managed catchments.
- Alastair commented that Committee need to think across the spectrum of times from short term, medium term (30years), to long term (80-100 years): what environmental outcomes or gains can be made across those timeframes?
- The funding regimes can then be made to spread across time. The longer you spread payment out, the greater flexibility and greater ability to fund it.
- The Chair thanked the presenters and gave special thanks to Steve for leading the recent fieldtrip to the Wastewater Treatment Plant – much appreciated by Committee members.

Session 5 – Regular update on conversations

Alastair - ongoing GWRC engagements with TAs:

- GWRC managers are meeting with PCC planning staff next week to discuss how processes can be aligned, particularly in relation to the PCC district plan review
- A useful workshop was held recently at PCC on district planning
- A series of engagements is being planned with GW, WWL and the TA partners, aiming to start to shift institutional culture and enable staff to support the whitua process. Seminars, workshops and “brown bag” (bring your lunch) sessions with all partner organisations at a staff level.
- First steps: highlighting the existence of the whitua process, having real policy conversations about its implications for people's work.

Jon - Restoration Day:

- was successful. Used Ki Uta ki Tai / Mountains to Sea videos, collected names and email addresses of interested people
- Many of these said they were interested across all three whitua programmes (including Chair of Forest & Bird Hutt Valley).

Sharli – Ngati Toa put on an historical bus tour as part of Restoration Day. Included information on rongoa (traditional plant-based medicine).

Richard – PF Olsen sustainability auditing:

- during April, PF Olsen underwent a 5-day audit to see if our metric would meet international metric.
- Have been recommended for certification for good cultural, social, environmental sustainability – only one in NZ!

Session 6 - Modelling & Analysis update

(John McKoy, Tech Team, plus Ned Norton, LWP)

Tech team has met once. Idea was to:

1. go through narrative scenarios and how modellers were defining them to make it possible to do their job and
2. discuss key assumptions they needed to make.

Key assumptions are:

- Sprawl and Compact urban footprints – used to try out the water sensitivity practices; density amount; various practices. Taking a very practical approach here
- Population growth rates
- Timing of certain developments
- Climate change – key point – tricky to deal with it straight up – so going to use current projections for now
- Low zinc roofs
- Numbers associated with these things
- Nature and extent of riparian planting

Modellers had questions for the Tech Team about these and how they're dealing with them. The Team provided some input and there are 1 or 2 things they'll follow up on.

Overall the Tech Team are pretty happy. Hayley wrote very good minutes which are recommended reading.

There was an additional comment that some issues have been highlighted that Committee / PT need to keep a weather eye on.

- For locations for infill, those in the WCC area appear as small spots as they are based on detailed housing capacity modelling that WCC has undertaken. By contrast the PCC identified infill areas are large. This is a result of a lack of demand modelling by PCC so village nodes picked as best guess locations – this also reflects work done by PCC in 2009 identifying possible infill areas. Modelled infill will reflect the population projections, which are low so likely densities to be modelled in the PCC infill locations will not be great.
- A concern that population growth stats are low given people's perception of recent growth seeming higher than what is anticipated by the modelling. PT noted that the modelling uses population projections from ForecastID (which is based on StatsNZ data) and that these are the agreed providers for all Tas and GWRC, so is a consistently and widely used dataset.

Ned commented that Committee should consider, as a topic for future meeting, how to incorporate Wellington Water work.

- Of six scenarios getting up and running, all are about testing different amount of density and different levels of practice (UD and Rural and SW).
- As Committee know, WWL's options (as described by Steve & Stewart tonight) are not incorporated - we haven't talked about scenarios that explore treatment plant and other WWL infrastructure options.

Session 6 – Any other Business

- The Chair thanked John G and John M for putting their hands up to chair last meeting at short notice when Barbara was detained by bus tendering. Apologies on behalf of the Project Team for the "John's chairing" confusion.
- Sharli reminded people that it is International Plastic Bag Free Day on July 3 (Saturday)

- Suze called for any further edits to the consensus decision-making document, noting that Jennie was the only member to have sent comments and that Committee need this document to be workable for the imminent consensus decisions.
- Committee requested that PT resend
 - Tech Team Minutes document
 - Jennie comments on consensus decision-making document
 - the date for the next Tech Team meeting.

The Chair thanked the presenters.

Hikitia concluded the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 9pm.

**The next meeting of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee is 15th June, 5 – 9pm,
Pātaka Art + Museum**

Appendix 1: “bucket” ideas mapped onto the policy package framework





