

Notes of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Meeting 15.9.16

5-9pm at Plimmerton Boating Club

Summary

Contents

- Attendees
- Purposes
- Actions & general business to do

Meeting notes 2

 Session 1 2

 Session 2 Scenarios 2

 Session 3 Communications update 5

 Session 4 Engagement Options..... 6

 Session 5 Values & Attributes and CMP Working Groups – report back..... 8

 Session 6 – Rural Issues Working Group report-back..... 9

 Session 7 - Urban Development working group report-back..... 10

 Session 8 - Stormwater and Wastewater working group report-back 10

 Session 9 - annual report of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Harbour & Catchment
 Strategy & Action Plan..... 11

Workshop **Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee:**

Attendees Barbara, Bronwyn, Diane, Jennie, Larissa, John G, John M, Naomi, Richard, Sharli-Jo, Stu (Chair), Warrick

Apologies: David Lee

Project Team:

Alastair (Project Manager), Hayley, Isabella, Jon, Jonathan, Keith, Murray, Shelley, Tracey

Members of the Public: V. Turner, resident of Mana

Workshop The purposes of this workshop were to:

- purposes**
1. To deepen understanding of scenarios and their purpose
 2. To understand the basics of 'Business as usual' (BAU) scenario 1
 3. To agree on the approach and way forward for community engagement
 4. To make a decision about attributes for Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health
 5. To get up to date on working groups' progress

The purposes were achieved.

Actions and general business to do

- Communications** *By Oct 6 Committee meeting*
- Tracey: send list of newsletter recipients to Committee
 - Tracey: draft letters for schools, with link to the Ki Uta ki Tai video to Sharli
 - Sharli: send schools' contacts to Tracey
 - John G send Whitby Newsbrief and Plimmerton Residents' Association contacts to Tracey
- Values: *by Oct 6 Committee meeting*
- Tracey, Jon reconsider publicising whaitua values, incl. role of animation, bring proposal to Committee
 - Sheryl clarify "cultural" wording in economic value description, inform Committee
 - Raewyn, Sheryl clarify Ngāti Toa values wording, inform Committee
- Engagement** *By end September / first week October*
- Jon/Tracey: send Committee a list of public events that could lift whaitua awareness
 - Committee: add to list and indicate interest in attending events
 - Jon: prepare suggested engagement purposes and criteria for selecting stakeholders, take to working groups.
 - Working groups: discuss stakeholders to potentially engage with.
- Attributes for Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health** *By Oct 6 Committee meeting*
- Project team: update attributes list with:
 - Acronyms expanded and more explanatory text
 - Modelling Leadership Group advice on including attribute for stream low flows
 - CMP WG: inform Committee about
 - attributes' application to open coastal waters as well as to harbour waters (and clarifying wording accordingly)
 - boundary between "fresh" and "salt" water environments, and which environment (and attributes) is assumed to dominate in brackish water

Meeting notes

Session 1

Stu welcomed everyone including public.

Session 2 Scenarios

(Alastair Smill, GWRC)

See presentation, plus handout on High-level Objectives, on Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee webpage <http://www.qw.govt.nz/presentations-and-reports-2/>

Session purposes:

1. To deepen understanding of scenarios and their purpose
2. To build understanding of the basics of 'Business as usual' (BAU) scenario 1

Please refer to the presentation for the substance of this session.

Clarification questions were asked and answered throughout, and some discussion followed. Key points from this are below, with slide numbers indicating the relevant slide.

Role and contribution of scenarios

- Management options in scenarios are things we will do in the catchment to improve the state of water.
- Several scenarios are needed because we will want to test many different management options
- Scenarios shed light on the consequences of doing particular management options – something that is often contentious (strong but uninformed opinions about an option’s merits)
- Scenarios are the only way we can get insight into the future for the whole catchment (pilots can do this but are limited in scale and scope)
- Scenarios help our understanding of the whole catchment’s systems: economic, environmental, social.
- The alternative to modelling a range of scenarios is to guess at the “best” package of management options and model just that package.
 - This approach is used in other areas but is often disappointing: typically people realise their management option package won’t achieve their desired future, and then they need to re-run the whole model with more choices. This is very expensive and slow.

Sequence of work

1. The Collaborative Modelling Project (CMP) and Modelling Leadership Group (MLG) are now doing modelling of the catchment’s status quo to build Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua models.
 2. The BAU scenario is being created; Greater Wellington will provide the information about the catchment’s current trajectory and assumptions (e.g. level of compliance with rules).
 3. Committee are now starting to create scenarios (see slide 5), which will be completed at the end of the year and given to the modellers
 4. Supporting working groups will be expert advice on what management options will actually make a difference to water in real life (the green box on slide 9’s diagram).
 5. It is also important that Committee are sufficiently aspirational for the gold effort scenario.
 6. These scenarios will start being run through the models in early 2017
 7. The results will trickle back to Committee over six months
 - a. Eventually all the results (the predicted impacts on the catchment of the Committee’s different scenarios) will be before the Committee
 8. Committee will make informed comparisons (see Slide 4), in a state of much reduced uncertainty compared to now – but still with significant uncertainty.
 9. After this is a discussion about how to get greatest efficiency and effectiveness in the policies that get management options applied on the ground.
- Committee members noted that the diagram of the sequence on slide 9 starts at the left and then goes right to left which feels unintuitive
 - It starts with a future (outcomes, which Committee have started to define with high-level objectives)
 - Then modelling starts at the right-hand side of the picture and proceeds towards the future.

Scenarios, outcomes, and the WIP

- See slide 7 (Freshwater outcomes vs scenarios)
- Gold / Silver / Bronze refer to the level of effort we put into managing land and water.
 - For example, a gold-effort scenario would involve
 - lots of management

- aiming for lots of improvement in water
 - lots of cost
- Silver would be less of all these things; bronze less again.
- The gold scenario really needs to “go for gold”: we must model the extreme end of improvement and effort otherwise the whole spectrum of results will be under-informed.
- The BAU scenario (we maintain the current trajectory of activity and effort in land / water management) is highly unlikely to be good enough for the whitua, but is useful to compare against
- The final mix of management options the Committee select to go in the Whitua Implementation Programme (WIP) will come from several different scenarios; it’s almost guaranteed that no scenario will go in its entirety into the WIP.
- The models will not be finished after the WIP is completed. Models can continue to be run beyond the creation of the WIP: e.g. for the 10-year review of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region (NRP).

Risks

1. One risk is that at the end of this process the Committee will realise a worthy management option has been omitted.
 2. Another is that all scenarios end up clustered around a particular catchment outcome.
 3. A further risk is that there are dominant variables in the underpinning models whose influence overwhelms any changes that different management options could make.
- We must manage and mitigate these risks as they cannot be removed entirely.
 - Risk 1 can be mitigated by a thorough process to identify possible management options
 - Risk 2 can be mitigated by Committee selecting genuinely “gold” effort for the highest-improvement scenario. Appropriate transparency about Risk 3 can be mitigated by appropriate transparency about the foundational machinery of the underpinning models.

**BAU /
Scenario 1**

- Refer to slides 10 and 11.
- There were questions about what is being assumed in this scenario.
 - Assumptions include:
 - Current regulation
 - Current practices (e.g. land use practices)
 - Investment that is already planned and committed to will be spent
 - Assumptions in the BAU Scenario about greenfield developments e.g. Northern Growth Area (NGA) will therefore include:
 - development will use today’s quality of development practices
 - development will have a certain spatial distribution
 - development will happen at a certain pace (being a proportion of the population and household growth projected for Porirua)
 - We must assume the NGA will be developed in all scenarios: it won’t *not* happen at all. The difference between scenarios will be in the extent and quality and impact of the development.
 - Committee members observed that we can only make the best assumptions we can, and be very clear and transparent about them. Modelling is an inherently inexact science.

- Management options**
- Working groups will mainly do the work of creating a menu of management options that could be used in the catchment. They will be supported by experts.
 - There was discussion about management options that were less able to be modelled (because there is insufficient quantitative data about their effects, and also because management tools' impact is much harder to discern in urban catchments).
 - An example is [Take Charge](#); there is only anecdotal evidence of its impacts but it is quite obvious that it helps reduce pollution from a given source.
 - The menu of management options should include "less able to be modelled" options. They will be kept to one side – while they can't be used in a modelled scenario there may be other ways of analysing them (e.g. case studies and careful extrapolation)
 - Examples like this are likely to be something that the Committee definitely wants to put some policy around or otherwise mention in the WIP.
 - For any management option we will have to make assumptions about the extent and magnitude of change it will achieve in people's behaviour. The policy tools chosen to get the management option being used (such as regulation, incentives, education) will be influential here.
- Climate change**
- There was some discussion about the incorporation of climate change into scenarios.
 - A certain level of climate change will be assumed across all scenarios, and different intensities of it could be modelled as sub-scenarios.
 - GWRC has projections and parameters from NIWA for climate change impacts in the catchment.
 - They are based on yearly means, and the changing likelihood of different intensities of weather event (e.g. the frequency of what we traditionally call a "1 in 100-year flood")
 - Alastair noted that the projections go out to 2080, and after 2040 the changes start to be dramatic.
 - There were questions about whether the social impacts of climate change (e.g. a refugee influx) will be included.
 - These will be built into the assumptions controlling the variable in question – e.g. a spike in the population projected for Porirua could be caused by a variety of forces, and these impacts and their likelihood will be built in to the models.
- Outstanding questions**
- Members asked about the limitations of the modelling.
 - Besides the aforementioned importance of assumptions, and the ever-present uncertainty, another limitation of modelling is the relatively coarse 'grain' to which the models are limited in Porirua. It is simply not possible to model to a fine level of detail (e.g. property-specific)
 - Members asked about the quality of Wellington Water's data and projections as inputs to the scenarios.
 - Wellington Water (WW) are doing their best to gather as much data as quickly as possible, and the modelling will have the best available. WW's projected investment will also be a key input (see notes to Session 9 of this meeting).

Session purposes:

- Update the Committee on communications work, and opportunities for GWRC to support Committee

Tracey talked briefly through the activity around the latest newsletter, answered questions and invited suggestions from Committee members to expand the reach of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua material. Key points are below.

- GWRC has only one key contact for many of the community groups in the catchment – typically a group secretary or someone responsible for administration / communication, who is expected to forward the newsletter on to the group’s members.
- Other recipients are the approximately 200 people whose emails were captured at engagement events.
- A list of recipients supplied by committee members has been requested and sent to Committee.
- There was discussion about who else should receive the newsletter, and potentially get more than just the newsletter (e.g. a tailored snippet with a link to the full newsletter, or even a visit with Committee members and / or various videos).
- Committee agreed that high schools were a good opportunity, noting several schools’ involvement with harbour clean-ups and so on.
- Sharli will send her list of school contacts to Tracey; Tracey will draft letters containing a link to the the Ki Uta ki Tai videoto Sharli
- Residents’ associations and the Whitby Newsbrief were also suggested channels. John G will send contacts for the Whitby Newsbrief and Plimmerton Residents’ Association to Tracey.

Session 4 Engagement Options

(Jon Gabites, GWRC)

Session purposes:

- Committee agree on the approach and way forward for community engagement

- Animated values: Committee animated**
- Jon showed an animated version of the values poster that GWRC Communications had created as a tool principally for social media (where videos are by far the most popular way to communicate lots of information).
 - The audience was anyone in the whaitua who uses social media (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn etc), and its job was to hook people with something appealing in social media and send them off to (e.g.) the whaitua webpage to find out more.
 - The video was a first cut and the Communications team were asking for Committee feedback.
 - Overall the animated video did not appeal to Committee members.
 - Key points included
 - The “anywhere” / non-Porirua nature of the landscape and waterscape
 - Follow-up: later in the evening, Committee firmly preferred the aerial photo of the harbour arms from the cover of the Harbour & Catchment Strategy & Action Plan’s annual report.
 - Not happy with the traditional waka
 - The speed of the text appearing and disappearing was too fast
 - The lack of any quintessentially Porirua water activities (waka ama, swimming, fishing, sailing etc)
 - The fact that the animation had no more values text than the poster
 - The consensus was to go back to the drawing board, and reconsider:
 - A video’s contribution to communicating the whaitua values
- The Committee’s critiques for the look & feel, and content
- Values text**
- There was some confusion about the status of some language in the values descriptions.
 - The presence of ‘culture’ was questioned in the economic value description. The Project Team will clarify the progeny of this language for Committee.
 - There was some confusion about changes to the mana whenua value and its description
 - The Project Team and Ngāti Toa will clarify this for Committee.
- Values awareness: work in progress**
- The values are a key element of the whaitua process and Jon is working on a marketing campaign to raise the public’s awareness of this milestone.
 - The opportunity of large public events (e.g. the Cockle Count, Pauatahanui School’s Lamb & Calf Day, the Duck Race) and Committee members were agreed that a whaitua committee presence at these would be valuable.
 - Jon / Tracey will provide Committee a list of known events for Committee to decide the presence.
- Focused stakeholder engagement: proposals**
- Following the August commitment to Committee Jon outlined a proposal for more focused engagement with selected whaitua stakeholders during the period of scenario development.
 - Important considerations for this include:
 - Identifying a sound and clear purpose for the engagement/s
 - Having good information and questions for the people engaged
 - Having sound criteria for selecting stakeholders to engage with (and for not selecting others)
 - Managing the different lines of communication / relationships between GWRC and the Whaitua Committee and stakeholders
 - The Committee approved this approach, and agreed that working groups should create the questions for stakeholders (with support from GW).
 - Jon will prepare some suggested engagement purposes and criteria for selecting stakeholders, to test with working groups, and the latter would discuss who they felt would be valuable to engage with.
 -

Session 5 Values & Attributes and CMP Working Groups – report back

(Hayley Vujcich, GWRC)

See handouts on *Kaitiakitanga Model and Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health attributes on Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee webpage* <http://www.qw.govt.nz/presentations-and-reports-2/>

Session purposes:

- Committee can make a consensus decision about attributes for Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health

Hayley spoke on behalf of Sheryl and Brent who were unable to attend. This was an update on the V&A and CMP Working Groups' combined meeting.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Kaitiakitanga model | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The working groups heard from Hohepa about the Kaitiakitanga model (see handout), presented to Te Runanga o Ngati Toa Rangatira board and representatives who endorse the approach.• The WG noted that the scope of the Kaitiakitanga model arguably goes beyond the scope of the Whaitua Committee's work.• Hohepa, the MLG and Ngāti Toa representatives are staying alert to this in the ongoing development, application and communication of the model and further work.• The Working Group endorsed Hohepa's Kaitiakitanga model, and approved him continuing to develop it while noting the scope of the Whaitua Committee.• There was a question about the merits of a presentation on the model by Hohepa to Committee, and the V&A Working Group will consider organising a summary presentation to Committee on Hohepa's Kaitiakitanga model. |
| Attributes for Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health: long-list, short-list, and others | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Committee had asked the MLG to review and refine the list of Ecological Health attributes that the Committee had generated (May meeting).• The MLG has suggested some clarifications of the attribute descriptions, noted that some attributes are better suited for other values, and used five criteria (see handout) to test the suitability and utility of the attributes for scenario modelling, setting objectives and limits, and monitoring into the future.• Most of the Committee's attributes could be modelled in some way and monitored in the future, though fewer could be used for setting objectives, or limits, or reliably influenced through catchment management actions.• The Working Groups had heard the MLG's recommendations on attributes that are not used, a long-list of ones they see useful for scenario modelling, and a short-list of attributes amenable to being quantitatively measured (so useful for setting quantitative objectives and limits).• Some attributes in the original list also applied to recreation and access rather than to ecosystem health, so have been shifted over with the V&A/CMP WGs' approval. |
| Recommendations – MLG and Working Groups | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The MLG recommend that the Committee proceeds with the long-list of attributes at this point. The MLG expect to be able to provide an assessment of these attributes through the scenario modelling, either quantitatively or narratively.• The MLG advised against further reduction of attributes at this point as exactly which attributes are used to set objectives and limits will evolve as Committee |

- move through the process and develop the WIP.
 - The V&A and CMP working groups accepted this advice and recommend that the Committee receive the long-list and short-list of attributes and continue working with these lists.
- Discussion: clarifying & filling gaps**
- There was a question about several of the acronyms in the handouts, and what some of the descriptions and reasoning meant.
 - Committee agreed that an acronym-free and more explanatory version of the lists should be provided.
 - There was a question about whether change in stream low flows was going to be an attribute, as it appeared to be absent from the lists. This was agreed to be an important inclusion, especially given the recommended approach of proceeding with a lightly-held larger number of attributes.
 - The MLG will be asked about including an additional attribute to cover this.
- Decision: proceed**
- Committee agreed with the CMP and V&A working groups' recommendation to proceed with the Hauora Kaiāo - Ecological Health attributes, subject to the two changes above.
 - The CMP WG will also clarify two further points and report back to Committee: whether the attributes apply to open coastal waters as well as to harbour waters (and clarifying wording accordingly)
 - Defining the boundary between "fresh" and "salt" water environments, and which environment (and attributes) is assumed to dominate in brackish water.
-

Session 6 – Rural Issues Working Group report-back

(Diane Strugnell, RI WG)

Session purposes:

- Committee members are updated on the Working Group's activity

- Field trips**
- The WG enjoyed the field trip to look at potential management options in the wild, and thanked Richard and Diane for their particular efforts.
 - The WG are keen to look at rural residential development and the Kakaho Stream (the latter field trip potentially with Guardians of Pauatahanui Inlet).
- Issues and options**
- The WG has identified the key rural issues for water in the whaitua (see handout).
 - There are a few gaps still, but having looked at the existing policies and background information the WG is well positioned to get this extra information.
 - The next work is to look at the assumptions around these phenomena that should be built into the scenarios.
- Discussion**
- There was a question from Committee about whether the WG had yet considered rezoning to control development, which they had not.
 - Another question inquired about the extent of aerial topdressing in the whaitua. There is very little of this, and what is done is of an insignificant scale. There is some weed spray but this is also insignificant in scale.
 - The lack of significant areas of regular chemical application is one of the key things that distinguishes Te Awarua-o-Porirua rural areas from a "true" rural

catchment.

Session 7 - Urban Development working group report-back

(John Gibbs, Urban Development Working Group)

This session was to update the Committee on the working group's latest progress. Key points are below.

Work update: The WG has identified most of the key issues and opportunities in this domain, with handouts provided for the Committee's information.

emerging impressions These will be used with the objectives in the development of management options. John outlined some emerging conclusions the WG has from their investigations, including:

- The seemingly reactive and unambitious nature of the Aotea comprehensive Development Plan (done circa 2000-2002)
- The extensiveness of the Whitby Coastal Estates and Benge Block areas and their potential as issues and opportunities
- The coordination and planning failures between the TAs, Wellington Water and GWRC (on which point the WGs have expressed their views through the various elected representatives)
- WW has two clients with quite different needs

There are more conversations ongoing, and the WGs are eyeing up various experts they may want to hear from.

Next steps: options and engagement

- The next steps are to create Easy, Medium and Hard groupings for management options
- The WGs are also starting the discussion about more focussed engagement with stakeholders, during the period of developing management options.
- There are some significant stakeholders in these areas with significant stakes in many areas of work, and the WGs noted the need for carefully-planned engagement.

Session 8 - Stormwater and Wastewater working group report-back

(John Gibbs, Stormwater & Wastewater Working Group)

This session was to update the Committee on the working group's latest progress. Key points are below.

Work update

- The SW&WW WG has been undertaking a similar issues-identification task to the UD WG, and handed out its current list of issues for the Committee's information.

Emerging impressions

- Some conclusions were highlighted:
 - There's a dominating focus on asset management with little consideration of its contribution to water quality
 - the working group has observed a general "hard infrastructure approach" that focuses on technical solutions

- There's little public understanding of the impact on the catchment of people's actions on private land.
- candidates standing for council all name-dropped the harbour in their campaign materials, but most had little better understanding than the general public of the harbour and catchment's systems.

Key deficiencies

- The working group observed that the balance between earthworks for development and environmental health seems to be generally found by argument between developers and council rather than any outcome-focused approach.
- Building consents use different standards in templates (such as pipe sizes). Different teams within TAs apply codes of practice differently
- The working group noted the challenge this presents for Wellington Water in providing consistent region-wide services.)
- The working group observed an environment of unhealthy competition in TAs' different approaches to development contributions.
- Building inspections are almost exclusively focused on the above-ground elements, neglecting to find deficiencies in underground infrastructure.

Wellington Water

- Wellington Water are conscious of the poor popular understanding of the relationships between the three waters. They are undertaking an education campaign to address this, and have done a stocktake of the education initiatives underway.
- WW offered to provide the Committee with the stocktake, and this was welcomed.
- WW is working on options to improve CBD water quality while alleviating flooding.
- The Master Plan for the region's three waters infrastructure is still a work in progress. It won't be ready for the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua scenario modelling, but the principles will be available by November.
- There is a deficiency of data about the catchment's storm water and wastewater network and its performance, and there is no region-wide consistency in how data are captured.
- This is improving, but the working group emphasised that the whaitua committee will operate in a state of data deficit in the storm water and wastewater domain as well as others.

Session 9 - annual report of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Harbour & Catchment Strategy & Action Plan

(Keith Calder and Cr Bronwyn Kropp, PCC)

This was an update for Committee from Keith Calder and the Chair of the Harbour and Catchment Joint Committee, Bronwyn Kropp.

- The presenters drew the Committee's attention to the new, public-friendly layout and production for the Annual Report.
- Also of interest is the supplement which for the first time presents all water-related spending that affects the harbour. Jonathan Gulland from Wellington Water was credited for this collation task.
- Hard copies of the report were distributed and more are available from Keith and PCC if members want to distribute some.

Session 10 Any Other Business

Committee member John McKoy reminded everyone about the upcoming cockle count in Te Awarua-o-Porirua Harbour taking place on November 27th and encouraged everyone to take part.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm.