

WORKSHOP NOTES

SUBJECT	Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara workshop notes – Kaiwharawhara and urban catchments
WHEN	Monday 7 December 2020, 9.30am-5pm
WHERE	NZ Deerstalkers Association, Thorndon
ATTENDEES	Zoe, Tui, Sam, Louise, Ros, Pat, Anya, Jonny, Pete, Hikitia (at 10.45 on Zoom), Quentin (from 11.15), Roger (from 11.40), Sean (from 1.30)
APOLOGIES	Kara, Gabriel, Wayne, Naomi
PROJECT TEAM	Vanessa, Tim, Glen, Phill, Emily, Kat, Denise, John, James, Richard, Mike, Brent, Emily T, Helen, David, Penny

Agreements in principle and actions

KEY

D = decision

A = action

PT = project team

R = idea for drafting a recommendation

TEMPLATE STRAW DOC

D: Amendments to be made by PT:

- Insert a row for values
- Show the linkages between the values=>desired outcomes=>relevant attributes=>strategies/actions
- Include the BAU state in the 'draft target attributes' to help show the current trajectory without intervention

Whakapapa

D: Add broader history and contemporary context for each area, e.g., Zealandia and Otari-Wilton's Bush into the Kaiwharawhara whakapapa.

A: PT to consider employing a writer (to assist with more than whakapapa)

TKT Mana whenua environmental outcomes

A: In relation to outcome 5, find out if Karori is an emergency drinking water supply.

A: Vanessa to revise outcome 7.

'Other' environmental outcomes

D: 'Other' values and environmental outcomes paper needs reworking. Phrase all outcomes in line with long term 100 year outcomes (i.e., not bottomlines).

D: Include that rivers have their own intrinsic (non-anthropocentric) values.

A: Ros to draft outcomes statements for community values. Zoe, Jonny, Louise happy to review.

General agreements for Kaiwharawhara/urban catchments

R: Need more data and more monitoring.

R: Need data to be made more accessible.

R: Need to enable community science and mātauranga Māori.

- so that more sites and attributes can be measured and reported
- for more data
- to engage citizens
- to inform progress towards outcomes

D: Committee to consider prioritisation criteria, e.g., which area, value, or attribute to target first?

- For Community connection value/attribute:
 - Is there a "friends of ... [stream]" or other anchor community group?
 - What is the proportion daylighted?
 - What is access like?
 - Is there active citizen science?
 - What is the proportion involved in community clean-ups?
 - Is there a council or WWL advisor or auditor and how many /often checked?
 - Is there business interest?

D: Committee can define its own top band 'wai ora' state aligned with environmental outcomes.

R: Need to ensure new developments take account of capacity beyond the development.

R: Water sensitive design reccs:

- enable WSD through regulation and guidance
- enable reuse of greywater and blackwater
- treat rainwater runoff if use particular product, e.g., untreated zinc roof
- grade buildings
- progress WOF recc
- need specialist to assess development site for WSD options prior to development
- All new developments to be stormwater neutral

R: Identify and fix cross connections.

R: Need proactive rather than reactive pipe replacement.

D: May need to consider different council recommendations if can't agree.

D: Consider a co-chairs press release referring to Mayoral Taskforce report.

R: Need feedback loop for complaints, e.g., tracking number.

Coast

D: Unlike Te Awarua-o-Porirua, coastal outcomes are less likely to inform setting freshwater objectives (due to differences between relatively static versus dynamic marine receiving environments).

A: Explore further whether attributes (e.g., mud) in estuary need to be a driver for setting targets.

D: explore further current coastal state assessments, e.g., Boffa Miskell reported lower state for metals.

A: clarify what constitutes and stormwater outfall and where monitored.

R: Kaiwharawhara estuary is a priority for protection and restoration.

Other actions

R: That the relevant authorities need to report on progress of WIP implementation.

A: PT to send WIP implementation report.

A: PT to send information on reducing copper at source, i.e., brake pads in the US (James).

A: All to review prioritisation memo.

Commonalities/Differences between FMUs

D: Options to consider:

- natural/urban/industrial/coast
- Responses, e.g., regs and non-regs
- Differences between receiving environments, e.g., coastal pressures and important species
- Current state and effort to stop the decline
- Values
- Community connections, e.g., effort to get from “no connection” to “very connected”
- Degree of urban growth

Discussion

Vanessa opened the workshop with a karakia.

Whakapapa of Kaiwharawhara

- PNBST had the first treaty settlement in the region in 2006, followed by Ngāti Toa Rangitira.
- The whakapapa in the draft framework goes up to the time of pākeha arrival. Suggestion to include history through to today to help the community connect with stream, including landfills and other issues.
- This is consistent with the concept of ruranga, meaning that people can grow their own roots and have connection to the land without having been on the original waka.
- Māori made agreements without understanding the number of pākeha who would arrive and the pressure they would put on the land. Mana whenua were pushed out of Wellington into the Hutt Valley. Following the Battle Hill event, the remnants of the Tenths Trust are minimal.

- Local chiefs offered manaakitanga when settlers arrived in Petone that they would not have survived without.
- Include importance of Zealandia in the Kaiwharawhara catchment, and the ability of wai to sustain taonga.

D: Add broader history and contemporary context for each area, e.g., Zealandia and Otari-Wilton's Bush into the Kaiwharawhara whakapapa.

A: PT to consider employing a writer (to assist with more than whakapapa)

Environmental outcomes

- Te Kāhui Taiao has reviewed the environmental outcomes and Vanessa will continue revising. Four of the values in the table are compulsory and there are three additional ones.
- Discussion about whether Kaiwharawhara should be managed to provide for drinking water when the main supply comes from Kaitoke. Need to confirm if it's an emergency drinking water supply. Clarification that it is part of the drinking water network but not a source of supply. It could be a desired outcome in the long term. May be more practical to provide for human contact than drinking water.
- How do the western science and mana whenua outcomes relate? The western science outcomes are national bottom lines. If all of them were met, this would significantly contribute to, if not provide for, Te Mana o te Wai outcomes, especially those requiring improved water quality and its management.
- Education does not go far enough; regulations need to be enforced to affect cultural change.
- Vanessa to better articulate the meaning of kawa in outcome 7, including the idea of 'calm' and what that intends to mean.

A: In relation to outcome 5, find out if Karori is an emergency drinking water supply.

A: Vanessa to revise outcome 7.

'Other' environmental outcomes

- Mana whenua values provide direction for the Committee's work. They are specific to mana whenua who have ownership of them because they have done the work to develop them.
- Discussion about the distinction between mana whenua and community values, and whether it is appropriate to weave them together. Desire is for alignment not assimilation.
- Values can apply to mana whenua and ruranga, not sure how to include visitors to Wellington in addition to residents. They should be cherished and upheld by the whole community, mana whenua cannot do it alone and vice versa.
- There may be some special access for Māori, but in most cases, what is good for Māori is good for everyone.
- There are also Māori in Wellington that are not mana whenua, principle of inclusion applies.
- The treaty house model is useful, showing two sides leading to the same outcomes.
- The community needs to have ownership and see themselves reflected in the values. There will be some differences in cultural and historical uses.
- Community values may not align perfectly with each of the mana whenua values listed. There may be some overlap or they may sit side by side.
- Mana whenua involvement in decision-making and using mātauranga Māori are unique.
- Value that reflects community owned projects and citizen science.
- Governance to include both mana whenua and the community. Historically, mana whenua have not had a voice at the table. Mana whenua and communities should be given resources and empowered to do the implementation/mahi.
- Protecting taonga species relates closely to conservation.

- Add value that addresses mental health benefits.
- Overarching principle that mana whenua and manuhiri can live with and enjoy freshwater.
- Revise community values, bringing together feedback from surveys and engagement.
- Smell is an important indicator and comes from sewage and exceeding E.coli limits.
- Management of stormwater should be included as a value to provide for. The community wants to know that their property will be protected in a large rainfall event as well as human health and safety. There is tension between letting a river or stream flow naturally and needing stopbanks in a flood.
- Strategies can be included in the whāinga section of the framework. Lower socio-economic communities have houses in the most flood prone areas and may need to be relocated over time. Challenge with the legacy of building houses in a flood plain, it may require appropriate managed retreat.
- Potential to recommend that developers don't continue to build in areas of greatest flooding risk. Other solutions could include swales that don't involve stopbanks and slowing down the flow of water. Discuss further in workshop on Te Awa Kairangi.
- The right of the river to be healthy for its own sake should give mandate for regulation and enforcement.

D: 'Other' values and environmental outcomes paper needs reworking. Phrase all outcomes in line with long term 100 year outcomes (i.e., not bottomlines).

D: Include that rivers have their own intrinsic (non-anthropocentric) values.

A: Ros to draft outcomes statements for community values. Zoe, Jonny, Louise happy to review.

Current condition/whāinga/strategies

- The gap between current state and where we want to get to creates a case for change. Consider variation and similarities between Kaiwharawhara and other urban catchments.
- Consider where we are less certain of assessments. Data comes from a specific monitoring site and not the whole catchment. Catchment data is based on modelling results. There is nuance between monitoring and modelling data and it can be difficult to determine which is more representative.
- The attribute for fish species measures diversity rather than the number of fish. Plentiful mahinga kai to be added as an environmental outcome.
- More ground-truthing and data collection is needed for streams of significance. Counting fish is resource intensive.

Citizen science and accessibility of data:

- How to communicate complexity of data to the community presents a challenge.
- Envision more pathways for community science in the future, across more sites and attributes. Regional Council to help enable and teach monitoring methods.
- Community science in Upper Hutt yielded the same results as GW science team monitoring.
- Database needs to be accessible in order to be useful. Government is slowly moving in this direction but need a recommendation to support sharing of knowledge. Need to make existing data available, e.g., Eugene Doyle pressed Wellington Water to provide data.
- Another benefit of monitoring is to engage citizens and improve their connection to water.
- Important to communicate the results to the community. Potential to link into existing water quality data so that it's all in one place, such as LAWA.
- Catchment lens of restoration and mitigations within communities, creates social trust and accountability.

R: Need more data and more monitoring.

R: Need data to be made more accessible.

R: Need to enable community science and mātauranga Māori

- so that more sites and attributes can be measured and reported
- for more data
- to engage citizens
- to inform progress towards outcomes

D: Committee to consider prioritisation criteria, e.g., which area, value, or attribute to target first?

- For Community connection value/attribute:
 - Is there a “friends of ... [stream]” or other anchor community group?
 - What is the proportion daylighted?
 - What is access like?
 - Is there active citizen science?
 - What is the proportion involved in community clean-ups?
 - Is there a council or WWL advisor or auditor and how many /often checked?
 - Is there business interest?

Stormwater and wastewater:

- The downward trend for E.coli is sobering. There are wet and dry weather problems, insight from expert panel and small group discussions show that extensive reductions of overflows and cross-connections are needed to make improvements.
- Priority should be fixing cross-connections and leaking pipes.
- Need TKT’s position on E.coli issue.
- Climate change/sea level rise and new development are the biggest pressures. WSD needed to slow water and treat contaminants. Existing developments need retrofit, roof replacement to address zinc levels.
- There should be incentives and encouragement for local treatment of stormwater and consequences if it hasn’t been done in 20 years.
- There are currently no guidelines for greywater systems because they are hard to put in. TAs should develop guidance to incorporate into new developments.
- Rubbish in streams is a visible indicator and relates to community connection. Included in mana whenua environmental outcomes. Could drive a recommendation for street sweeping to reduce stormwater contaminants.
- Roving crews are needed to not only identify leaks but fix them where they can.
- Pipes in Kaiwharawhara are grade 4-5 with 2 overflows in 2 years.

R: Identify and fix cross connections.

R: Need proactive rather than reactive pipe replacement.

Development:

- Before developments are built, need to ensure the pipes have sufficient capacity.
- With regard to zinc and copper, it is beyond the scope of the Whaitua Committee to prohibit using legal materials. There could be other incentives, impact assessments for new builds. If harmful materials are used then there should be mitigations to capture and treat stormwater.
- There could be an opportunity for education in the industry to help developers and consumers make well informed decisions, e.g., specify the best products to use.

- Difficult to get rights to investigate laterals on private property unless it is evident there's a problem.
- Incentives to check laterals at point of sale in LIM report or WOF idea. Recommendation to consider replacing roof at the same time. How to ensure it's equitable so people can do the right thing even if they can't afford to make upgrades.
- Some of these issues are nationwide and need to be addressed by central government. The Whitua Committee can only make recommendations about the water coming out the end of the pipe but the source needs to be addressed.
- Opportunity for brownfield developments when the old network is being replaced to meet water quality targets with suggestions for how to achieve.
- If WSD is not possible due to topography, it should be offset up the catchment.
- Housing NZ concerned with warm and dry homes and less about environmental or water quality considerations.
- There are carbon targets for 2030 and there should be water quality targets.
- Other issues in urban areas include permeability, fish barriers, quantity/hydrology, piping, loss of streams, etc.

R: Need to ensure new developments take account of capacity beyond the development.

R: Water sensitive design reccs:

- enable WSD through regulation and guidance
- enable reuse of greywater and blackwater
- treat rainwater runoff if use particular product, e.g., untreated zinc roof
- grade buildings
- progress WOF recc
- need specialist to assess development site for WSD options prior to development
- All new developments to be stormwater neutral

Sediment:

- Consider opportunities for better practice within new developments such as runoff controls, on site treatment and slowing down water within the existing landscape.
- There are ongoing maintenance costs to factor in and agencies need to own the problem. Economies of scale needed to make WSD more efficient.
- If the current regulations were enforced, it is expected there would be improvements. Environmental regulation currently only responds to sediment issues when there's a complaint due to insufficient resourcing.
- Need to communicate there is a pollution hotline for people to use.
- Important to close the loop and follow up with community members who report issues, share a summary of the investigation and results. There should be acknowledgement and encouragement.
- Suggestion to track the progress of an issue like sending a parcel in the post.

R: Need feedback loop for complaints, e.g., tracking number.

Target attribute states:

- The table sets target attribute states over three time steps – current state is E, shift to C for generational change and A for long term outcomes. Stopping further degradation and holding the line in the first step will be a challenge but the NPS requires that we maintain or improve.
- Targets for mana whenua attributes to be added by TKT.

- Need to be informed by science and possible mitigations for short terms targets, but allow for the possibility of new technologies over the long term. Generational actions could include improved community connection to waterways and education. Difficult to measure but can use narrative description.
- Setting target attributes and strategies to achieve them will be an iterative process.
- Recommendation to Wellington Water for short term infrastructure investment, need to prioritise where to start and why as it's not realistic to fix everywhere.
- What defines 'A' band? It may fall short of the 100 year vision. National model doesn't take into account unique geology and the natural conditions in a place. Committee can define wai ora in their own terms based on environmental outcomes.
- Objective to maintain A state water quality starting in the headwaters and work down through the catchment. In order to enable communities, it's important to tell them where there is A state, not only where there is E state.
- Hard to accept E state as short term goal for E.coli in urban catchments.

D: Committee can define its own top band 'wai ora' state aligned with environmental outcomes.

Mayoral Taskforce report:

- Report includes 50 recommendations on the 3 waters network.
- The taskforce was established in response to the Dixon St pipe failure and sought to understand constraints and why rates didn't go toward maintenance.
- Consider a structural shift that would allow Wellington Water to own the assets and have access to funding that is not limited by government. Considered the Water Care model in Auckland and the alignment between funding and maintenance.
- The current model is that when there are big pipe failures they need to be repaired urgently with huge economic impacts. Need to start asset analysis of pipes network in the CBD to understand priorities.
- Need to help Wellington Water get on top of the network and provide technology to know where assets are broken.
- Bad smell at the bottom of the Kaiwharawhara stream near the wastewater pumping station. It's in the public eye since people walk and bike past it and receives a high volume of complaints.
- There should be a recommendation for government agencies to include and prioritise WSD in projects like Let's Get Wellington Moving. Climate change has become a standard consideration and water quality should be the same.
- Acknowledgement that the recommendations are for Wellington City Council, although some could be applied to other TAs.
- It would be useful for TAs to have an environmental advisor for water.
- Whaitua Committee interested in supporting the taskforce report in a press release.

D: May need to consider different council recommendations if can't agree.

D: Consider a co-chairs press release referring to Mayoral Taskforce report.

Coast

- The coastal expert panel assessed current state and the outcomes for the receiving environment in the three scenarios assessed by the freshwater expert panel.
- Attributes included zinc, copper, mud content (fine sediment), algae, phytoplankton, macroinvertebrates, overall ecosystem health.
- There is no coastal attribute required for the NPS-FM, but the freshwater attributes have been adapted for the coast.

- Kaiwharawhara is no longer a functioning estuary. It is a highly modified environment with increased water velocity and concrete channelization.
- Unless the habitat is restored, there are no improvements expected for the target attributes.
- Stream form and function is not its own attribute but the panel commented where relevant.
- Sanctuary to Sea has discussed the estuary and creating habitat and spawning ground for native fish. This type of habitat is scarce and a priority for restoration, aligned with mana whenua outcomes. It takes a long time for this kind of environment to recover.
- If the ferry terminal is built at Kaiwharawhara, there might be an opportunity to rebuild habitat. It could make Kaiwharawhara a feature for people to celebrate and protect.
- Important to look further up the catchment to help improve the habitat at the bottom. Issues of sedimentation and fast flowing water.
- Sediment contributes to the mud content in the inner harbour, which smothers habitat and oxygen. Mud content is at a D and the trend is getting worse.
- The inner harbour was assessed as a separate coastal unit from the rest of the harbour based on the hydrodynamic model and where the pressures from the inner city are concentrated.
- Important to restore the mana of waterways whether they are piped or not.
- Salient points from the expert panel report will be brought through the place-based memos.
- There are different dynamics in the Wellington harbour from Porirua.
- Are there seabirds of significance in Wellington to provide estuary habitat for?
- Copper and zinc are representative of heavy metals, report to include a map of hotspots where metals have accumulated. Source control of copper important for making a shift.
- The freshwater expert panel water sensitive scenario assumed full implementation of WSD, retrofit existing houses, factored in development and climate change, and still resulted in net increase of contaminants.
- California and Washington state already have rules about copper brakes. Whaitua could lobby a transportation rule to central government.

D: Unlike Te Awarua-o-Porirua, coastal outcomes are less likely to inform setting freshwater objectives (due to differences between relatively static versus dynamic marine receiving environments).

A: Explore further whether attributes (e.g., mud) in estuary need to be a driver for setting targets.

D: Explore further current coastal state assessments, e.g., Boffa Miskell reported lower state for metals.

A: Clarify what constitutes a stormwater outfall and where monitored.

R: Kaiwharawhara estuary is a priority for protection and restoration.

A: PT to send information on reducing copper at source, i.e., brake pads in the US (James).

Governance:

- Beyond biophysical attributes, want to see changes in community connection, mana whenua in decision-making and change in governance. There are other measures to ensure we're going in the right direction for long term outcomes. Important not to kick the can down the road for implementation.

- The Ruamāhanga Whaitua Committee wanted to continue meeting to assist GWRC in the wording of clauses for the plan change. Recommend that the relevant authorities need to report on progress of WIP implementation.
- Opportunity for social change model in this community, shifting to a catchment based organisational structure.
- GW to share report on implementation received at a recent Environment Committee meeting.
- Need for more resourcing to do implementation effectively. Mana whenua need to be part of decision-making to influence change.

A: PT to send WIP implementation report.

R: That the relevant authorities need to report on progress of WIP implementation.

Criteria for assessing differences:

- Differences in between FMUs that need to be considered:
- Receiving environments, areas marked for urban development, degree of current intensification and future pressures.
- Mana whenua values will be helpful in identifying places of significance to prioritise.
- Consider community connection – E.g. Owhiro has an engaged community but others have no friends groups or equivalent.

Closing comments

- Need to include mana whenua and community values in framework, many will be transferrable across catchments.
- Add justification for target attribute states and commentary on contributing factors.
- BAU should incorporate what it will look like in the future if we do nothing. We need to interrupt the downward trend lines.
- Help communities feel connected to the problem but talking about it locally and steps individuals can take to make a difference.

A: All to review prioritisation memo.

D: Options to consider:

- natural/urban/industrial/coast
- Responses, e.g., regs and non-regs
- Differences between receiving environments, e.g., coastal pressures and important species
- Current state and effort to stop the decline
- Values
- Community connections, e.g., effort to get from “no connection” to “very connected”
- Degree of urban growth