

MEETING PAPER

SUBJECT	Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara Committee
WHEN	Monday 12 April 2021, 9am-5pm
WHERE	NZ Deerstalkers Association (3 Collina Terrace, Thorndon)
ATTENDEES	Sam, Louise, Tui, Pat, Zoe, Pete, Jonny, Ros and Roger (from 1.20pm)
APOLOGIES	Hikitia, Naomi, Wayne, Anya, Sean, Gabriel, Kara
PROJECT TEAM	Tim, Phill, Emily, Kat, Richard, Mark, Brent, Matt, Glen, Onur, James, John, David

KEY

D = decision.

A = action.

PT = project team.

R = idea for drafting a recommendation.

General business

Louise opened the workshop with a karakia.

- Remaining urban issues to be discussed include water wastage and use, source protection, natural form and flow, water sensitive design, stormwater, community connection and flood protection.
- Process for working through recommendations involves hearing from each Committee member around the table, then reviewing what has been agreed or not agreed and identifying where further information is needed. Consider feedback on narrative and structure of recommendations.
- The purpose of the online evening follow up sessions is to recap changes to the recommendations that are discussed during the workshop, especially so those who were unable to attend the workshop have an opportunity to provide input.
- PT to represent comments in the Draft WIP on SharePoint during the workshop discussion.

D = 8 March Committee meeting notes were agreed by the Committee.

A = PT to provide transparency on how we're tracking actions from Committee meetings so Committee members can also see this.

Meeting schedule

- PT looking at topics for upcoming workshops and when information from Te Kāhui Taiao will be ready to feed in.

- Next workshop to cover values, outcomes, FMUs and target attribute states. Suggestion to work through them in breakout groups.
- Need time to revisit recommendations and finalise the WIP content.
- Need to employ a writer to write the narrative sections in plain English, capture the Committee tone and make it more cohesive and accessible to the public.
- PT to confirm dates for GW Council meetings when the WIP will be tested and received.
- PT to organise an evening session for the ongoing involvement of the Committee after the WIP is completed.
- Need to be able to support recommendations with evidence that they reflect community values. C&E subgroup to review comms plan.

A = PT to employ an external content writer to capture Committee tone and ensure the language is plain English.

D = The version of the WIP that is discussed at the final GWRC Council workshop needs to include a final narrative.

D = Source protection WIP recommendations will be discussed at the water quantity Committee meeting on 12 May.

Urban recommendations

Recommendations 7, 10 and 11 on contaminated land

- Not sure of feasibility of timeframe to find unknown landfill sites. PT to follow up with further information.
- Contaminated land is an important issue to communities, it came through in feedback from the engagement event in Wainuiomata. Need to involve community in discussions.
- From discussing with subject matter experts, more funding would be needed to identify new contaminated sites. Little is known about the sites and their impacts on water quality. Remediation of sites is very expensive and takes time, to be considered as part of prioritisation.
- Does the Committee want to focus on remediating contaminated sites that are known or investigating new ones?
- If focussed on the sites that are known, it is possible to investigate the source of high nutrient loads. Known sites are likely to have the highest risk and are identified in the [SLUR database](#), which is publicly available.
- Unknown sites rely on local knowledge or records to identify. Some people may not want a contaminated site to be identified if it's on their property as there could be concern about legal implications. These sites are often found in the process of development.
- Overall outcome for water to be treated before reaching the receiving environment. Challenge to enable a natural filtering system as some sites may be spatially limited, although natural methods are preferred.
- Clarification that recommendation 10 relates to leaching issues and recommendation 11 concerns surface contamination.
- Councils should review consents for existing landfills as part of ensuring draft WIP recommendations are met. Reviewing consents is a conversation to be more widely than just contaminated land.
- Add action plan and resourcing to the recommendation.

D = Bring Pete's draft recommendations 7, 10 and 11 into the contaminated sites section of the draft WIP and delete the other draft WIP recommendations as they have now been covered in the wastewater section. Incorporate the narrative into the wider urban narrative.

R = Recommendation 11 – Remove the word 'natural' and include a **preference** for natural filtering systems. It may not always be possible e.g. due to space constraints.

D = Addition to the narrative that any contaminants need to be treated before they reach the environment.

D = Want to discuss reviewing consent conditions as a WIP recommendations when considering cross cutting recommendations.

A = PT to come back to the Committee with some information about feasibility of timeframes of draft WIP recommendations and any additional relevant information having talked with GWRC experts.

Pre-treatment of wastewater

- Follow up on discussion at previous workshop about pre-treating wastewater overflows before they reach the receiving environment. Wellington Water says that there are some screens on overflows already, which is partial treatment.
- Potential for treated wastewater to be reused to water golf courses and greenspaces if safe to do so. Need to check thinking with mana whenua regarding the treatment of overflows.
- Overflows occur due to capacity constraints but should not cause degradation to the environment.
- Treating overflows could be seen as an excuse to continue allowing overflows rather than ceasing them. Engineers might argue that overflows need to be designed for as a constraint on the system.
- If the goal is to remove overflows, treatment is an interim measure. Does the Committee want to put money into removing overflows or treating them?
- Possible to put screens on all overflow sites in the short term? It is not cheap or easy and there's an issue of scale.
- Explore options for reusing treated wastewater as a resource. Consider cost benefit – is it worth spending a lot of money to reuse wastewater to irrigate a sports field?

A = Sam will meet with representatives from the Netherlands to understand the paradigm shift that's been going on in the EU in the last 30-40 years in regards to regulation and small scale treatment of wastewater. The aim is to understand more about whether it's something we would want to design for in the future here.

A = Project team to come back to the Committee with some suggested sites where pre-treatment isn't currently happening but could be. E.g. a screen at certain sites.

Reducing wastage of water

General narrative

- Explain meaning of 'water take consent' in public facing terms. Include wording about why we should care about reducing water use and restoring a more natural state.
- Important to include the figure that ~20% of drinking water is lost in leakage through the network.
- Need to include figures per household or person to make them more relevant. A new source of water supply will be needed by 2050 based on current trends in usage and population growth.

D = The following changes to be made to the narrative under reducing wastage of water to make it more community focused – Why do we want to maintain flows in the river, managing population growth, explain what a water take consent is, be specific about the kawa that wasting water doesn't align with, more

discussion on how we'll reduce demand. Make it easier for the community to understand bullet point 4 on the amount of water used by households, commercial and leaks.

D = Add a water quantity section to the draft WIP.

Network efficiency narrative

- Before we need a new reservoir, can we be more efficient and use rain water tanks?
- Goal of 10% reduction of demand by 2026 is ambitious. Possible to achieve if water meters were installed? Also aiming to test leakage in this timeframe.
- Estimated cost to fix the potable water network is \$2-3 billion but this will not affect water quality measures.
- Need for a paradigm shift to reduce demand.
- Possible to make it harder or more expensive to get a resource consent for water take?
- Urban water recycling (e.g., greywater) may be more practical at the household level rather than the network scale. Should not be at the expense of encouraging rain water harvesting.

D = The following changes to be made to the narrative under network efficiency – replace the word 'dam' with 'reservoir'.

Recommendation 19

- Difficult to set a timeline to repair and replace drinking water pipes before the size of the problem has been identified.
- Need to ensure there is ongoing assessment of pipes after the initial investigation to deal with legacy issues.
- Link with water metering? Addressed in recommendation 63 but stated vaguely. 63 seems to support the status quo with an education campaign and advice on metering.
- Potential to check for leaks and cross-connections on private property at the same time? Checking leaks is not as simple as checking for cross-connections.
- 100% of pipes to be investigated by 2030.
- Consider benefits of metering at the household vs. street/block level. If placed strategically, could neighbourhood meters still identify leakage? Could neighbourhood metering be introduced as a step towards household metering, or would it be more cost effective to start at the household level?
- Consider whether metering is used for information about leaks or for volumetric charging.
- Expensive to install water meters. All new builds should be required to have meters.
- Different councils have different stances on metering. Does the Committee want a consistent approach or recommendation?
- The WCC Mayoral Taskforce explored water metering in depth. Their report supports metering and anticipates that charging will be a consequence. Recommend an equitable approach to fix leaks.
- WCC strongly supports metering but is divided on whether it is used for charging or measuring. How metering will be implemented is key.
- Discussion continued under recommendations 63 and 64 below.

R = Incorporate recommendation 24 into recommendation 19 as they both relate to achieving an Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) of 2 or less.

R = Replace the word 'roadmap' with 'plan'.

R = Change '90% of the drinking water network has been assessed for leakage by 2030' to **100%**.

D = The plan is to be published and reported on publically. Needs to have 10 year interim targets to achieve the outcome.

R = Add wording to ensure the need for ongoing maintenance to continue achieving an ILI target of 2.

Recommendation 20

- Recycling wastewater likely to raise different concerns from recycling stormwater, needs to be tested with Te Kāhui Taiao. Discussion can be had at the same time but treated differently.
- Needs to be more specific than 'begin discussions.'
- If a community identified an opportunity for urban water recycling, would they be able to implement it? Need a mechanism to enable community led projects, e.g., swales, wetlands or rainwater harvesting for public use. Add support for local initiatives.
- Include greywater and rainwater harvesting as part of discussions with community and mana whenua. More comfortable with greywater recycling at the household level.
- Separate public from private water recycling. Encourage urban water recycling at both levels.
- Infrastructure for wastewater recycling may be a bigger investment and more challenging to implement, start with stormwater.
- Discussion about rainwater tanks to be parked until the Committee reaches the relevant recommendations.

D = Split out stormwater and wastewater more clearly.

R = Increase clarity on the recommendation that this is community focused (utilising public spaces). Ensure rainwater collection is higher in importance than community stormwater collection.

Recommendation 21

- Recommendation came from a small group discussion about reporting annually on top commercial water users to see if they are becoming more efficient.
- Relates to commercial users on the municipal supply rather than those who apply for a resource consent.
- Not useful information as some commercial users may use more water from year to year if their business is growing. This doesn't tell us about commercial user's efficiency. Difficulty of comparing commercial users to consent holders.

R = Remove recommendation 21 as unclear on what it would achieve.

Recommendation 22

- Recommendation aimed at top commercial users on municipal supply but should include users who take from bores as well.
- Need a plan to incentivise water efficiency, offer support to commercial users to help them reduce use. Not a high priority but good to support.

R = Agreed the programme should be developed by 2023 as it's to **begin** conversations with commercial users.

D = Programmes should also include commercial users who hold a water take consent with GWRC.

D = The recommendation is about providing support for commercial users. Agreed this isn't a priority in the whitua.

R = Replace the wording 'aim to' with 'will'.

Recommendation 23

- Don't want to punish commercial users who are paying for their water supply. Need to improve efficiency rather than take.
- Charging for water is effective at influencing behaviour. There are other mechanisms besides volumetric charging to consider.

R = Agreed the investigation should be carried out by 2023 to provide consistency with WIP recommendation 22.

R = Replace the wording 'volumetric pricing' with 'pricing mechanisms' as there may be better mechanisms to improve efficiency.

R = Replace 'modify their water demands' with 'improve their water use efficiency' as this is the change the Committee wants to see.

Household efficiency narrative

- Needs to reflect community aspirations, add a positive framing – we want to be efficient with water use.
- Need to be bolder, data demonstrates we are significantly behind Auckland and other NZ cities in terms of per person usage.

D = Add a bullet point on urban water recycling as it applies to households.

D = Change 'shorter showers' to 'more efficient showers'. E.g., options for low flow showerheads.

D = Remove reference to 'smart meters'.

D = Change the language to better reflect community aspirations.

Recommendation 25

- Include 'water warriors' and catchment groups in raising awareness about water efficiency.
- Beyond an education campaign, practical support is needed, i.e., home plans and advisers.
- Roving crews that identify leaks and cross-connections could also provide information and advice.
- Follow up about wording of TAs funding/resourcing Wellington Water for all recommendations that this applies to.

R = Tighten up the wording around greater educational opportunities. It is also about practical support and linking in with catchment groups and with professional associations.

R = Remove the wording 'Input from GWRC and mana whenua should also be sought to incorporate environmental values and outcomes'. Not needed in the WIP recommendation as it's about delivery.

R = Include 'water warriors' here. Mana whenua thinking on water warriors is happening wider than just this WIP recommendation.

Recommendation 26

- Include in range of options listed in recommendation 25 as a type of practical support.

- Expand on the Sustainability Trust model and add a recommendation that supports professional associations and tradespeople in promoting water efficiency. Include in a recommendation for plumbers across other issues.
- Provide education and a pathway for early adopters, e.g., using low flow shower heads.

D = Incorporate the intent of recommendation 26 into 25.

Recommendation 63

- Don't believe that an education campaign on water metering is an effective tool for reducing household use. It could be a preface to let people know that water metering is coming.
- Work with community groups to communicate the value of water metering.
- Support for water metering in long term but need to consider transition for communities.

R = Update wording to reflect the need to undertake campaigns on the benefits of water meters.

A = PT to provide some further information on the cost of installing meters.

A = PT to provide information on Wellington Water's current advice around the use of smart meters at a household level.

R = Remove sentence 'The Whaitua Committee supports the current advice Wellington Water is providing in regards to use of smart meters, to better inform households about water consumption and improve network management.'

Recommendation 64

- People object to water metering because they think they will be charged for water. They are currently paying for water but the costs are hidden in rates.
- Assumption that water metering will be inequitable and adversely affect low income communities.
- Installing water meters would help with demand management and defer the need to build a new dam.
- Comfortable with installing meters on new builds but it's more of a challenge on existing houses. Potential to install during renovations as well.
- Need to enable early adopters who want to install water meters, maybe through a rates rebate. Would early adopters be required to pay to install meters or would it be paid by TAs?
- Evidence supports that people are more efficient with water use when they can see how much it costs them.
- Recommendation to state that all public drinking water assets remain in public ownership, state that water metering does not imply privatisation.
- Equity concerns regarding the current state of housing and that tenants are more likely to pay for leaks than landlords. Could block water meters be used to identify leaks instead?
- Can't influence the housing market but don't want to put renters in a compromised position.
- People don't want to have to pay for water when they see leaks haven't been fixed in the public network.
- Inefficient to do water meters for new builds first and then existing housing as you can't have some users charged by volume and others who aren't. Charging needed to control demand.
- More than demand, metering helps identify leaks. There needs to be a way to identify leaks and take an equitable approach.
- Starting with block metering will become irrelevant when household meters are introduced.

- There can be different pricing models, e.g., you start paying extra if you use more water than a sufficient amount covered through rates.
- Need to see options explored in Kāpiti and by the Mayoral Taskforce. Discuss with Kara, Sean and Hikitia who were on the Mayoral Taskforce.
- Stakeholder engagement is the next step, consult ratepayers on the merits of water metering.
- Three key issues that need addressing relating to water efficiency: leaking public pipes, leaking private pipes and water use behaviour. Can't address private pipes without addressing public.
- Information from water meters should go to Wellington Water so they can fix leaks. Charging for water metering should not be implemented until leaks are fixed.
- PT to look into policy measures to address inequity. Propose that properties cannot be rented if there is an identified leak.
- Consider implications for other infrastructure costs if universal water meters are introduced.

D = The installation of water meters on new builds should be required.

More general conversation about water metering

D = Agreed to block level water metering.

D = Support the use of other mechanisms to reduce water use in the short term ahead of metering.

A = PT to provide a list of options to support equity for universal household metering.

Closing

- Chairs and PT to discuss how recommendations that have been previously discussed will be reviewed again.
- Important to allow time for conversation about water metering.
- Engagement event with Houghton Valley community on Wednesday 14 April.
- Wānanga led by Te Kāhui Taiao on Thursday 15 April.

Sam closed the workshop with a karakia.

A = Committee members to let the Co-Chairs know their preferences to finish discussions on a topic or to spend time looking back at previous topics when time is short.