

Report of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Workshop

21 June 2018, 5.00pm – 9.00pm
Judgeford Golf Club, Porirua
Workshop (Closed to the Public)

Summary

This report summarises notes from a workshop of the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee held on Thursday 21 June 2018 at Judgeford Golf Club.

Contents

These notes contain the following:

Overview

Workshop Notes

- Part 1: Introduction
 - Part 2: Connections between freshwater and harbour objectives
 - Part 3: Exploration of economic analysis
 - Part 4: Conclusion
-

Overview

Workshop Attendees Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee:

Present: Diane Strugnell, David Lee, Barbara Donaldson (Chair), John Gibbs, John McKoy, Larissa Toelupe, Warrick Lyon, Richard Cook

Apologies: Hikitia Ropata, Dale Williams, John Gibbs, Stu Farrant

Project Team: Alastair Smaill (Project Manager), Suze Keith, Jon Gabites, Hayley Vujcich, Brent King, Paula Hammond, Keith Calder (Porirua City Council)

Facilitator: Hayley Vujcich (Greater Wellington Regional Council)

Guests:

- Ned Norton, Land Water People
- Sue Ira, Koru Environmental
- Simon Harris, Land Water People
- Nick Taylor, Social scientist

Notes prepared by Jon Gabites.

Workshop Purpose The purposes of this workshop were to:

- To understand the connections between the draft Freshwater and Harbour Objectives.
- To compare and contrast the cost differences between the different scenarios, and begin to explore the economic implications of the scenarios for rural and urban areas.

Both purposes of the meeting were achieved.

Agenda The agenda is detailed in the table below.

TIME	TASK	PURPOSE	WHO
Part 1: Introduction			
5.00pm	Karakia		Hikitia
	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies & introductions Chair's Direction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of meeting & agenda outline Report on Ruamāhanga WIP Presentation to Council	Establish purpose of meeting	Barbara Barbara & Hikitia (WIP)
	Housekeeping		Hayley
5.15pm	Role of tonight's Workshop Focus of the workshop	Clarify what we are doing tonight, and where this fits in the decision-making process	Hayley
Part 2: Connections between Freshwater and Harbour Objectives			
5.20pm	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why we are looking at both freshwater and harbour objectives 	Make connection between freshwater and harbour objectives	Hayley

5.25pm	Presentation & Discussion: Compatibility of Freshwater & Harbour Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compatibility of the draft harbour objectives with the freshwater objectives • Identification of the most constraining objectives • Modelling assumptions and areas that need further analysis – any questions on validity of results? • Discussion • Confirm direction of draft objectives in light of understanding the intersection between two areas 	Inform Committee of work undertaken to look at compatibility of objectives; confirm Committee content with direction of draft objectives	Paula and Brent
Part 3: Economic analysis			
6.00pm	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of the economic analysis – what it does covers and what it doesn't 	Establish scope of analysis	Brent
	Presentation: Economic Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the costs of the two scenarios across four sites • Questions 	Understand the differences in costs between the two scenarios	Sue Ira
7.00pm	Dinner		
7.30pm	Introduction to Activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce exploration of economic analysis and draft objectives 	Introduce activity	Hayley
7.55pm	Activity: Exploration of the economic implications of the draft Objectives	Explore material and confirm comfort with draft objectives	Hayley
8.25pm	Report Back & Group Discussion		Hayley
Part 4: Conclusion			

8:45pm	Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on field trip/stream walkover • Update on Rural Landowners Meeting 		Suze or Jon
8:55pm	Thank yous		Barbara
	Karakia		Hikitia

Key Decisions to be made

- Committee to confirm the direction of the draft Freshwater and Harbour Objectives, in light of understanding the intersection between the two areas.
- Committee to draw initial conclusions re effort and cost required within rural and urban areas for the scenarios modelled.

Committee Decisions

The Committee accepted the process the project team had deployed to check the connectivity and consistency of analysis of the Committee's objectives. This will be formally decided upon at the July 12 Workshop.

The Committee proposed a response to their objectives in light of the economic analysis which will be formally decided upon at the July 12 Workshop.

Workshop Actions

The following actions were agreed to:

1. Note discussion on implementation, monitoring and management of data for future TAoPW Committee Meeting agenda.
2. Suze to send draft Ruamāhanga WIP to all Committee Members.
3. Ngāti Toa Update to be included in July 12 agenda.
4. Sheryl to look into ways of tracking E.coli and report back to the Committee at the next meeting on how this will be completed.
5. Project Team to develop an agenda outline for the rural engagement event and seek feedback from committee.
6. Suze to issue invites to Committee for July 26 engagements – morning PCC Workshop with Councillors and 4 – 5.30pm PCC District Plan Reference Group.

Workshop Notes

Part 1 - Introduction

Welcome

Barbara welcomed everyone and introduced the guests in attendance at the workshop.

Report on Ruamahanga WIP Presentation to Council

Barbara presented on the Ruamahanga Whaitua Committee's presentation to GWRC and Te Upoko Taiao on their draft Whaitua Implementation Programme (WIP) which was heard by Council on 12 June. The Ruamahanga Whaitua are currently at the draft WIP stage, with the draft document out for public feedback. They are in the process of writing up the final document to be presented to Council on 16th August, following which an associated plan change will be prepared.

Barbara noted the Ruamahanga Whaitua has been going for one year longer than TAoPW; they have had more and longer meetings, and in recent times the frequency had increased significantly. The five committee members presenting took turns at talking to different points of the presentation confidently. They have had significantly more engagement and consultation with the community and stakeholders throughout the Committee's deliberations, and this engagement increased towards the end of the process.

Their engagement with iwi through Ra Smith was evident and obviously beneficial, as was the opportunity to learn from each other. The connectedness of the community to their water resources had an impact on how effective the engagement was. The obvious difference was that the community in Wairarapa are connected economically, compared to communities within TAoPW, for whom it is more a recreational and wellbeing connection, which drives a different outcome. Their objectives look very different and water allocation is the big issue. It was noted by one TAoPW Committee member that the rural community in the TAoPW catchment was the exception to this assumption.

The Ruamahanga Whaitua have followed the same process as the TAoPW, setting objectives for minimum flows and water quality. They have made 106 recommendations under themes such as river and lake management, natural character, managing sediment, flows, promoting wetland restoration and discharges. Many of the 106 recommendations will not end up in the Natural Resources Plan but rather follow into a discussion about how GWRC will implement and give effect to these non-regulatory recommendations. Barbara noted that all of the "how" will be part of the TAoPW Committee's responsibility to understand, and it is their role to make recommendations on methods. The Committee members noted that it will be useful for the Committee to get an understanding of how support for implementation, the monitoring and managing of data will play out in the future and what it looks like. For example, how GWRC show progress over time.

Action: Note discussion on implementation, monitoring and management of data for future TAoPW Committee Meeting agenda.

The Committee indicated that they wished to see a copy of the draft Ruamāhanga WIP.

Action: Suze to send draft Ruamāhanga WIP to all Committee Members.

Ngāti Toa Update

No update was provided as the GWRC meeting with Ngāti Toa was postponed to June 29. The Committee will be updated at the July 12 Workshop.

Action: PT to ensure a Ngāti Toa update is included in the next Workshop Agenda.

Role of Workshop

Hayley noted that the first part of the evening would be spent looking back at the very immediate work the Committee has been doing to set draft freshwater and harbour objectives; to understand any differences, and what levels of effort are required to meet these objectives. Hayley noted that the objectives conversation would be parked there, and that while the economics are important to the objectives, the workshop would not go so far as to say what the economic implications are for those objectives, but rather to take the time to explore the economics.

Part 2 – Connections between harbour and freshwater objectives

Introduction

Hayley introduced the work of the project team to understand how the draft objectives developed by the Committee for the freshwater WMUs align with the objectives sought for the harbour. She noted that in doing so, they've also been looking at the differences and similarities between objectives in similar WMUs and land uses, and also taken the chance to check in on any quirks of the modelling to double check on whether they impact on the Committee's objectives.

Hayley noted that Paula would talk through the exercise and bring to attention the areas that require further consideration. She noted Brent was available to help talk to some of the technical aspects of the modelling, and that the discussion was a chance for the Committee to have another think about the objectives and to confirm you are happy with the direction of the objectives in light of understanding the intersection between the two areas.

Hayley noted that the work of the Committee last year to consider the policy packages would be brought back to the Committee soon. The role of Nick Taylor in providing an understanding of the social impacts of the draft objectives was noted. Hayley also noted the quantitative modelling information that would fold in, to allow the Committee to start setting limits and targets.

Presentation & Discussion

Paula and Brent provided an overview of the work undertaken to understand the compatibility of freshwater and harbour objectives, following on from the memo issued to Committee members ahead of the meeting.

MEMO: [Rounding out the objectives](#)

PRESENTATION: [Rounding out the objectives](#)

Paula noted that the aim of this work was not give a definitive analysis but just to give it an overview look at what the objectives look like to make sure the efforts required up and down stream aligned and make sense. No ecological objective analysis was undertaken, as it would have been difficult to align with the other results.

Paula noted that the upstream and downstream objectives were looked at, and that they all appear aligned. When modelling work comes through this can be double-checked. The level of effort required to meet those objectives were looked at. The project team asked, are there significant differences in levels of effort required upstream and downstream? Stebbings and Upper Kenepuru Streams require high levels of effort than the downstream WMUs because they are development areas. These areas will require high levels of effort in order to maintain their current state. The level of effort was examined looking at the difference between BAU, Improved and Water Sensitive, with the differences in cost relating to the levels of effort required.

Underestimating effort and associated risks

Paula noted that there were a couple of areas where the data is possibly over-estimating the extent of the contaminant, so it is recommended that the Committee keep what they have for now, and the achievement or level of effort can be reviewed with further information. The Committee questioned the underestimating and overestimating of data, and how this can be applied across the catchment, including the risks around underestimating efforts and risking underperforming against targets. The risk being that this may mean over compensating in management options or policy. Clarification and credibility around this was sought.

Questions raised by the Committee:

Issues within rural areas

- *Is Zinc an issue in the rural areas?*

Not an issue at present. Need to keep an eye on the impacts of Transmission Gully and make sure that we don't need water sensitive scenarios, or where rural areas are changing land use we can look to opportunities to manage differently.

Levels of effort required for WMUs

- *If there is a difference in effort between WMUs, what are the reasons for that difference are they OK or need further work?*

The one area we did pick up was the Belmont Stream, where the Zinc objective was set at a C under BAU. We wondered if with an improved level of effort could be moved up to a B. This is an area that is likely to be developed. You may consider changing this draft objective once you have all of the modelling results on hand.

- *Do we need to do anything now?*

If we are worried about a particular area we need to look deeper into the effort and intensification or land use change\development potential or plans.

Sources of E. coli

- *What is the source of E.coli? We need to know the source of E.coli because if it is septic tanks stock our management options will be quite different if the E coli source is human.*
The science team are looking into what can be done to provide this information and will report back.

Action: Sheryl to look into ways of tracking E.coli and report back to the Committee at the next meeting on how this will be completed.

A number of Committee members noted that they generally felt the objectives were on the right path. The high degree of effort required to meet the sediment objective but the need to do so given the significant issue sediment is for the TAoPW catchment was noted. Committee members also noted that most of the earlier draft objectives were made in the absence of modelled information. It will be helpful to know more about the assumptions we made during that time, to take the next step.

The Committee signalled interest, now that they are in the process of confirming objectives, with turning to understanding how these objectives will be met. Discussions such as how they will be implemented; what actions can be implemented, by whom, and the associated costs. Paula noted the importance of the rationale behind the objectives and the need to continue to add to this reasoning as the policy packages are established. Alistair Smaill noted this as needing to set the objective and what timeframe is acceptable to community, and whether this lines up with their expectations? It was noted by the Committee the difficulty of making these decisions in places where even significant effort doesn't get the water quality to the place that the community would like it to be.

Part 3 – Economic Analysis

Presentations

The presentations on the economic analysis were introduced by Brent.

Sue Ira (Koru Environmental) presented on the urban results and Simon Harris (Land Water People) on the rural results.

MEMO: [Key messages from life cycle cost analysis of TAoPW Committee's scenarios](#)

PRESENTATION: [The life cycle costs of the objectives](#)

Discussion

There was a general discussion following the presentations. Across the whitua there is a variation in costs, largely due to the variability in wetland costs. Wetlands make up considerable amounts of the improved scenario. Greenfield developments look at costs at the lower end. In an existing urban area, costs will be at the higher end, due to increased unknowns. There are significant uncertainties around wastewater costs which need more investigations of costs. Patterns which emerge are that costs are not that different when aggregated across per dwelling costs; the water sensitive and improved scenarios are similar; scenarios modelled shows level of effort in the existing is quite low (because this was not included in the scenario modelling). Missing from the wastewater results is the cost of infiltration and cross connection repairs due to a lack of data.

The Committee indicated they were generally comfortable with the waste water costs for the improvement in water quality, even where the costs are at the high end of the scale. It was suggested by some that changes need to be made immediately for greenfield development to prevent further degradation, whereas infill will need to be further considered as it is more complicated. It was acknowledged that in an urban context, water sensitive design is highly desirable and needs to be regulated.

Discussion was had on how the story around the objectives and the decisions that have been made by the Committee can be wrapped up for the community, in order to provide the Committee members with confidence in telling the story. Means of engaging people in the story were also canvassed.

The difference in scenario costs due to the retirement of land in rural areas was discussed, which is the biggest cost for rural areas, but also the means for reducing sedimentation. Retirement is difficult as predictably no landowners like the idea of being told that they cannot use their land; there is a need to enable people to come to that conclusion themselves. The high connection to place and pressures of lifestyle blocks and retirement means losing land to hand on to the next generation. Other ways for achieving retirement which enhance the amenity value – of importance to the urban dwellers as well - were discussed. It was noted that in rural settings there is increased pressure on the community to do things differently, whereas the focus for urban is on changing the way new developments are undertaken. The role of education and learning, while taking the time required to drive change was discussed, noting that education is where the investment needs to be in the rural context. Accordingly, Committee members noted the importance of setting realistic timeframes and targets for change. The example of forestry having to respond to a deadline on the use of some chemicals has created the space for change in practice. This assists with getting people thinking about different strategies.

It was noted that to create a shift in practice in a rural setting, regulation and/or incentives are required. The TAoPW catchment is unique in that the majority of landowners' income comes from off-farm, rather than from the land, and the land has high amenity value. It was noted that for the bigger land owners the turnover opportunity is low; there are greater opportunities for the smaller lots which are at the bottom of the catchment.

It was noted that everyone wants to see an improvement in environmental outcomes, but so long as it doesn't cost. There was substantial discussion on how the costs are borne both across the whaitua catchment and more broadly, with one Committee member expressing views that the urban costs should fall on the owner in the same way the rural costs do. There was some discussion on the role of central government funding, however acknowledging this is difficult to obtain and should not be relied upon. Funding for erosion-prone land may be able to be drawn upon. It was expressed that the rural contributions, shared amongst few landowners, are for the greater good and that there should be a broader contribution from the community. Opportunities for changes to practice within the regional park, a significant landowner within the catchment, were also mentioned. Opportunities for rates increases and targeted rates were discussed.

It was noted by the Committee that there are places where actions must be taken in order to meet the central government bottom lines for water quality. In a limits regime where we have to maintain or improve water quality and accepted that we have now we have no choice but the high end of practice.

Questions raised by the Committee:

Economic analysis

- *What portion of greenfield costs are land costs? Does this explain difference between infill and greenfield LCCs?*
 - *What about difference between existing urban dwellings and new development?*
 - *Note there are few interventions applied in the scenarios to existing dwellings as this is difficult to model at a subcatchment level and the variables within the catchment would be too large. This does not mean policy will be developed to address retrofitting water quality mitigations.*

Socialising costs and where the cost burden should fall

- *How do existing council budgets for wastewater upgrades etc fit into this analysis?*
- *What are the total LCC costs for rural?*
- *What are the rural costs per rural dwelling?*
- *Can 'retired' land carry productive value?*
- *Who pays for the retrospective costs?*
- *How do we socialise the costs?*
- *How would the rural community feel if the cost of mitigations were borne more broadly by the whitua community?*
- *How do the costs fall in urban areas? On the owner, in the same way they do in rural areas?*
- *Would Councillors be willing to back this in their campaign?*
- *How do we get people to understand the process of the Whitua? How do we get them to turn around and invest in good outcomes? How do we make people take notice?*
- *How does it feel if the costs on rural, on urban, on new development, were spread across the whitua?*
- *How do you spread costs over time?*
- *If costs of rural mitigations for sediment are mainly taking land out of pasture, what other options are there? e.g. forestry*
- *Moment of change in property ownership as door into ensuring change is made?*

Part 4 - Conclusion

Update on Rural Landowners Meeting

Jon Gabites noted the pressures on the original date of 27th June. These included Jamie Peryer-Fursdon being unavailable (as the Land Management Officer for the Region), Project Team availability, and TAoPW Committee readiness to present on topics including the ability to understand the economic implications of the objectives. This made us rethink when we should meet with this audience just yet. We are now looking to early August as we consider Project Team capacity through July and Diane's availability. The Committee will be kept informed throughout and are encouraged to have an active role in both the agenda development and the presentations on the evening.

For the rural engagement, the agenda has been roughly developed, with Committee member input, as 1. Current state report; 2. Amount of improvement needed; 3. What it costs – held in an open forum which encourages dialogue.

It was noted by the Committee that the education message is a critical part of the engagement from here on in, including current state and what it's going to cost. The presentation to rural landowners needs to be "this is the information", whilst then providing space for input from them to comment.

Action: *Project Team to develop an agenda outline for the rural engagement event and circulate to Committee for feedback.*

Community Engagement

Suze reminded the Committee that they had been sent the list of local organisations that they had developed early in the Whaitua programme. They were asked whether, now that they know what they know with regards to the work they are undertaking, do they see value in connecting with any of these groups? There would need to be explicit value identified in the exchange – either information out or feedback received for the development of the recommendations / objective setting.

Other than the rural engagement, which would incorporate people from Pauatahanui Residents Association, Takapu Road, Fed Farmers, Pauatahanui Wildlife Reserve, Rural Women, and Young Farmers, GOPI was the only other specific group mentioned. John M commented that he keeps this group updated monthly, and he thought that the material would need to be far more fully developed before there would be value in presenting more to this group.

It was generally agreed, that for this type of presentation the policies would need to be developed, justifications for the policies made clear. It was also agreed that it is important to include a sense of story-telling in the dialogues as it is the personal impact that resonates. It was also agreed that telling the full story can engender participation, rather than resistance.

There are a number of engagements with Porirua City Council (PCC) scheduled for 26th July. The morning being to present to PCC draft objectives and economics to the Councillors. In the afternoon there is an opportunity to present to the District Plan Reference Group. Interest from Committee members to attend these workshops was sought.

Action: *Suze to issue invites to Committee for July 26 engagements – morning PCC Workshop with Councillors and 4 – 5.30pm PCC District Plan Reference Group.*

Thankyous

Larissa closed the meeting with grace and fortitude.

The meeting closed at 9.10pm.