

# Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara Committee Meeting 11 Notes

---

17 February 2020, 9am – 4pm  
WREMO, Thorndon, Wellington

---

## Contents

<b>Contents</b> .....	1
<b>Attendees</b> .....	1
<b>Action points</b> .....	1
<b>Meeting notes</b> .....	3
Session 1: How we will work together in 2020 .....	3
Session 2: 2019 TWT Committee summary report.....	4
Session 3: Future meetings, timing and focus .....	4
Session 4: Te Komiti – direction and work programme.....	5
Session 5: Providing for mana whenua values in water allocation.....	5
Session 5: Water flows and allocation in the whaitua.....	5

---

## Attendees

### Committee members:

Louise Askin, Roger Blakeley (from 11am), Ros Connelly, Quentin Duthie (Until 12pm), Peter Matcham, Zoe Ogilvie, Anya Pollock, Kara Puketapu-Dentice (9am – 10am), Hikitia Ropata (from 11am), Pat van Berkel, Sam Kahui.

Apologies: Jonny Osborne, Wayne Guppy, Naomi Solomon, Tui Lewis, Gabriel Tupou, and Sean Rush.

### Project Team:

Tim Sharp, Phill Barker, Matt Hickman, Denise Young, Richard Sheild, Mike Grace, Penny Fairbrother, Alastair Smail, John Philips, Sharyn Westlake, and Pauline Hill (GWRC), Onur Oktem (WCC), David Burt (HCC) Glen Lauder (facilitator), Angela Penfold (WWL), Aaria Dobson-Waitere (Taranaki Whānui), Maiora Dentice (WWL).

Apologies: Emily Osborne (GWRC), Ike Klyenbos (UHCC).

---

## Action points

### Project Team:

Action points to follow up from Meetings 9 and 10:

- Follow up on paper on peatlands and advise the Committee at the next meeting when this will be able to be discussed
- Check GWRC website information on water bottling and determine whether any further information is needed for the Committee to develop a view on this issue
- Follow up whether all golf courses, parks and schools have nutrient management plans and report to the Committee at the next meeting
- Provide Aaria's presentation on freshwater sponges to the Committee
- Include the timelines for the national freshwater proposals and LTP submissions in the Whaitua 2020 plan
- Follow up with the Regional Biodiversity Framework Collaborative Working Group and discuss meaningful overlaps between the two groups
- WWL to provide more information on the options for changing demand, including the impact of requiring all new builds to install rainwater tanks and other alternative sources of water.

Action points from 17 February 2020 meeting:

- Re-draft and recirculate the Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara 2019 Summary Report to include:
  - The primary purpose of the report is to provide a summary of the Committee's work for 2019 (as communicating 2019 content to the public may be best delivered with a range of additional products or tools)
  - That the report has been prepared by the Project Team for the Committee (NB: we will still be seeking Committee endorsement of the report as a correct reflection of 2019's mahi and learning)
  - All state of the environment information is easy to understand and well referenced
  - The "lightbulb issues" to be re-written to be statements of fact only (rather than any perception of agreed position) and re-named as key things the Committee heard
  - More explicitly outline the kaupapa of the project and commitment to kawa and supporting mana whenua values with reference to information received from Morrie Love.
- Check with Committee members who were not in attendance dates for the remainder of 2020 with a preference for either Monday or Friday and full day meetings
- Provide a freshwater values report at the next Committee meeting
- Agenda for next Committee meeting to include values/issues and options for prioritisation.
- Prepare a list of all research intended to be undertaken.

**Co-chairs:**

Action points from Meeting 10:

- Follow up with Roger whether an email was sent in relation to GWRC involvement in farming and implementation, and monitoring of forestry activities within the Whaitua.

**Committee members:**

- Pete to send examples of pressure/ state model to Project Team.

Subgroups:

- Comms and Engagement subgroup to engage stakeholders to invite them to events we are attending

- Policy subgroup to progress work on values, issues and prioritisation criteria.

---

## Meeting notes

### Meeting 9 and 10 Meeting notes

The meeting notes for Meetings 9 and 10 were reviewed and accepted by the Committee. Action points from these previous meetings that have yet to be followed up have been added to the action points above. There was a suggestion for action items to be emailed in advance for efficiency and Committee members to raise specific questions about these via email.

### Co-chairs' report

Co-chairs discussed their recent attendance at Hutt City and Upper Hutt Council meetings. The Hutt City meeting was well attended by the Hutt-based Committee members and there was good support and engagement from Hutt City Councillors. Hutt City Chief Executive was supportive of including whaitua engagement in upcoming district plan review community engagement. WWL had presented to Hutt City the previous week and the Councillors were well briefed on the need to invest in the three water infrastructure.

In the meeting at Upper Hutt City Council, the co-chairs lead a 10 min presentation, allowing for limited opportunity for discussion.

Co-chairs emphasised a key benefit of presenting to Councillors is the opportunity to suggest questions about water quality for inclusion in consultation documents.

### Session 1: How we will work together in 2020

*Glen Lauder (Facilitator)*

Glen introduced the Commitment – Coherence – Clarity – Confidence hierarchy model. He stated that from interviewing all Committee members he observed that the Committee were all committed but needed to move towards gaining coherence and then eventually confidence. He then compared this model to the 4 kawa statements and asked the Committee the following questions (with responses in bulletpoints):

#### **What are your strengths (individually and as a Committee)?**

- Growing understanding of the issues and the scale of the challenge
- Political experience and influence of members, especially elected members' and their ability to know which levers will be effective
- Kawa foundations and growing insight into impacts on mana whenua values
- Depth of knowledge and questions, however, also need to continue to bring in a range of views
- Members bring an opportunity to connect with a wide range of networks
- More comfort in having disagreements within the Committee

#### **What needs to shift?**

- Networks and committee members working separately; need to weave together
- More focus on the kawa is needed; focus has been on learning about issues and aspirations rather than looking at kawa for solutions to improve water quality.
- Meeting attendance rates variable; community members have barely missed a meeting; sometimes do not close out meetings with a quorum.
- Need to ensure we look at the implications of the possible solutions on all members of the community, e.g., rural landowners and how rate rises impact on poorer communities.

#### Where do we see progress?

- Committee members are working with Councils to change things, but also working with the community to change the Council activities. Why should we change personal behaviour if Councils aren't changing their behaviour?

Glen's take away question to the Committee was to challenge them to consider how to lift themselves collectively from commitment to confidence, while bringing in a range of views.

#### Session 2: 2019 TWT Committee summary report

*Penny Fairbrother and Denise Young (Senior advisors, GWRC)*

- Conversation on whether the report is the Committee's report or a report from the Project Team to the Committee. Noted that it was intended to be a report drafted by the Project Team to summarise the work carried out by the Committee in 2019 and that the Committee would endorse it as that record.
- The Committee requested that the Project Team amend the report (as noted in Actions above).

#### Session 3: Future meetings, timing and focus

*Louise Askin (Co-chair)*

- In light of the low attendance at the last few meetings, Louise proposed that future meetings could be shorter, e.g., half a day and more frequent, such as every 3 weeks, instead of monthly.
- The members present for this session (Zoe, Anya, Pat, Pete, Hikitia, Roger, Quentin and Ros) were concerned that having half day meetings would reduce the amount of time the Committee would have for discussion.
- Sam and Hikitia suggested having meetings in the early evening from 4.30pm to 7pm. However Anya stated she could not make evening meetings.
- Zoe requested that the meetings be held on the same day of the week each month, and Roger suggested for elected members Monday or Fridays are preferable.
- Committee members requested that future meetings are more targeted and focused. Agenda items should pose a range of questions that the Committee needs to answer, so that decisions can be made.
- Committee want a stronger say in agenda setting and requested that the Project Team provide a paper on the "values" at the next Committee meeting. The values report would be pre-circulated and used by the Policy subgroup to develop prioritisation criteria to determine which issues the Committee should discuss at future meetings.

## Session 4: Te Komiti – direction and work programme

### *Hikitia Ropata*

- The komiti has a new name *Te Kahui Taiao (TKT)*.
- TKT was formed in response to mana whenua wanting to get things moving and to make a difference for the environment (mountains to sea), as opposed to just setting objectives under the NPS-FM.
- It doesn't replace the need for GWRC to give effect to the NPS-FM, the PNRP and to ensure mana whenua values are provided for.
- Membership is limited to mana whenua, but can invite other tangata whenua members of the Committee and GWRC will provide policy and administrative support.
- TKT work programme will include:
  - Development of a mana whenua narrative; and
  - An evaluation framework for what good looks like from a Mātauranga Māori perspective.
- Committee members questioned how TKT would integrate with the full Whaitua Committee. Sam responded by stating that the Whaitua process is a:
  - One in 100 year opportunity to improve water quality; and
  - Gives the Committee confidence to develop a coherent narrative which combines Te Ao Māori and all other values.

## Session 5: Providing for mana whenua values in water allocation

### *Alastair Smail (GWRC Lead Urban Water programme)*

- Need to reflect mana whenua values in the WIP (as per NPS-FM and PNRP)
- Water allocation techniques tend to be limited to consideration of effects on ecosystem health.
- The PNRP has a highly developed framework for water allocation.
- Numeric limits in plans invariably need to shift in the future.
- Opportunities for the Committee to evaluate whether mana whenua values are being or will be met through numeric limits. Need evaluation framework (as proposed by TKT) to be able to determine this.
- Setting the limits in the plan also includes other considerations such as water efficiency, and iwi rights and interest (albeit iwi rights and interests is a national level conversation).
- There are no mechanisms to take water off existing users via the regional plan; central government would need to address this.
- Regional plan does have policy around priority for supply for human health. Question raised as to whether this is still sufficient.

## Session 5: Water flows and allocation in the whaitua

### *Mike Thompson (Hydrology, GWRC).*

Mike clarified the following technical terms:

- 95% of water use in Whaitua is for public drinking water from 3 surface water sources: Hutt, Orongorongo and Wainuiomata Rivers and the Waiwhetu aquifer (which is under Lower Hutt City).

- Minimum flow is the flow needed in the river for ecosystem health; takes are cut off at minimum flow.
- Allocation limit is the total amount consented to take (subject to cut off at minimum flow).
- Permitted take is an allowed take over and above human and stock drinking water. This is unconstrained by minimum flows. This may be a problem where takes affect small streams, for example. Permitted takes are not metered.
- Waiwhetu aquifer is a “confined aquifer” (confirming clay layers limit the effect of drawdown on nearby streams) and the effect of taking from the aquifer on surface water is limited to the Hutt River, from downstream of Taita Gorge.
- Upper Hutt aquifers are less confined, and thus have more direct impact on streams (due to interaction between surface and groundwater)
- Risk of saline intrusion has been well thought through with regards to the groundwater limit and there will be difficulty in amending this limit based on the current understanding (i.e., the limit has been set in a precautionary manner to take into account saline intrusion risk).

The Committee requested the following further information:

- Clearly set out what the issues are and what decisions the Committee must make about water flows and allocation.
- WWL to provide more information on the options for changing demand, including the impact of requiring all new builds to install rainwater tanks and other alternative sources of water.
- What are the options for future storage and supply?
- How can the Committee support iwi rights and interests?
- What are the options for controlling land use effects? E.g., protection of groundwater, wetlands, good urban planning. Also look at impact of rural takes on aquifers.
- Is there a need for a different allocation regime?
- How do we address community concerns such as water bottling while addressing the key policy issues the Committee must comment on?

Water allocation scenarios:

- Scenarios based on how different flows (higher or lower) impact on ecosystem health (i.e., fish).
- Question raised as to whether there are cultural flows in allocation? Aaria is looking at intersection of flows on Schedule B of PNRP. Mātauranga Māori framework being developed by TKT will include considerations of flows and allocation.
- A lot of the indicators from the water allocation expert panel will be useful to the Mātauranga Māori framework.
- In Ruamāhanga torrent fish were used as an indicator for cultural flows. Could do something similar here. Outputs from modelling can inform this.
- Management flow – as opposed to minimum flow, which includes cultural flow – narrative is important, but can only set one flow, which achieves all values.

**Next meeting: Monday 30 March 2020 at GWRC Council Chambers.**