

# Notes of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Meeting 14.7.16

---

5:00PM – 9.00PM, Tawa Community Centre

---

## Summary

---

### Contents

- Attendees
- Purpose
- Actions & general business to do

Meeting notes ..... 2

Session 1 - Welcome, Introductions..... 2

Session 2 - Water Management Units (WMUs) for Te Awarua-o- Porirua  
Whaitua..... 2

Session 4 - Values & Attributes Working Group update (and CMP update) ..... 5

Session 5 - Reviewing Urban Development Working Group’s Scope of Work.... 7

Session 6 - Reviewing Stormwater & Wastewater Working Group’s Scope of  
Work..... 8

Session 7 – Any Other Business..... 8

Appendix 1 – Initial WMUs for Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua ..... 10

### Workshop **Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua (TAoPW) Committee:**

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

**Project Team:** Brent, Isabella, Jonathan, Murray, Nicci, Sheryl, Shelley

**Members of the Public:** Jackie Dingfeller

**Manuhiri:** Ton Snelder, Michelle Rush

**Workshop** The purposes of this workshop were:

#### **purpose**

1. Committee get familiar with concept of WMUs and identify some for TAOPW
2. Committee decide about proceeding with WMU identification (analysis)
3. Committee updated on V&A WG activity
4. Committee review Scope of Works (SoW) for SW&WW WG and UD WG, decide whether to approve

By the end of the night we aimed to have produced:

- Committee’s WMU boundaries for TAoPW
- Decision about proceeding with WMU identification
- decisions to confirm or rework 2x SoWs

The purposes were achieved.

---

## Actions and general business to do

---

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>WMUs for TAOPW</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project team: arrange for Ton Snelder to do further work identifying WMUs. Update Committee on this work.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Economic Value</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• V&amp;A WG: consensus from committee that Economic Use and Te mana o Te Awarua-o-Porirua value descriptions are agreed on</li></ul>   |
| <b>Working Groups</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PT provide Committee with worked-up diagrams mapping the subject-matter coverage of working groups, and add “overlaps and gaps” as a recurring item in the WG leaders’ catch ups.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Committee session with WCC</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project team: email details of meeting with WCC’s Environment committee to Whaitua Committee</li><li>• Committee: placeholder in diaries for Thursday 1 September 9.15 am</li></ul>   |
| <b>Communications</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project team: Tracey to send out newsletter to Committee members absent form tonight, by 18<sup>th</sup> July.</li><li>• Committee: Please send comments on first newsletter draft to Tracey by end of 18th July.</li><li>• Project team: check the “meet your committee” areas of the website for currency and update as necessary</li></ul> |

## Meeting notes

### Session 1 - Welcome, Introductions

(Stu Farrant, Whaitua Committee Chair; Jennie Smeaton)

*See presentation in Whaitua Committee shared workspace*

Jennie gave the karakia.

Stu welcomed the two manuhiri: Ton Snelder (Director of Land Water People), a presenter, and Michelle Rush (Ruamāhanga Whaitua facilitator, observing) and ran through the agenda.

---

### Session 2 - Water Management Units (WMUs) for Te Awarua-o- Porirua Whaitua

(Murray McLea (for Hayley Vujcich), Greater Wellington; TAoPW Committee; Ton Snelder, LWP)

*See Hayley’s presentation and Tom’s presentation in Whaitua Committee shared workspace*

Session purposes:

1. to build understanding of concept of FMUs / WMUs and role in the process,
2. to capture Committee members’ insights as locals, as Committee’s WMUs map
3. for Committee to make a decision whether to proceed as proposed.

The session’s planned sequence was:

1. An introductory presentation (Murray McLea – GW)

2. Identifying and mapping initial WMUs based on members' knowledge and sense of what's important (TAOP W Committee)
3. Presentation on ways WMUs are identified using biophysical data, and a proposed version of this process for Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua (Ton Snelder, LWP)

Following the introductory presentation, some members questioned the merit of the Committee identifying WMUs before hearing how experts would do it. Some people were concerned that the whaitua's WMUs had already been identified (e.g. through NRP mapping) and these were not available to the Committee. There was a strong desire to change the session sequence and hear Ton's presentation before embarking on the WMU mapping exercise, so this was done.

The following are some combined key points from Murray's presentation (on behalf of Hayley who was ill) and Ton's presentation.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>NPS-FM definition</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FMUs are defined areas in a catchment. There can be lots of them and a single place can be part of multiple nested FMUs</li> <li>• FMUs have two elements– water and land</li> <li>• Water element is the “receiving water” – fresh and salt - where objectives are set and impacts assessed</li> <li>• Land element is where activities are managed and limits can be set</li> <li>• NPS-FM says “freshwater management units” and requires these, but we may use coastal management units too – working term for TAoPW is “water management units” (WMU)</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Reasons to use FMUs /WMUs</b>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give us a spatial framework for applying values and objectives to. Plus NPS-FM says we must (for freshwater – and we may for coastal too)</li> <li>• To group similar water bodies in which we might have different or similar values, goals</li> <li>• To know what bits of land to manage to reach these water goals</li> <li>• Help us administer and monitor resource use</li> </ul>  |
| <b>FMUs/WMUs vs other catchment mapping</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many different kinds of spatial information and ways to “slice and dice” a catchment go into identifying WMUs, including (but not limited to): land use, land cover, values in land uses or land / water areas, soil types, topography, significant sites, climate information, planning zones, water quality, political boundaries, hydrographic information).</li> <li>• Dividing up catchments for managing water is not new.</li> <li>• Using a variety of other data sources to infer causes and effects for a variable about which we have insufficient data (e.g. water quality) is not new either</li> <li>• Doing these activities under the aegis of the NPS-FM is new.</li> <li>• WMUs are used to realise the NPS-FM's cascade of attributes, objectives, limits and management tools.</li> <li>• WMUs have never been identified for TAoPW before, and this is the first largely urban catchment in which FMUs or equivalents have been identified.</li> </ul> |

**Uses for WMUs and the Goldilocks spot**

- WMUs are an important component of the water management regime: they are the spatial units by which we organise monitoring and manage different areas of the catchment to achieve our objectives.
- Having too many WMUs – i.e. managing lots of parts of the catchment as if they're all completely unique – therefore generates complexity (and unaffordable costs – e.g. in modelling and in monitoring).
- Having too few WMUs – i.e. managing large parts of the catchment as if they're effectively the same - means the management is too broad-brush and areas that differ in important ways are managed as if they're the same.
- There is a sweet spot somewhere between too many and too few WMUs, where there is sufficient detail to reflect the important distinctions in the catchment but not crush the WIP under a weight of detail and complexity.

**Ad hoc – option?**

- Some jurisdictions have subdivided their catchments for management purposes in an ad hoc way – people pick certain spots, and manage upstream from them, with management zone boundaries and rules added over time.
- This can work but has significant limitations – such as:
  - The potential for subjective criteria to be used (leading to inconsistency, inequities, etc)
  - Poor transparency
  - Difficult to defend (see below) as ad hoc decisions accumulate over time
- Having a consistent regime for subdividing a catchment, that's based on objective characteristics in GIS and (as far as possible), is therefore better.
- Maximum transparency means it can be iterated and adjusted with minimal risk of the above problems.

**Justifiable to communities and publics – important criterion**

- Because WMUs will be the way objectives, limits and management tools will be realised and applied, being on one side or another of a WMU boundary will mean there's guaranteed to be people who want to move a WMU line.
- Part of the WIP is having justifiable and defensible WMUs – “this line is here for these reasons – which are the same reasons applied across the catchment.”
- Being clear and transparent is especially important in TAoPW because compared to the Ruamāhanga, human-generated and cultural factors have a greater influence relative to biophysical characteristics.
- “Special WMUs” will be an important addition which also needs to be transparent (e.g. in the Ruamāhanga, Wairarapa Moana is its own FMU because of its immense cultural significance).
- WMUs must be consistent with the community's values and reasons for thinking one place is different to another. This is a vital role for the Committee.
- WMUs can also be part of community engagement (in the Ruamāhanga there was a handful of community members at the Committee meeting where FMUs were first mapped).

**Revisitable and adjustable – important criterion**

- WMUs will be developed in an iterative way by combinations of Committee and supporting input.
- We must start with some basic building blocks, and assumptions.
- Examples of building blocks:
  - biophysical characteristics of the catchment in space
  - Spatial distribution of different values and uses
- Examples of assumptions
  - areas with similar natural and human-created characteristics will probably have water quality in a similar state
  - the community most values preserving water quality that's currently good (e.g. high up in the catchment) and is *more* accepting of poorer water quality downstream

**Iteration of WMUs: there will be lots**

- An example of the transparent iterative approach is:
  - pretend we know what the WMUs are
  - look at the management objectives against these WMUs and “try them for size”.
  - This will throw up tweaks
  - Tweaks will be done or rejected (with transparent reasoning)
- Do-ability is another example of a ‘see if it basically fits’ iteration.
- WMUs can change without objectives changing
- There is no need to do “contingency” WMUs because all of them are mutable and will be iterated

The Committee then took approximately 45 minutes to draw an initial suite of WMUs on the catchment map. Photographs are at Appendix 1.

Ton Snelder then outlined some proposed next steps for identifying WMUs for TAoPW (subject to terms of engagement with GW):

1. Come back to Committee with information answering the sticky-note questions (as far as this is possible)
2. Use biophysical and other spatial data to enhance the Committee’s initial WMUs
3. Come back to Committee with the revised WMUs and the methodology explained

Stu asked if the Committee were happy to proceed as proposed, and there was consensus to do so.

**ACTION: Tonight’s WMU maps will be provided to Ton and the terms of the work will be arranged with the Whaitua project manager.**

---

Dinner was “session 3”

**Session 4 - Values & Attributes Working Group update (and CMP update)**

(Sheryl Miller, Greater Wellington, for V&A Working Group, plus Brent King, Greater Wellington, for CMP)

Session purpose:

- Update the Committee on the V&A WG’s latest work and get agreement that Economic Use and Te mana o Te Awarua-o-Porirua value descriptions are okay to proceed with

On behalf of the V&A WG, Sheryl presented the group’s recent work from their meeting immediately preceding the Committee meeting. This was followed by discussion. Key points are below:

**Progress:  
economic value  
for water**

- The WG has worked a lot on improving the value description for economic value in water.
- The working definition was “A reliable water supply provides opportunities for sustainable agricultural production, and cultural, domestic and commercial use”.

**Discussion:  
concepts to  
strength**

- Committee had questions and suggestions about concepts’ articulation in the value description, including:
  - Commercially-oriented recreational uses (e.g. hiring SUPs)
  - The overlap between “sustainable” and “resilient”
  - The concepts of resilience and reliability
  - Which words “sustainable” applied to, and the way punctuation drove certain interpretations
- There was some resistance to further reworking the statement in full Committee and questions about the respective roles of the WG and Committee.
- The Te mana o Te Awarua-o-Porirua value description was also tabled for comment.

**Decision**

- The value descriptions written here were agreed as good working value descriptions to proceed with:
  - **Economic Use** – a reliable water supply provides opportunities for sustainable agricultural production, cultural, domestic and commercial use.
  - **Te mana o Te Awarua-o-Porirua** – Mana whenua, mana moana of Te Awarua-o-Porirua is held by Ngati Toa Rangatira. The mauri of the harbour is connected with the mauri of the people.

**Other values work**

- The WG has also been brainstorming attributes for other values, and Jim Sinner has been working with the V&A and CMP WGs and grappling with cross-cutting concepts (such as *a sense of place*).
- The WG has recently mapped recreational values, and is looking deeper into what “accessibility” and “access” concepts mean.
- There is further work underway on Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health with the modellers, and some attributes for this value will cross over into social, cultural and economic values.

**Ecological health attribute update**

- The experts are currently working on the Committee’s attributes for Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health, and report that “it’s tricky”.
- Their approach is to err on the side of keeping more attributes and not whittle down the set too early.
- Some of the attributes relate to objectives and outcomes, some to the drivers of change. Some lend themselves to quantitative measurement, others qualitative.
- The experts will come back to the V& A and CMP WGs in August with three products answering the committee’s questions about Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health attributes from the June meeting, and advancing these attributes :
  - Full table of attributes documenting decision making process for each attribute
  - A summary table of the attributes for Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health, organised by these above characteristics (e.g. objective, outcome, quantitative, qualitative)
  - a brief paper/presentation explaining thought processes on list of attributes.
- Committee agreed that this sounded good.

---

**Session 5 - Reviewing Urban Development Working Group’s Scope of Work**

(Stu Farrant, UD WG)

*See Group’s draft SoW in Whaitua Committee shared workspace*

Session purpose:

- Review UD WG’s SoW make decision to approve or rework (with specifics)

Stu spoke to the draft SoW, noting the different deliverables, and clarification questions and discussion followed. Key points from the brief discussion are below:

**Working group coverage – risk of gaps**

- There was a discussion about how to ensure there were no subject areas that will fall in gaps between working groups, and go unnoticed until it’s too late.
- Ecological restoration activity was discussed as an example of an activity type that might fall between groups (though it seemed to have a natural home, the risk was noted as real).
- The Committee noted that the leads of working groups have regular catch-ups; Committee also agreed that this catch-up should specifically address the issue of gaps and overlaps and ensure these are well-handled.
- PT members noted that there are a few diagrams mapping the subject-matter coverage of working groups, which should be developed and provided to the Committee.

**Attendance**

- The five absent Committee members were noted, and it was

recalled that 1. SoWs are not set in stone and can be amended if people have valid issues; 2. all Committee members received the draft in advance.

- Decision:**
- The UD WG's SoW was approved.
- 

## Session 6 - Reviewing Stormwater & Wastewater Working Group's Scope of Work

(Cllr Bronwyn Kropp, SW&WW Working Group)

*See Group's draft SoW in Whitua Committee shared workspace*

Session purposes:

- Review SW&WW WG's SoW and make decision to approve or rework (with specifics)

Bronwyn spoke to the draft SoW, and clarification questions and discussion followed. Key points are below:

**Working Group's coverage and next steps**

- Flood protection objectives are outside the WG's scope, but there may be connection where around erosion and scour (sedimentation)
- It was noted that flood protection and stormwater flooding management is funded and run respectively through a different arm of GWRC and by TAs.
- The Committee's recommendations need to think about how it aligns with the flood protection direction of travel
- The next piece of work for this WG is getting a baseline understanding of the SW and WW networks' operation.

- Decision**
- The SW&WW WG's SoW was approved.
- 

## Session 7 – Any Other Business

(Various)

**Rural Issues WG update**

- Diane gave a brief update on the Rural Issues WG's inaugural meeting.
  - Turnout was excellent and their SoW is underway. They hope to present this for Committee review at the August meeting.

**Meeting WCC**

- Nicci Wood (WCC) and Cllr David Lee (WCC) have arranged for the Whitua Committee to present to the WCC's Environment committee in one of their formal meetings.
  - This has the best chance of maximising councillor attendance.
  - David has offered to present on behalf of the Committee
  - Shelley will send details shortly, but please put a placeholder in diaries Thursday 1 September 9.15 am.

### **Communications**

- Shelley handed out hard copies of Tracey's draft of the first TAO PWC newsletter. Please send comments to Tracey by 18<sup>th</sup> July.
- Please note – the newsletter is as long as it can be, and needs to be introductory in tone given the low awareness of the Whaitua and committee.
- Past material in (e.g.) the *Kapi Mana* was standalone.
- One member noted that the “meet your committee” material on the Whaitua webpages was out of date – this will be checked.

### **Upcoming sessions**

- Stu ran through the upcoming topics, for which the list so far is:
  - Outline of overall work and policy process
  - V&A WG report back to Committee: Review and decision re attributes for Hauora Kaiao - Ecological Health, and potentially the social attributes
  - CMP MLG report back
  - Rural issues WG report back to Committee: Review & decision re:SoW
  - Flood management info session (as suggested by Barbara)
- Stu invited any Committee comments, queries or additions at any time.
- Jamie Peryer (GW) was suggested as a useful person for the whole Committee to hear from.

## Appendix 1 – Initial WMUs for Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua







