

Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee

Meeting

9.2.2017

5-9pm at Plimmerton Pavilion

Summary

Contents

- Attendees
- Purpose
- Actions & general business to do

Meeting Notes	2
Session 1 – Karakia, Welcome, Getting ready.....	2
Session 2 Part 1 - Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Scenarios.....	3
Session 2 Part 2 - Scenarios and place.....	8
Session 3 – report back on Combined Modelling Project full workshop.....	10
Session 4 – Looking closer at proposed Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Scenarios Framework.....	11
Session 5 – Any Other Business.....	13

Workshop Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee:

Attendees Barbara, Diane, Dale, David, Larissa, John M, Sharli-Jo, Stu (Chair), Warrick

Apologies: Naomi, John G, Richard, Jennie

Project Team:

Brent, Grace, Hayley, Isabella, Murray, Nicci, Sheryl, Suze, Jon & Ned Norton
(CMP, Land Water People)

Members of the Public: Jenny Brash, Belinda Mackenzie-Dodds, Frances
Cawthorn, Phill Barker

Workshop The purposes of this workshop were:

purposes

1. Get familiar with the proposed framework for scenarios
2. To confirm the scenario framework

The purposes were achieved.

Meeting agenda

The meeting agenda was:

1. **Karakia, Welcome, Getting ready, Agenda** (Stu Farrant, Isabella Cawthorn) (5:00-5:15pm)

2. **TAoPW scenarios and place** (background - Hayley Vujcich, GWRC, small group workshopping, Committee, with Ned Norton, Land Water People) (5.15 – 6.45pm)

Dinner break (6.45 – 7.15pm)

3. **CMP Workshop Report Back** (John McKoy) (7.15 -7.30pm)

4. **TAoPW scenarios – looking closer** (small group workshopping, Committee, continued) (7.30 – 8.45pm)

5. **Any other business, New Year processes and karakia** (Stu Farrant) (8.45 – 9.00pm)

Meeting Close 9.00pm

Actions and general business to do

Scenarios framework

By next Committee meeting:

- Project team: find some alternative wording for “urban development area”
- Clarify framework language i.e. bronze, silver & gold vs. new terminology (current, improved, water sensitive)

Field trips

By next Committee meeting:

- Project team: develop some proposals for field trips

Transmission Gully

By next Committee meeting:

- Project team: find out more about change in cap on open earthworks, and how to inform Committee
- Set up Field Trip

Meeting notes

Session 1 - Karakia, Welcome, Getting ready

(Stu Farrant, Sharli-Jo Solomon, Isabella Cawthorn)

Sharli-Jo opened the evening with the karakia, and Stu welcomed the Committee back from the seven-week summer break.

He spoke of the challenges facing the Committee and project team this year, such as a step up in the complexity and quantity of information needing to be processed. He observed that a matching step up will be needed from Committee in terms of understanding the material and engaging in discussions.

Stu finished with a brief report-back on the field-walk that some Committee members had chosen to do just before the meeting to Taua Tapu Track, overlooking the Northern Growth Area of potential urban development. He noted that urban development – both its spatial extent and its characteristics

- is a major determinant of water quality in the whitua, and one of the most challenging and significant areas for the Committee's focus.

Committee members then shared a pleasant memory from the seven-week break in Committee meetings (summer weather outside Wellington was a recurring theme), and something members were looking forward over the coming year.

Session 2 Part 1 - Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Scenarios

(Hayley Vujcich, GWRC)

Important: see Hayley's presentation "Next steps for scenarios - 9 February 2017" in Whaitua Committee shared workspace. See also one pager on Proposed Scenario Framework

This session's purposes were:

- to introduce the proposed framework for organising scenario material
- to get a solid understanding of this, enhanced by the subsequent mapping activity

See Hayley's presentation

Why scenario modelling & what it's not

- Ultimate purpose of modelling: generate information to help Committee make decisions in the Whaitua Implementation Plan (WIP)
- Testing the scenarios might include both:
 - things you currently do and don't want to have in the final package
 - things that you may not want – that you're uncomfortable with.
- Several good reasons to test options you're not comfortable with
- Also NOTE: the scenario packages are not policy packages.
- They may (unlikely) or may not (far likelier) represent what you'll actually land on in your WIP – most likely that Committee will pick and mix from within multiple scenarios to create ultimate package.

Testing scenario content: helps us fill in the rest of the pictures

- Scenario modelling gives us some information on what we'd probably get if we kept managing things in different ways – including the way we're managing currently.
 - the meandering path of messy reality - helps us be informed to pick objectives and management methods out of the array of potentials.
- Note – attributes are the measures by which we test how the catchment and its people fare in the scenarios.

Scenario work so far:

- By Committee/ working groups: 3 quite different pieces of work
- Committee charged PT with developing the WG material with modellers and Wellington Water (WW)
- Since then the project team has:
 - Reviewed working group scenario material
 - Examined Committee questions
 - Raised ideas for a new framework for organising scenario material
- Advice from Modelling Leadership group on 2016 working group outputs is that:
 - Committee's management options all make sense
 - Very few can't be modelled
 - Alternative approach for some options – e.g. testing these outside the modelling architecture – to get information on their impacts
 - 'Urban development area' could be used as starting point for

framework

- Options can be tested in an 'additive way'
- Model assumes all practices are adopted – 100% uptake

**Variable 1:
development
area**

- Refer to *one-pager on Scenarios Framework* and to Hayley's presentation slides 8-10
- Spatial extent of "developed" vs "not developed" land (ratio) is one characteristic that defines different scenarios.
- Four different manifestations:
 - Existing growth:
 - development areas in district plans
 - Identified further growth:
 - all 'existing growth', plus likely areas
 - 'Restricting' and 'Expanding growth':
 - Based on 'further growth' area
 - TBC by Committee with technical input

**Variable 2:
land and
water practice**

- Refer to Hayley's presentation slide 8, 12-13
- Second characteristic that defines different scenarios: quality of land and water management practice from water quality perspective.
- Practices means everything that's done – practices of rural operations, practices of urban development, practices of stormwater and wastewater management
- There are now three qualities of land and water practice: 'Current', 'Improved' and 'Water sensitive'.
 - Current is BAU(more information to come)
 - 'Improved' and 'Water sensitive' - specifically what they are – what detail is in there, and how the material from last year's scenario work distributes across each- this is TBC by Committee with technical input.
- It's the work of the next few meetings to back fill with management options.

**Scenarios
work to come**

- Build on today's discussion and workshopping, and start filling in the content of scenarios:
 - Defining specifics of different "water sensitive" and "improved" practices across rural land, urban development, stormwater management, wastewater management
 - Defining spatial extent (delineations) and densities of the 'restricted' and 'expanded' development areas
- Scenarios need to be handed to modellers by March 2017
- 10/12 scenarios are up for the committee to define – really 9 as scenario 9 about retrofitting into already-built places which is very difficult to achieve.

**Defining
"practices"**

- In the rural area, practice must also be defined. What is happening in the rural areas? Is there lots of retirement into gorse? Revegetation mānuka / honey industry? More sheep?
- Also need to understand impacts of different practices - e.g. Scenario 5 – what effect does "improved" land management practice have on rural land?
- Questions:
 - Q: Shouldn't we separate rural from urban & model separately?
 - A: ultimately they will be modelled separately, but the framework architecture combines it so we have a full catchment picture.
 - We are trying to find a way to conceptualise all land & water management activity – it's all captured under "practice" of one

kind or another.

- All working groups' scenario material (everything that's better than BAU) will fit somewhere under "improved" and "water sensitive" practice.
- Q: Language is problematic – is there a better way to describe land area than by "urban"?
- A: There will be – we'll find it!

Current policy & expectations

- Several questions about whether existing growth can be affected by the decisions of the Committee – noting that people are already starting to make investment decisions (e.g. buying land) based on what they think the rules will be; potentially a risk of litigation if people's expectations are frustrated, or at least a risk of people being confused if two plans are in force (Natural Resources Plan (NRP) and District Plans) with different directions.
- Responding discussion:
 - The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) has set mandatory national policy direction of "maintain or improve water quality", but policy under that operationalises "maintain or improve", is missing right now.
 - There's lots of policy in District Plans and so forth that covers the activities that affect water quality, but they weren't created with this new national obligation in mind.
 - Due diligence applies as it would for any investment.
- There's a "pipeline" of planning from high-level strategic documents (such as structure plans) through to very specific zoning (in operational district plans).
- Only when zoning is imposed that allows for land-use change (e.g. rural to residential) do landowners get a right created, and an entitlement to some certainty about being allowed to develop if they keep to the rules around that.
- "Identified further growth" areas have not yet been zoned for development – there is no right to develop yet.
- NB: Wellington's Northern Growth areas (Lincolnshire Farm, Stebbings Valley development) zoned in the District Plan for development. These fall into "existing growth" in our scenarios. It's hard for the whitua process to affect these.
- Porirua's Northern Growth Areas have not yet been zoned for development.
- There is more opportunity for our work to affect urban development areas not yet zoned for in a District Plan.
- PCC is working on the District Plan review, including a gap around the coast / harbour, and a new chapter is being envisaged. The whitua outcome may inform this component, depending on timing.
- Developers are free to do better environmental performance than the minimum required in the district plan.

Restrict or expand urban development

- See Hayley's presentation - slides 9 to 10
- Questions:
- Is expansion of urban growth extent or restricting it in the Committee's / WIP's power at all - isn't it outside the NRP and in Territorial Authorities' (TAs') jurisdiction, and has already been decided that it'll increase?
 - Is defining spatial extent for scenario testing therefore trying to guess what councillors will decide?

Responding discussion:

- Porirua’s population increase (population growth) will occur – we are using Forecast.id regional projections (based on StatisticsNZ national projections) as are all the TAs.
- Area (spatial extent) of land developed: restrictions or expansions will be decided and implemented via District Plans – so yes it is TAs’ jurisdiction but it must be done to “maintain or improve water quality”. Water quality impacts are the question, and WIP is the link between the two
- Clarity of where rural residential development fits in can be hard – it will be modelled through both change in land use change where it’s new and through the practice that is attributed to it as a land use.
- Whether rural residential put in “urban” or “rural” doesn’t matter as long as we are clear & consistent

What scenarios tell us

- Q: Won’t the difference between “restricted” and “expected” need to be dramatic – e.g. restrict growth by 30%?
- A: our decisions about management options need to have information on the magnitude of change in outcomes from doing something different.
- For example if modelling shows that restricting urban development by 30% will achieve minimal change, clearly no point in pursuing that. If it shows that there’s heaps of improvement in water quality from reducing urban development by a little bit – it’s clearly a critical piece of the puzzle.

- Q: Can we do anything to improve water performance of ‘existing’ urban development areas?
- A: Current rules operate over existing development area – we can’t do much about development that’s already underway.
- We can make direct recommendations to the regional plan that may affect new urban development.
- Scenario modelling will enable us to see what it will mean for the catchment if we keep doing what we’re doing.

- Q: there is an assumption of 100% compliance – how sensible is that?
- A: Modellers tell us we must assume 100% compliance – a management option is assumed to be fully implemented as described. This will give us information on this option’s impact on water quality.
- Later, in the policy tools / methods discussion, we can start sorting out the ways to achieve that (finding most effective, efficient, equitable policy tools).

Modelling transparently: “additive” approach

There were several questions about the “additive approach” – what that meant and how it would be modelled. Members observed how significant a gap exists about what “water sensitive” and “improved” practice actually is, the complexity the models will need to tackle, and the importance of sensitivity testing.

Responding discussion:

- We want the models to produce results which are understandable and able to be unpacked so we can see what actions are causing what effect (if any) on water quality. Individual actions can then be identified as having large or minor impacts and the Committee can select those that provide the best return on effort.

Current practice & BAU

- There were several questions about BAU and current practice, including things we “know” already.
Responding discussion:
- We don’t yet know exactly what we’ll get if we continue current practices. We have some pretty good hunches, but we don’t actually know: how bad or good will that be for water? And our attributes?

- BAU 1 & 2 scenarios will tell us what we will get, over time. Modelling will show:
 - The ‘baseline’ state of the attributes identified by the Committee, showing the impact of past and current land and water practices, and
 - The impact on those attributes of continuing current practices out to 2050 and 2080
- BAU is complex because practice is not static – e.g. WW has network optimisation work underway – so we need to be careful. This is why having TAs and WW in the rooms is important.
- There were several questions about whether the current wastewater system capacity would automatically limit urban growth, and whether we have information from Wellington Water (WW) on this.
Responding discussion:
 - We could for example say to WW – we would like to see no more than 5 overflows p.a. (to take a random number) – then we would need WW to tell us what the cost is of achieving that.
 - if we run out BAU – we will be able to tell you about the likely future number of overflows etc. from the wastewater network.
 - Similarly we’ll be able to see – if we did that same population growth in a water sensitive way – e.g. treatment plant upgrades, improvements to the network, source control – what the costs of doing that would be, and the effect on
 - If from a financial cost perspective something is totally unaffordable, then that scenario might not make sense – but we need to find that out.
 - As far as information goes – recall Steve Hutchison’s Dec 1 presentation on the master plan for Porirua.

Network capacity: a limitation on development?

Assumptions

- Q: does climate change factor in this?
- A: Yes it is factored in – increased intensity of rainfall etc. Using NIWA projections – best information available.
- Q: are we assuming existing population will stay constant?
- A: no we’re using a population growth projection – using the same population trajectory across scenarios
- Slower or faster population growth scenarios are not used – going with the one from Forecast.id agreed by PCC, WCC, WWL, GWRC
- In other words, the increase of people remains constant across scenarios – land use is the variable.

Scenario Example

The following is a worked example of a scenario:

- *Modelling would look at before and after an area of new urban development.*
- *Collaborative Modelling Project (CMP) would run this in the modelling using a current map versus a future one, and that the future one could have two forms i) with BAU effort in urban development, stormwater, wastewater, rural activity and ii) with water sensitive design effort in all those.*
- *An output from modelling would be predicted changes in sedimentation rate, as a consequence of the new urban area, under type i and type ii levels of effort.*
- *We would then describe that further in terms of what it meant for shellfish beds and also mahinga kai value.*

- *A related pair of outputs would be the costs of the two levels of effort above (i and ii) and what they might mean for things like rates and other things.*
 - *The point is that all this info allows the merits of each level of effort to be explored. Modelling gives the Committee information – they are able to say yes it's worth doing that, or no it isn't worth it, on balance.*
-

Session 2 part 2 - Scenarios and place

(Ned Norton, Land Water People)

See Ned's presentation in Whaitua Committee shared workspace

Session purposes:

- Gather information on Committee's important locations in whaitua, for modelling team

Ned introduced the concept of modelling reporting points.

Modellers need to know which places in the whaitua are important to Committee – i.e. what places people want to have a proverbial finger on the pulse of water quality.

Modellers will recommend a set of reporting points for this whaitua, modellers can be informed by committee's suggestions as well as by biophysical and historic criteria that determined existing points.

Committee members broke into two groups, and identified their top 10 freshwater and marine locations of significance, with reasons why.

Members invited visiting members of the public to contribute to these discussions.

Ned and the modellers will take the Committee maps and come back to Committee with recommended modelling reporting points.

Photos of the maps are at Appendix 1.

Dinner break

Session 3 – report back on Collaborative Modelling Project full workshop

(John McKoy, Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee, Brent King, GWRC)

This session was for John and Jennie Smeaton (absent) to report back from their observations of the first workshop of the full CMP team. Brent added some comments with an overview of the CMP.

Key points from the session are below.

John explained:

- Attending the modellers' workshop was important because outputs from modelling process are vitally important for Committee – necessary for TAoPWC to come up with sensible decisions - so members need confidence in this process.
- Came alongside the session thinking "is this going to give us what we need?" and came away very impressed.
- Entire modelling team (not just the lead group) were there, and the process of introducing them to whaitua project gave a lot of confidence. They're getting the right information,

taking the right approach, making sure they are aware of the outputs Committee require. They are in tune with what Committee need.

Brent added:

- Workshop marked the real beginning of the full CMP getting into gear following completion of engagement last year. Committee can look at who is now on the team (see the attachment sent with this meeting's materials).
- Each component of modelling is technical and the work briefs have had to be written around this but this project really relies on the connections between the modellers – so ran an exercise at the workshop to reveal this.
- Another workshop focus was the BAU – running this through will be a very useful first exercise for CMP.
- Final focus was the communications protocol – to make sure we (PT and modellers) are communicating well amongst ourselves – every 2 weeks either written reports or skype meetings.
- MLG and PT are the main conduits from CMP to the Committee, to manage information.

Q: When will modelling produce results:

A: April/May for BAU and July/Aug/September for other scenarios – some components take longer than others

Q: so apparent that there are some models that are able to deliver clear impacts and then others that will take longer?

A: yes and remember the additive approach – we are then able to unpack the results.

Session 4 – Looking closer at the proposed Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Scenarios Framework

Session purposes:

- To dig deeper into the proposed framework, and surface issues
- To confirm the Framework

Overview of session:

- Committee members broke into three groups, and had in-depth discussions about the proposed scenario framework facilitated by Ned, Sheryl and Hayley. The groups discussed how the framework works, what its implications are, and how it relates to the previous arrangements of scenario material.
- Each group generated a summary of its views of the proposed framework to report back, with aspects that they were comfortable with and aspects causing discomfort. “Discomfort” included both “I don’t understand this” and “I understand but I don’t like it”.
- Groups reconvened as a plenary to discuss and process their findings together, and make a decision about using the framework.

The small groups’ outputs are below, with the areas causing discomfort arranged in the loose groupings the group identified during initial plenary discussion.

Aspects of scenario framework with which there is comfort:

- Open and community led
- ‘Land and water use practice’, contingent on high understanding of ‘improved’ and ‘water sensitive’
- Similar principles to Gold and Silver
- Evidence based approach
- Concept of ‘Development Area’
- Existing growth and identified growth

- Comfortable with overall framework
- Concept as discussed in room - not as written

Aspects of scenario framework causing discomfort:

Grouping:

- That alternative frameworks were not presented so they weren't sure whether alternatives had been considered and/or what they were
- Needs to be teased out further (develop what Hayley presented)
- Need to adjust to new terminology and make it meaningful. Uncertain about how it works (there is a lot to work through)
- Whether only having 'improved' and 'water sensitive' categories will capture full range of meaningful outcomes (depending on model sensitivity)
- Haven't gone into detail and will need to fill out a lot further - content
- 'Water sensitive' label - can see the equivalent ideas in rural
- Examples needed to help understand. Uncertainty of expanding growth extent
- Scenarios may limit combination of possible options that may achieve same outcome

Grouping:

- Language is urban focused rather than on overall land use or rural :(

Grouping:

- Relationship with our brief (what can we really influence - district plans, TAs, Wellington Water).
- Other tools than (fixed) rules.
- Level of aspiration vs what is achievable

Grouping:

Losing the community - we have to manage risk + developers.
Key points from the discussion are below.

Exploration & content There were questions about how the framework would work:

- The additive approaches mean that we're not going to get 12 boxes and pick one entire one. Combinations and permutations of different management actions will be done, so we need to be sure that "improved" practice is actually the medium level, and "water sensitive" is aspirational but pragmatic ... it must all be meaningful.
- And if someone questions us on how we did this, we need a sound rationale.
- We need a starting point from which to launch.

Responding discussion:

- The framework is under construction – it needs a little faith that it will end up being a workable structure. We are building the meandering path as we walk on it.
- It could help to think of the framework and scenario modelling as an exploration first, and after getting the scenario modelling results – what's looking good or bad - we can then test all the good bits to find the best solution.
- The solution will not be any one of scenarios 1 to 12 – it is the exploration afterwards where you recombine all the good bits discovered.

Framework: origins, Goldilocks

- There were questions about the two basic variables as a way to organise the management options and what alternative frameworks had been tried / discarded.
- Responding discussion:
 - PT has done a lot of work with CMP and WW in the last 6 weeks investigating how to arrange scenario material. There weren't lots of

alternatives considered, rather that this framework felt like a significantly more workable and manageable way to do it.

- Q: By adding another column of practice levels – is that 50% more work? More expense? Is there a reason to keep it short?
- A: it isn't just extra work – some models could easily do more columns – but it is how much complexity committee wants to deal with. 12 scenarios is a manageable number – in the Goldilocks zone (not too many, not too few), given the purpose which is supposed to be exploration and providing information to Committee rather than limiting or narrowing down now.
- Modelling outputs will show which areas will get best bang for buck, and on that basis Committee can decide which management options to pick and choose.

Tolerable discomfort, & trust

- There was general agreement that most members were not feeling wholly comfortable with the framework but were happy to go forward given what they had heard and discussed.
- If GW can give assurance that this will deliver the outputs Committee need then go for it – it looks efficient and effective as an exploratory tool. We don't really need to understand specifically how the project team got to it – as long as there is assurance and we trust you.
- It seems simpler to understand than the first arrangements of scenarios. It isn't the end game – it is the beginning.

DECISION: The Committee agreed to proceed with the proposed scenario framework with proviso that areas of discomfort, such as language bias towards urban development, will be explored.

The remaining areas of discomfort were then discussed.

Community & stakeholder engagement

There was discussion around the risks people highlighted about bringing the community along, and engaging with stakeholders.

Points included:

- The difficulty of engaging with the community – people are generally uninformed, there's challenge in getting them up to speed to contribute meaningfully.
- People will, if they want, discuss their development with a developer; if water sensitivity is going to cost more, why would they pursue it?
- There are multiple barriers and incentives to change
- Committee is due to hear back about the discussion around stakeholder engagement; it is on the agenda for 2 March

Relationship with our brief

- There were questions about areas where the existing rules appear not to be changeable – are we looking at writing off existing urban areas for improvement?
 - No – it's harder than new development for sure, but there are other ways to bring about change that don't involve rules (education, supporting investment etc.) that we can explore. That is in the policy discussion phase.
- Q: what about treading on the TAs' territory – what's the relationship with their progress?
 - A: This is one of the dimensions of stakeholder engagement and the partnership, and is related to community engagement too. It'll be part of the conversation next meeting.

Language – bias Q: The use of “[urban] development area” as the label for the spatial axis is problematic. It generates an unconscious bias towards a focus on urban areas.
A: there are plenty of other ways to label that axis – we can find others.

ACTION: PT to find alternative language for spatial variable

The final part of the substantive session was about process.

Discomfort: raise it

- A level of uncertainty will always be with us in this process because we are trying to understand immensely complex systems, so we will never feel completely comfortable and secure.
- That said, peoples’ unease usually exists for a good reason. In consensus processes, it’s especially valuable and important to surface unease so causes can be discussed.
- If uneasy, please say something – fine to do so without suggestions for how to fix it, or not being able to articulate unease precisely. All channels are open: through the Chair, through Project Team anytime, anonymously on paper via the small black box (to be present at all Committee meetings).

Committee ideas sought

- As per Alastair’s email, our next meeting has a whole session on process, plus a Project Team planning meeting to which you’ll all be invited.
- Ahead of these meetings, please put your thinking caps on about ways to make our Committee meetings better.
- Please also think laterally: **other ways outside Committee meetings** to get better engaged with the material, better engaged with other’s perspectives.
- Options such as: small field trips, larger field trips, “kitchen table” conversations, meetings without Project Team, and more.
- If there’s something you believe would deepen comfort with process, or content, or people please let Project Team member know.
- Field trips: Current ideas include Hayley’s wastewater trip (Cannon’s Creek Lakes to the treatment plant), and Transmission Gully (TG Community Liaison and Stakeholder Engagement Manager has contacted PT offering field trips). There was strong interest in both areas, and Project Team will come back with options to Committee.

New approach

Finally there was some comment from members about trust and the new approach (this meeting compared with 2016).

- There was concern last year that this group was supposed to come up with first principles material. A much better approach to use in future is– Project Team going away and working off committee material and with the experts, and bringing back a proposal which we talk through and discuss our comfort and discomfort.
- If we’re going to make real progress [Committee] can’t understand all the processes by which every Project Team and modelling decision is made. This seems a much better way forward.
- There is going to be a whole lot of information amongst the modellers that will be very technical so there does need to be trust – and we [Committee] will have to be a lot more engaged with that material.

Transmission Gully

There was a brief discussion about Transmission Gully, noting that TG have sought (and GWRC granted) to raise the cap on the maximum allowable area of open earthworks. Committee members were very interested in this. The discussion included observations of:

- the increased risk of sediment runoff
- TG still have to stay within their consent conditions
- TAoPWC cannot affect the conditions of granted consents
- it is very interesting to people who care about water quality
- TAoPWC can't effect change but can embolden the TG staff to learn from new approaches and can provide examples of good and bad practice

ACTION: GWRC find out more about the earthworks change, consider the best way to pass information to Committee (noting the paucity of Committee meeting time).

Session 5 – Any Other Business

(Stu Farrant, chair)

- Sharli-Jo informed those in attendance of the Porirua Harbour Clean-up – all welcome
 - Tues Feb 28, 5pm, Postponement date Wed 29th Feb 6pm – to coincide with the super low tide
 - Meet at the north end of Pirates' Cove mini-golf
 - Everyone welcome – something for everybody
 - Old clothes, gloves, don't wear white, old shoes recommended
 - We will be pulling cones, tyres etc. – also small land-based rubbish.
- Future meetings:
 - Christine and Amanda (PCC and GWRC Parks reps) have relevant information for Committee and will be rescheduled at an appropriate time. They also received apology gifts from Project Team for being bumped from December 1st agenda.
- Next meeting topics:
 - Scenarios – content
 - Process discussion:
 - Consensus and what it means
 - Opportunities to improve meetings
 - Big-picture timeline for Committee
 - Community and stakeholder engagement - proposal from PT

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm.

Appendix 1:
Maps of TAOPWC's proposed modelling reporting points

