

Whaitua Kāpiti Committee hui

6th December 2023

Venue: Kotare Room, Ramaroa Centre, Whareroa

Committee members present:

Mana Whenua Whare

Dr. Mahina-a-rangi Baker (Taurite) – Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust

Dr. Aroha Spinks – Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki

Naomi Solomon – Ngāti Toa Rangatira

Sharlene Maoate-Davis – Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust

Kāwanatanga House

Jenny Rowan (Taurite) – Kāpiti Coast community representative

Jocelyn Prvanov – Kāpiti Coast District Councillor

Kerry Walker – Kāpiti Coast community representative

Pātaka Moore – Kāpiti Coast community representative

Monique Leith, Kāpiti Coast community representative

Committee members apologies:

Mana Whenua Whare

Shane Parata – Ngāti Toa Rangatira

Caleb Royal – Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki

Kāwanatanga House

Penny Gaylor – Greater Wellington Regional Councillor

Facilitator:

Dr. Kathie Irwin, Greater Wellington Regional Council Contractor (Kathie Irwin & Associates), Tangata Whenua Whare

Kaimahi present:

Mana Whenua whare

Claire Gibb – Mana Whenua Whare Coordinator, Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust

Torrey McDonnell - Planner, GWRC Contractor (Incite)

Aaria Dobson-Waitere

Dr. Russell Death - Professor of Freshwater Ecology

Mana Whenua kaimahi Rob van Duivenboden – Consultant for Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai

Kāwanatanga House

Michele Frank – Catchment Manager Kāpiti Coast, Catchment, GWRC

Phill Barker – Senior Policy Advisor, Environmental Policy, GWRC

Ames Donovan (Minutes) – Senior Catchment Advisor, GWRC

Brent King – Team Leader Evaluation & Insights, GWRC

Chloë Nannestad – Policy Advisor, GWRC
Adele Dawson – Planner, GWRC Contractor (Incite)
Rita O’Brien – Stormwater & Coastal Engineer, Kāpiti Coast District Council

9:30 am – Start

1. Kārakia, Mihi and Welcome

2. Bottom-lines and targets - Mana Whenua Whare presentation

Mana Whenua

- The goal of this session is to go through each of the attributes to record the decisions the committee are making for each.
 - To look at current state across each FMU and what needs improvement
 - Are there particular attributes and measures of health that are poor across the district, as this flags systemic issues we need to address
 - Explore drivers
 - Draft recommendations for WIP and to make through the Plan Change
 - Test this with our model
- The committee has changed tack and moved out of the values-based policy side of the decisions into the technical side of things, the science, and numbers.

Dr Russell Death

- I have started with the big model and where there is existing data and modelling. Looked at other Whaitua decisions and my sense is that the committee need to go through all the attributes and decide what the committee would like them to be for each FMU. Currently constrained by the NPS-FM, i.e., dissolved phosphorous, the committee doesn't need to make decisions, and same for fine sediment, as the national levels are adequate.
- The one issue is nitrate levels. My understanding that the committee will at least want to maintain but for many of the lower reaches you want to improve that state.
- NPS-FM there are three measures for ecological health. NCI is familiar measure. Prefers QCI as it takes in an abundance of measures and more reflective of the situation. MCI can confuse things. Most of the science and data is based on macroinvertebrate health.
- Other things, like freshwater fish and mahinga kai are linked to this measure too. Once the model builds, we can develop. Started where I have the most information and there is a huge amount of science around this from 25 years of research. Useful place to start, looking at the current state and then the nitrates will impact the health of the water ways and macroinvertebrates.

Mana Whenua

- Model will tell the committee how the attributes interact and influence the likely state.
- Can start to look at decisions and make recommendations. The NPS-FM details the bottom line is for the attributes and we added on heavy metals and campylobacter in water, if we, the committee, looked at achieving the bottom line of those attributes,

that doesn't necessarily take into account what is needed to impact macroinvertebrates as they interact, so there might be a need to lift some of the attributes measures as they require a higher state of health.

- The committee also need to set target attributes. Bottom line not good enough to achieve the other measures that we want to achieve. That's the work of the model.

Russell Death

- Map visualises the report grading of streams. Up in the Tararua Ranges the water is good, in native forest, and then it deteriorates as it makes its way downstream. The streams go from being very healthy to not so healthy.

Discussion

Kāwanatanga: We need to understand what decisions we, the committee, are making and where we received the information from to make decisions.

Mana Whenua: Based on the State of the Environment monitoring provided from GW and likely to be from KCDC too.

Dr Russell Death: The model uses algorithm learner tool that determines relationships. Some of the bands are ones that I've developed because if the committee went for NPS-FM figures you wouldn't make the improvements you want to see. These are medians over a three-year period.

Kāwanatanga: Could we receive push back because we are setting figures more restricted than the NPS-FM? If so, I'm ok with that.

DRD: Yes, to make the improvements you want to see you'd need to.

Kāwanatanga: Does the model tell us if we use the figure that it will improve things by a certain percentage?

DRD: Yes, it shows the Mana Whenua kaimahi ability of what the improvement would be as a percentage.

Mana Whenua: From what I am hearing, the first consideration for our committee is: do we all agree that we want a stricter measure across the catchment with the outcome being improving our waterways? I see no purpose in this if we are just going with the national standards. So maybe a suggestion before we proceed is to agree that's what the committee would like to do?

DRD: Kāpiti already have some sites that are below the national standards and my understanding is that councils are required to do something at those sites to improve them. Suggest the committee starts at the bottom of the MCI and QMCI for each of the FMUs and set them.

Confirmed that the model can then be applied across all Kāpiti.

Mana Whenua: The model allows us to understand the likelihood of attributes states changing based on land use changes.

DRD: If the catchment is indigenous, nitrates low, good health, not impact deposited sediment (still get a lot). High intensity e.g. dairy farming, low is sheep and beef, the

model doesn't include horticulture and I have no information downstream of lifestyle blocks so I can't include it.

Mana Whenua: Also, keeping in mind the model doesn't include ground water and wetlands.

DRD: When I get info on riparian zones, that will come in between deposited sediment and land use and will impact the measures. This is the first step in a bigger model. I think it would be useful to debate the thresholds here.

Mana Whenua: Think we, as the committee, could make recommendations and test them against Russell's thinking. What we are doing here is playing with the specific reasons for why we are setting them at a set level.

DRD: Suggest the committee identify the objectives you want to achieve, so like the headwater at Ōtaki, you'd say maintain current state but further down you will decide what band for the MCI and QMCI you want and how feasible they are. Then you work backwards.

Mana Whenua: The committee will then set timeframes. This comes in around deciding our management options.

Kāwanatanga: It's important that the committee comes out of this discussion with measures higher than the national average.

DECISION: Agreed that the Te Tiriti House want to see targeted attributes that are above the national average and make a difference to water quality, not just maintain it.

Mana Whenua: What impact does urban land use have on nitrogen?

DRD: Not much but quite a limited amount of urban data.

Mana Whenua: A way to think about it is that as we, the committee, go through the FMUs we will know what the current states are so we can look at if we are achieving it and what can be tweaked and then we look at the management options, what could we feasibly intervene with.

DRD: Dr Mike Joy would agree that an 'A' for MCI and QMCI is a very healthy stream, his concerns centre on nitrates.

Kāwanatanga: It is difficult at this scale to see where the monitoring sites are. Previously the committee had asked for maps that were zoomed in.

ACTION: GW to provide detailed maps of the monitoring sites so the committee can review the location of the current monitoring sites.

Kāwanatanga: I'd assume that E. Coli affects macroinvertebrates?

DRD: No, it doesn't.

Mana Whenua: E. Coli isn't part of the model yet; the committee will make today's decisions based on what DRD has modelled so far. Does the committee set this for each FMU or do we do set it for all across the FMUs?

Recommend that, we the committee, set them for each FMU but if we have the benefit of these monitoring sites, we can use them to set our targets across everything we do. The assumption is that they provide a representative view of the other FMU sites. Does

knowledge around the relationships between deposited sediment and impact on macroinvertebrates exist?

DRD: I need to get data from outside of this region as most of the sites have lots of deposited sediment. The NPS-FM sediment guidelines are strict, and Kāpiti streams are miles from that. By law they need to be at 30% [deposited sediment cover].

Mana Whenua: There's the ability to do stuff to recover that area and upstream of it, there would be real benefit in elevating the deposited sediment above a D band, giving it a higher target and elevate that state for our plan.

Kāwanatanga: If the amount of suspended sediment was reduced then you would reduce the amount of deposited sediment.

10:45am Morning Tea (15 mins)

Kaimahi: Clarified that the proposed Kāpiti Targets table (refer 13 December minutes) includes metrics from two different sets of monitoring undertaken and it's displaying the worst of the measures as any improvement will drag both up together. One column is the baseline 2017 dates so we are maintaining from then, the minimum level you can set the target. The current state provides a more recent snapshot.

Kāwanatanga: Is QMCI or MCI better?

DRD: MCI around longer and councils seem to like it. A negative of the QMCI is that flooding effects it significantly, but I still think QMCI is a better measure.

Kāwanatanga: As the committee are considering whether to maintain or improve the standard, I am thinking about a statement made in the 1970s about Te Reo Māori, we had no one under 30 who could speak it and the saying was, "Help to decline or thrive". Think this is something the committee might want to think about it in this context of improving our waterways.

3. Current state

Compare the current states across each FMU to the bottom-lines and targets and identify what needs improvement.

- a) What specific FMUs?
- b) What attributes consistently need improvement across the Kāpiti Coast District?

Discussion:

DRD: Dissolved Reactive Phosphorous (DRP) doesn't have same impact on macroinvertebrates and human health in the way that nitrates levels do.

Mana Whenua: Russell's model shows that native land use is quite typical and there isn't much change that could be affected by elevating the state with dissolved levels of phosphorous.

Mana Whenua: The model doesn't have a nuance where you look at each of the five sites and works out a percentage for each land use - it is determined based on what is the main land use upstream from a monitoring point.

Mana Whenua: The committee are looking at the current state of the water and what we want to get it to and then we look at the current state of land use and what we need to change.

Kāwanatanga: Why would we not want to improve each grade?

Mana Whenua: The question is what would this impact be in real terms? And Russell is saying there wouldn't be much impact. If the committee sets that as a 'B', that becomes the level for the whole FMU.

Kāwanatanga: How many monitoring sites will we have in each FMU? Because if it's not being measured, we won't know what's happening.

Facilitator: Let's add location of the monitoring sites to a carpark.

ACTION: Review of the location of the monitoring sites added to a carpark for follow up.

Discussion:

*** The notes below detail the start of the discussion around the Freshwater Management Unit Target Setting, which also took place at the 13 December Kāpiti Whaitua Whare meeting. For a visual representation of this information, please refer to the tables in Appendix 1 of the 13 December minutes ***

Waitohu FMU

DRD: An 'A' based on nitrate toxicity still means the awa health isn't high. You are going to have to reduce that nitrate level well below 2.4 to have any impact on ecological health.

The committee can improve water on top but heavy sediment will wipe macroinvertebrates out. A higher QMCI could be set but changing the nitrate level isn't going to be the management solution because of the heavy sediments.

Mana Whenua: Digging out sediment is very impactful, creates flooding issues.

Kāwanatanga: When the Waitohu is referred to as soft-bottomed, are we talking about the Norfolk DRD monitoring point, or in the waters above us? Those are two very different things to me. Important to note that the Norfolk Road site is the more representative site for the FMU target attribute states of the sites presented. (Noting the gravel bottom nature of the stream at the site).

DRD: This is characterised as soft-bottomed according to MfE.

Kāwanatanga: But upstream is hard-bottomed. For the monitoring sites discussion, might need more sites to capture better understanding of the stream.

DRD: Most regional councils have downstream monitoring sites in FMUs, rather than in the middle. There is no reason why the committee can't have a parameter in here about Dissolved Inorganic Nitrate (DIN) threshold that is about awa health and not just toxicity.

Mana Whenua: Let's come back to that as a decision for the Te Tiriti House. There is a decision to be made around whether to increase baseline D, and move it to C.

DRD: Does the committee want to go for the minimum or be more aspirational? An MCI that's a 'D' is in a bad way, I'd consider it a dead awa. Once it's that bad it's almost where do you start to fix it? A 'C' is what people with low aspirations would go for. It's the minimum. 'B' is slightly aspirational. If I put my pragmatic hat on it's what I'd like to see for all our farming waterways. An 'A' is realistically only going to be attainable in national parks and heavily forested catchments.

Mana Whenua: If we aim for an 'A' a 'B' might follow.

Mangaone FMU

Mana Whenua: The first baseline is a 'B' for nitrate toxicity, Mike Joy gave the committee clear feedback that this isn't a good measure.

DRD: If you think about alcohol, for it to be toxic you must drink a lot, but a lesser amount can still make you sick. It's the difference between a poison and just impacting on your health. So, suggest the committee keeps it lower, so it doesn't become a poison. While advice from advisory group recommended that dissolved nitrogen was adopted, only toxicity made it into the final NPS-FM.

12pm: Aroha Spinks leaves.

Mana Whenua: To be clear DRD is proposing that there is another way to measure nitrate and based on the work we've circulated, is suggesting adopting DIN, which is a different measure to nitrate toxicity.

Kaimahi: There is another section about nutrients, so the committee must develop a DIN and DRP to achieve your nutrient dependent attributes. So that's the other avenue. So those nutrients became attributes, and they are considerably lower than nitrate toxicity.

Mana Whenua: The committee used the guidance to determine what the DIN should be to achieve the periphyton target that had been set.

DRD: My experience is that it is very difficult to manage periphyton as it changes so much. Whereas I find QMCI and MCI much more stable. There is also little monitoring of periphyton in Kāpiti, which would be a gap.

Kāwanatanga: In the paper it says that DIN is inorganic dissolved nitrogen.

DRD: DIN is made up of nitrate, nitrogen and ammonia, but it gets converted to nitrate very quickly.

Mana Whenua: DRD's point is that it's easy to do the nitrate testing compared to periphyton.

Mana Whenua: Do we know what the difference in the numbers would be between nitrates and periphyton. Just thinking it would be hard for the committee to set their own periphyton levels as there aren't other people doing it. There is also little information so how would targets be set?

DRD: Would like to measure but hard to do that if we don't have the data.

Kāwanatanga: The periphyton is the biomass and that's organic. Whereas the DIN is inorganic. One way to conceptualise it is that periphyton is the grass and nitrate the fertiliser.

ACTION: For GW staff to bring back to the Committee the figures on median DIN across the FMUs (done during lunch break).

Mana Whenua: I'd like to recommend that we set a band for DIN based on the bands DRD has in his model and it could be a number. It doesn't have to be a band to avoid confusion as its not in the NPS-FM.

DRD: Yes, I would be uncomfortable making a band without knowing what the numbers are.

Mana Whenua: We can come back to this then.

DRD: Can you put alternative sediments measures on a stream where it was historically a gravel base?

Mana Whenua: Is the Waitohu classified as a soft-bottomed stream?

DRD: Yes.

Kāwanatanga: Incorrect; it's gravel-bottomed, under about a metre of silt and sludge.

DRD: The NPS-FM considers it soft-bottomed, so it won't have limits on deposited sediment; can we put them on it based on historical knowledge? Would have to be a percentage of fine sediment I think rather than A or B. Not sure how the plan would work with it. Sediment class 4.

Mana Whenua: Our elders also knew this as gravel-bottomed. Can our streams be reclassified?

Mana Whenua: Note for kaimahi: we could provide an objective that deals with deposited sediment to the target of A.

Kaimahi: To clarify, the site you select for monitoring, we want that to be representative of that FMU, so that's the site that drives the change. The management options that are taken to achieve the targets at that site will get applied everywhere, irrespective of whether streams are soft- or hard-bottomed.

Mana Whenua: Would it be useful to set the monitoring site at Norfolk Crescent? This would take care of this issue.

Kaimahi: You could decide to improve deposited sediment (this would look like a reduction) so that they return to historical state.

KCDC kaimahi: Even if soft-bottomed you'd still need to monitor sediment.

Kāwanatanga: Have we looked at the suspended sediments line? Yes.

Mana Whenua: We should make monitoring sites where they are representative of the issues that we want to reflect. Think we should be saying that Norfolk Crescent is a site.

Mana Whenua: In my mind we are trying to be aspirational so it should be a B.

DECISION: The committee agreed that deposited sediment should be a B.

Kamahi: Setting the target at site or for part of the FMU. In plan change 1 the target is set at a site and then the change that this requires is applied across the FMU, a management approach created across the whole area to meet that target. Particularly like the small streams that go from a forest to a coast go from A to C. There will be bits of the

catchment that might improve greater than other parts but what you are trying to do is improve the whole area.

Mana Whenua: So, we want it to be a little bit aspirational; if we set it too low then everything else goes down. Setting FMU targets across Macroinvertebrates, Deposited Sediment, DIN and DRP are we wanting to make them for the whole FMU? That's what we're required to do?

Kaimahi: No, you're required to set a target attribute state site at a chosen site for your FMU.

Mana Whenua: If we retain the decisions we've made, we've got them per site. It's also about whether these are the right monitoring stations but that's outside the scope of what we are deciding now. Also, by bringing new sites to the table we must recognise that we would need to repeat this process.

Kāwanatanga: What happens if the monitoring sites we want aren't ones that GW currently monitor? I don't want to spend hours talking about something that isn't going to happen. Can I please receive a reality check for the regional council on what we can do?

Kaimahi: It comes down to timing if it's not possible now.

Mana Whenua: I can't see a scenario where the site would impact the rating we would want to see.

LUNCH BREAK.

Waimeha FMU

Mana Whenua: Note that this is an urban environment FMU.

DRD: Urban environment can be affected by other contaminants which may or may not be measured by local councils.

Kāwanatanga: Where the monitoring site is positioned, is a soft-bottomed stream.

DRD: The challenge we have is a lot of streams were historically gravel but now with 100 years of agricultural land use loading them up with sediment, it is soft-bottomed.

Mana Whenua: I think we should make a recommendation on that as the NOF won't back us up. So we need to identify those streams we know are not naturally soft-bottomed, and also identify an attribute.

DRD: You would need to state that the streams are not as they are stated in the NPS-FM.

Mana Whenua: Can we set targets for sediment in these soft-bottomed streams?

DRD: For other attributes you can set more restrictive conditions.

Kāwanatanga: Do we want to return those that were to hard-bottomed streams?

KCDC Kaimahi: It's very hard to tell now as they have been smothered up. So, to put depth stuff down it's hard to find the gravel. I think it's kind of doable, especially to take some of that soft sediment out and then stopping more stuff going in. And it's important to do further investigation to understand the soil types, like Ōtaki, where there is little development but it's still filling up with sediment.

Mana Whenua: I think there is a pipeline of decisions for the committee. One message is that the committee is saying that with the Waimeha where the natural character of the stream was hard-bottomed, because we definitely need the non-regulatory but also the regulatory levers too. Maybe with handing over the plan change, we don't need to determine what that mechanism is and that council staff can integrate that into the plan change going forward. Can I confirm with staff that's correct?

Kaimahi: Yes.

Mana Whenua: DRD's recommendation on sediment is based on NPS-FM and ecological data.

DRD: 10-30% seems to be the threshold. 30% is some of the bottom of the stream still visible.

Mana Whenua: Visual assessment at a 20-metre reach so 40% means 40% of the bed is covered by sediment. What percentage is a B?

DRD: About 20% I think. Must remember that this is all washing out to sea as well, so we need nutrient limits too.

Kāwanatanga: So, the attribute can be attached to a soft-bottomed stream.

Mana Whenua: The counter to the aspirational goal is even just getting baseline metrics.

Mana Whenua: Could the committee be proposing that for the Waimeha B bands for macro, C for deposited fine sediment and A for the nitrates?

Mana Whenua: This is highlighting that the committee can't necessarily regulate what would be the key issues.

Waikanae FMU

DRD: Don't know how you would ever get an 'A' with this awa.

Kāwanatanga: I don't know what grades these 'A's are referring to as it's not the river I know.

Mana Whenua: I think if we get to the presentation we can look at exactly what are the Mana Whenua bits for this river. My view at this moment is that the significant lifting is from a 'D' to a 'C' and not from a 'B' to an 'A'.

Kāwanatanga: What GW spoke to us at the beginning and showed the results of their monitoring I thought that things were going downhill on the river.

Kāwanatanga: What would be done to lift an 'B' to an 'A' for the river?

DRD: Not sure how you could ever get it to an 'A' but I get the sense from the committee that there are questions about the quality of the 'A'.

Kāwanatanga: However, the 'A's are only applicable to a small portion of the river.

DRD: Think this could be reflective of the monitoring sites.

Kāwanatanga: I think we need to change how we monitor, it's currently not giving us the info that we need.

DRD: Invertebrates don't change regularly.

Mana Whenua: If we are happy with a 'B' is that also an indication that in particular areas where it might be urban that that level is achievable. So, if the Waikanae can get a 'B' why can't other rivers?

Mana Whenua: Highlighted that some large companies have consents to discharge gravel and sand into the river from Goodman Fielders and that was consented.

DRD: A lot of our streams are naturally high in phosphorous. My experience is that changing the nitrate levels will have a much better impact on ecosystem health than DRP.

DECISION: Nitrate A, Macro B, sediment A and DRP B and DIN 0.3.

Wharemauku FMU

- **Mana Whenua kaimahi Rob van Duivenboden joins online – Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai consultant.**

Mana Whenua: There is a lack of data here. I think the best we can do is to go through the attributes and with the assistance of the model make some decisions about the state we are aiming for and on the approach that DRD has been advocating for that we start with the MCI.

KCDC Kaimahi: I believe the modelled state, a 'C'. The stream gets warm, but there's a lot of fish. Not a lot of fish passage barriers.

Mana Whenua: The copper and zinc measures might be interesting here. Along with the sediment it might tell us what is going on.

Kāwanatanga: Intensification around Coastlands is going to be massive and add to sediment load. The stream needs to be cleaned.

DRD: A number of the tributaries are soft-bottomed.

Mana Whenua Kaimahi: recent observations say that the stream is hard-bottomed down to the motorway.

Mana Whenua: the issues for the committee are: the water level is too quick to rise and fall, low flood-carrying capacity, lots of sediment washing down, industrial contamination, E. coli, campylobacter, issues with contact, and no shading. The Kiwi Road site is big for us, connected to the expressway and an ex-market garden.

DECISION: Nitrate A, Macro B, C suspended sediment, DIN at .6 = B for MCI, a B for sediment, B for DRP.

Whareroa FMU

Mana Whenua: If we were to achieve a 'B' what would we need to drop down to?

DRD: 18% sediment.

Kāwanatanga: Stream comes out of DOC land, covered by trees, then in the park to the beach, it should be an A, it should be our top stream. No farming up there. So don't know where the sediment will be coming from.

Mana Whenua: Is it possible to even get sediment down to 9%?

DECISION: A's across the board.

Wainui and Paekākāriki:

Mana Whenua: Little data other than IBI and fish data.

Mana Whenua: Is the issue sediment in this area too?

Kāwanatanga: Did K&I access the NZTA data on the Waimeha.

Kaimahi: Confirmed it was.

Kāwanatanga: Is this soft-bottomed?

DRD: No, it's not.

DECISION: Nitrate A, MCI B, deposited sediment 27%, DRP A, DIN 0.3

DECISION: The committee will complete the remainder attribute values at the next meeting, with NHOO in attendance.

Mana Whenua: Given what we did for Whareroa, I think just all As on Kāpiti Island.

DECISION: All A's on Kāpiti Island.

Mana Whenua: The decisions around the targets we have made set the tone. Can there be an action where Russell recommends the targets set, we could adopt as a whole? We can separate out where there are targets that need to be set or attributes that aren't within Russell's model, like copper and zinc, then we can integrate NHOO targets and next week we should be able to complete all the targets for FMUs. What about the targets in terms of flow?

DRD: You could come up with attribute around minimum flows, minimum flood events. Plenty of hydrological attributes that could be set?

Mana Whenua: I get the allocations decisions will be ultimately constrained by flow.

DRD: I would suggest you look to get something in there about habitat. Inevitably what happens when you remove water you decrease habitat. 'Habitat' is critical for mahinga kai. It's a component of ecosystem health. But none of the local councils have adopted habitat quality index. Another critical component for awa health. I think it needs to be an attribute; you need to put a number on it. The HCI is a good measure of habitat quality.

DECISION: DRD to return with the proposed HCI attribute and what the number should be.

Mana Whenua: Does it duplicate MCI?

DRD: No, this is the one thing that will really protect Mahinga kai.

Mana Whenua: Could this be repeating the mahinga kai attribute?

DRD: Partially.

Mana Whenua: But our mahinga kai attribute does focus largely on tuna.

DRD: It is a component of ecosystem health that hasn't been covered by the NPS-FM.

Mana Whenua: It allows us to ensure that habitat isn't lost, is protected or remedial works required. It's very instructive in what to protect, regulate and restore.

- **Afternoon tea break**

4. Drivers: Part A (Verbal update provided by Incite on behalf of the Kāwanatanga)

We have investigated how land use can impact health. Undertaken some work on the current natural resources plan as to what you might be able to do, and, in the non-regulatory space.

We have attempted to provide some high-level analysis of each FMU, which doesn't include DRD's modelling data or mahinga kai. Also, some indicative timeframes of how long it might take to see change.

It's high level and the options need to be developed further with your local knowledge, and based on where you land on your attributes, they will be developed further through the Section 32 process.

Mana Whenua: The focus next time will be what should be in the plan change and the management options. The committee should be able to go through it all in advance of next week and then we can go through it by each FMU. The paper in front of you are the proactive recommendations from the Kāwanatanga.

Kaimahi: To clarify, the recommendations paper and management options papers are separate (recommendations paper had only been seen by the taurite at this point) – suggest that Kaimahi merge those papers and send through a list of recommendations for the Committee to discuss next hui.

Mana Whenua: It's going to be a big ask to finish off what we need to with DRD and going through all the FMU management decisions. We are more prepared to go through what we don't agree with as I don't think we will be able to go through FMU by FMU.

Kāwanatanga: The language needs to be tightened up. If these recommendations can be landed as action points, and who they will sit with. We don't want the woolly language.

DECISION: Kaimahi can be proactive and review all the recommendations and broken down by FMU where there is a need too. This can include the groundwater recommendations. This will guide the next meeting.

DECISION: The FMUs relevant to NHOŌ committee members, who aren't present, will be parked until the next committee meeting.

ITEM 5: Mana Whenua: Ki tai ki uta: as the kōkopu swims

Mana Whenua kaimahi provided a presentation on behalf of the Mana Whenua Whare (Please Refer to Appendix 1). Mana Whenua kaimahi is a consultant employed by Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai.

A significant catchment issue is sediment.

Kāwanatanga: Where has the data come from? Differs to what we reviewed today.

Mana Whenua kaimahi: Discharge data. The variation is likely to be attributable to sampling at different times.

Mana Whenua: And the different figures can be explained by the different monitoring sites could be different. Either way, it's not great habitat for the kōkopu.

Mana Whenua kaimahi: The Mazengarb Stream has several toxicity issues, hormone type chemicals – organic contaminants of concern and the Dissolved Oxygen is very poor. The headwaters house the country's largest unlined landfill. Ammonia is very high. Likely toxic. The other side of the landfill there is some impact on the waterway there. The mid-section has high temperatures and hot concrete, anoxic water flowing in.

Mana Whenua: The implications for flooding in the catchments as you continue to remove the flood storage for the water that will come up through storm surges and rainfall.

Upstream there are some significant land inputs like stock access to waterway. There is an imbalance of rules between forestry and residential or commercial developments. There is the potential for different land use in this zone.

Mana Whenua: So, what you are saying there are no current issues but by setting a high standard we are making it difficult for other types of activities to happen. So, we want to protect against that potential being realised in these areas so it could take place without the usual effects.

Mana Whenua kaimahi: If this FMU and the Whaitua could foresee the development you could eliminate the adverse impact through guidance.

Kāwanatanga: Thanks for presentation. One thing we spoke about was how you deal with septic tanks.

Mana Whenua kaimahi: The nitrogen discharge of the systems is not fixed; the expectation of certain systems are there but they are a bell-shaped curve.

Kāwanatanga: Some of your recommendations are pointed at the district council, is that correct?

Mana Whenua kaimahi: Yes, discharge of effluent systems is GW and then the Territorial Authorities would then follow with making the polices to align with the regional.

Kāwanatanga: It's disappointing to learn about the collection of septic tanks that seep and that is a regional council issue, which is coming through as a recommendation, I think. Intensive developed proposed near Southwards, think this is the biggest issue for this district.

Mana Whenua kaimahi: I agree. The national guidance is clearly for facilitation of urban development. Able to develop in sensitive areas because there is nothing there to stop them.

Kāwanatanga: Council voted not to approve the development and the minister overturned the decision.

Kāwanatanga: In terms of intensification, the horse has bolted, but what can KCDC do it in terms of achieving hydraulic neutrality?

Kāwanatanga: I am shocked by the wetland discussion. The NPS-FM is supposed to protect that. Disappointed to see given the high level of protection they have. Saw the NPS-FM as an opportunity and it's disappointing to hear that this is happening. Those developments are causing damage.

Mana Whenua: On that point, we have these national directives and then decisions are made which smash through that. So, the weak point in the process is that applicants are applying and getting them consented.

Mana Whenua kaimahi: in my opinion the NPS-FM allows people to offset impacts elsewhere. There is a gap in which hearings are held and the right people are involved.

Mana Whenua: Developers got their consent applications in before the plan changed but I would argue that the policy statements are strong enough for council to defend.

Mana Whenua: When we came through the Porirua Whaitua process, we wanted to sit down with the consents team to go through the Whaitua intent.

Kāwanatanga: Outside our jurisdiction of this committee but I did sit on the Environment Court for 16 years, I got sick of the greed and money driving those conversations. A way out of it has to be strong collaboration between the authorities so the left hand knows what the right hand is doing. Applicants play off the institutions against each other and iwi get messed up in the middle. Would like us to take five minutes at the end of this process to ensure that the key agencies are able to ensure that regulatory can operate effectively. The Waikanae is particularly at risk. We need to cement the trust and goodwill at the table so the agencies can effectively use their authority as developers are astute at finding weakness and once one is found KCDC and GW don't have the capacity to go up against them.

Mana Whenua: Tautoko this. Developers have brought considerable stress and trauma to relationships. As Mana Whenua, we are so vulnerable when developers operating like this, are in our rohe. I'm thinking about off-setting and what is appropriate and not appropriate. The risk to our wetlands nationally, the significant of the wetlands from flooding and climate change. Are we able to prevent off-setting around wetlands? To close that window?

The other thing that our colleague has referenced is that there are instances where mana whenua have provided guidance and expertise to KCDC. For example, applications to discharge effluent to land - the council recognised they didn't have the internal capacity to respond to the effects to those matters. Mana Whenua were able to assist and interpret the impact on the land from the mahinga kai perspective. What's the ability to ensure that the initial intent of the committee carries on post-the Whaitua? Be great to have a method where Mātauranga Māori and mahinga kai are informing and framing the method through which the plan is interpreted. This could look like Mana Whenua sitting alongside the consenters to provide responses. Also, it would help to if the community became familiar with the plan.

At a minimum the WIP it needs to include statements around if you are going to implement these attributes then what is the mechanism by which mana Whenua can assist in implementing the measures and participate in the consents process.

KCDC: There is no joint processing so it's easy for developers to pick us [government bodies and mana whenua] off. Even at the pre-application stage we work with mana whenua so developers know we are on the same page. Fast tracking stuff is a nightmare. They apply just before the cut-off which allows them to circumvent the community consultation requirements.

Mana Whenua: Mana whenua need to work with councils around the need for sustainable economic development. It shouldn't be considered in isolation.

Kaimahi: GW are also looking at how we can improve in this space too on how we can interrupt or stop this. There are gaps in the system, how do we strengthen things.

Mana Whenua: The committee is Kaitiaki for the WIP, let's just do this.

Kaimahi: The WIP must be monitored post-development, and this could be a great recommendation on creating mechanisms to allow us to monitor the WIP.

Mana Whenua: I wonder if there should have a recommendation where there isn't a scenario in which we would allow off-setting for a wetland.

Mana Whenua: I think the conversation around where to from here is a big one. I'm even inclined that in good faith we have that convo as Taurite in advance of the hui or after. What would be helpful is to get an indication from GW as to where it is at.

**4:30pm – Karakia, Finish and Depart
Kaimahi pack down.**

CONFIRMED ACTIONS

Note that all actions captured during the Committee meeting must be clearly stated as an action and providing instruction to minute taker to note down. If there is no clear instruction to capture an action, it will be included in the requests log/eddy.

Opened	Action	Owner	Status
06/12/2023	Item 1 - GW to provide detailed maps of the monitoring sites so the committee can review the location of the current monitoring sites.	GW	Open
06/12/2023	Item 3 - For GW staff to bring back to the Committee the figures on median DIN across the FMUs.	GW	Closed
06/12/2023	Item 3 - Russell to bring reasoning and measure on Habitat Quality Assessment	DRD	Closed
06/12/2023	Item 3 - Include recommendations to address septic tank standards.	Whaitua Committee	Closed
06/12/2023	Item 5 - To scan recommendations for ones that address the issues raised in Rob's presentation.	Kaimahi	Open
06/12/2023	Item 5 - Kaimahi to email Taurite to confirm the wetland recommendations ideas from the Committee for further drafting by kaimahi in the collected draft recommendations doc to be returned to the Committee.	Kaimahi	Closed

REQUESTS LOG/EDDY

Note that all requests said during the Committee meeting by either of the Whare will be captured in this request log/eddy. If it was not clearly stated or instructed to be captured as an action, it will stay here until it is officially confirmed as an action.

Opened	Request	Update	Owner	Status
06/12/23 1	That there is an objective in the Natural Resources Plan to address deposited fine sediment reduction in the catchment where there are soft bottom streams		GWRC	

DECISIONS LOG

Note that all decisions captured during the Committee meeting must be clearly stated as an action and providing instruction to minute taker to note down. If there is no clear instruction to capture a decision, it will be included in the requests log/eddy.

Opened	Decision	Update
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 - AGREED that the Tiriti whare is seeking to arrive at a higher than national bottom line targets states to ensure ecological improvement of water ways in Kāpiti.	
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 - AGREED to carpark decisions on locations of monitoring sites . NOTING - Russell and Pātaka conversation of setting monitoring sites in the middle of the catchment for better representativeness where there are soft bottomed streams in the lower catchment. Rather than just at the bottom of the FMU.	
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 - AGREED that DIN is used as an attribute measure across FMUs for ensuring ecological health.	
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 -AGREED the requirement to maintain baselines across the board as a minimum target.	
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 - AGREED to carpark DIN targets across FMUs, pending being provided DIN/Nitrate median figures across the FMUs.	
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 -AGREED that the NRP develop an objective for where stream reaches are gravel bottomed that ensures protection of this from deposited fine sediment where other or monitored reaches are currently classified as soft-bottomed.	
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 - AGREED that the NRP develops regulatory methods	
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 - AGREED that prior to the next Meeting: That Mahina-a-rangi will work with Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki to bring advice on remaining FMUs (Ōtaki, Mangaone, Kowhai, remaining on Waitohu)	
06/12/2023	ITEM 1 - AGREED for Russell to populate the remaining attributes from these objectives to discuss especially where some are very low in E/D and the Copper and Zinc attributes which are outside the model.	

Appendix 1: Presentations

ITEM Number	Title	Presenter	Presentation
ITEM 5	Ki tai ki uta: as the kōkopu swims	Mana Whenua kaimahi van Duivenboden	GW are not able to include due to not owning copyright / IP