

Minutes

Community-led Coastal Adaptation Project co-design workshop¹

Friday 21 February 2020

1:00-4:00pm

Te Newhanga Kāpiti Community Centre, Paraparaumu

<i>Attendees:</i>	Quentin Poole & Jo Poole (CRU), Jo Rosier (NOBRG), Natasha Tod (KCDC), Lyndsey Craig (KCDC), Liana Cook-Auckram (KCDC), Tim Sharp (GWRC), Suze Keith (GWRC), Iain Dawe (GWRC), Al Cross (GWRC), Stephen Daysh (Mitchell Daysh).
<i>Apologies:</i>	Natalia Repia, John Maassen
Agenda Item:	Minutes:
Introduction	<p>Quentin gave opening words to welcome everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>Everyone introduced themselves as there were some new members attending for the first time.</p> <p>Stephen stressed that as the facilitator he would ensure the end time of 4.p.m. set in the agenda was met as it was a Friday afternoon and only fair that people could get away at the time specified. This was agreed.</p> <p>Quentin requested that we should amend the order of the Agenda that was issued to everyone in the group earlier in the week by starting with the Recap of the previous co-design workshop. Stephen agreed but said he thought it might be better to start the meeting with the Discussion of the principles of the Co-Design process and how we work together as was set in the Agenda that had been pre-circulated. This was agreed, and it was also agreed to move the Recap and also the Update on feedback from Iwi, Community Boards and GWRC up the Agenda as Al indicated he needed to leave the meeting at 3p.m. Quentin also indicated he wanted to talk about the Summit.</p>
Discuss Principles of Co-Design process and how to work together	<p>Stephen began this discussion by acknowledging that he had just seen some material prepared by the CRU Chair, Paul Dunmore regarding their thoughts on how we work together.</p> <p>Natasha emphasised that the Council had been in dialogue with the Kāpiti iwi regarding their involvement and role in the Co-design process and while an agreement on this was close in her opinion and there was every indication they would join the co-design group for the next meeting set for 3 April, they were still not at the table. This meant any final discussion on how we work together as a group and the preparation of a wider Terms of Reference for the co-design process needed to wait until the mandated iwi representatives were at the table.</p> <p>Quentin strongly expressed the continued frustration of the CRU membership regarding further delays in the process and quoted the finding from Judge</p>

¹ These minutes were discussed at the 17 April 2020 Takutai Kāpiti Co-design Working Group where it was noted that not all matters in the minutes were fully agreed, but they should be finalised and issued based on the updated draft that had been circulated by Stephen Daysh.

Dwyer's March 2017 decision regarding the Council needing to get on with the job around planning for coastal hazards in the District Plan. Jo Poole said that CRU saw the key output from the community led process to ensure there is a new section in the District Plan dealing appropriately with the coastal hazards issue ASAP, and questioned the sequencing of work and resources i.e. emphasis on the Summit rather than the community led process to achieve the new section in the Plan.

Natasha acknowledged the delays and said from the Council's perspective she was pleased that planning was now progressing in a co-design way with input of a range of stakeholders, but that good planning processes do take time especially when overall stakeholder views need to be included. She said that in terms of partnerships it was critical for the Council that their iwi partners were involved and engaged which does take time.

Stephen said from his perspective the co-design process which had been advocated by CRU added a lot of value and was Kāpiti was a step ahead of other prior processes he had been involved with, due to community representatives having a role in the actual design of the process itself, rather than it being imposed.

Jo Rosier indicated NOBRG were happy for small delay as indicated to occur to achieve a robust and durable process.

Concerns and reservations about this co-design meeting proceeding without the iwi representative's present were discussed, with Jo Poole querying why this meeting was being held without iwi given the necessity of iwi being involved. The overall group felt it was important and acceptable to keep momentum by continuing the meeting, particularly with the significant representation from GWRC at this workshop who were here to discuss their involvement going forward.

There was a general discussion about the Terms of Reference aspect, including Lyndsey reminding everyone that the Terms of Reference for the previous Hawke's Bay and Makara processes had been pre-circulated with the Agenda. However, that there is no intention to draft terms without iwi full iwi representation around the table.

Quentin made the comment during the discussion that CRU thought the Terms of Reference that had been agreed for the Makara project was more attuned with CRU's values and aspirations.

Quentin then used the whiteboard to suggest the concept of a "Steering Committee" comprising 4 or 5 people with an independent chair to liaise with the community panels when they are established. This would have the advantage of using the community's expertise in environmental law, planning, coastal science, historic, iwi values etc.

Stephen added to the whiteboard drawing by suggesting that if this was a form of governance group he thought KCDC and GWRC would need to be

	<p>included and Jo Rosier said that iwi would have to be included too, and this was also added into the whiteboard sketch.</p> <p>It was agreed that KCDC should develop this idea further and report back to the 3 April co-design meeting with options for overall coordination and governance of the process as part of the community-led process. It was also agreed that the group should hold off-further detailed discussions on this “working together” topic until the 3 April 2020 meeting so the iwi representatives could be involved in the discussion.</p>
<p>Recap of previous Co-Design Workshop</p>	<p>There was further discussion about how far the meeting could go in terms of discussing what had been recorded from the whiteboard at the previous meeting, based on the prior discussion regarding the mandated iwi representatives not being present.</p> <p>In terms of the detail Jo Rosier considered that the Strategy should be called <i>Coastal Resilience</i> instead of <i>Coastal Hazard</i> and after a brief discussion this was supported and it was agreed we should note this in the minutes for further discussion at the 3 April co-design group meeting.</p>
<p>Update on feedback from iwi, Community Boards and GWRC regarding the number, geographical areas, and various roles for the CAP(s)</p>	<p>As already discussed, Lyndsey outlined why the iwi representatives were not present for this meeting but emphasised this was not a sign of a lack of interest. The iwi representatives she has been liaising with are engaged and do want to be part of the overall community-led coastal adaptation process going forward. There is still some work for her to do within mana whenua to get an overall agreement on their participation, but she anticipated this would be concluded shortly, and that the mandated iwi representatives would be able to attend the 3 April co-design meeting.</p> <p>Lyndsey outlined she had recently met with Mahina-a-rangi Baker and there is an ongoing discussion around the following details of participation in the co-design work. Recent discussions indicate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mahina-a-rangi Baker will represent both Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai and Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga; • Natalia Repia will represent Ngāti Toa; • The iwi representatives are keen to interlink the GWRC Kāpiti whitua process regarding freshwater management with the coastal hazards adaptation community process; • The preference is for 3 Coastal Adaptation Panels 1) Ōtaki - Peka Peka, 2) Waikanae – Paraparaumu, 3) Raumati- Paekākāriki, rather than the two panels suggested at the previous co-design workshop; • This was on the basis of manageability and appropriate iwi representation. Ōtaki – Peka Peka & Waikanae – Paraparaumu, Raumati – Paekākāriki; • From the iwi perspective only 2 Community Assessment Panels split somewhere north of the Waikanae River mouth as suggested at the previous co-design workshop doesn’t reflect the range and differences in coastal processes or the different effects from a range of environmental and cultural values that they hold.

The 3-panel concept was discussed by the group, and those present all understood the rationale and it was agreed this should be revisited at the 3 April co-design meeting. Jo Rosier noted this option would have resourcing implications for the Council.

Some discussion ensued about the level/type of engagement (email, phone, face-to-face) and Lyndsey commented and it was agreed that, along with future GWRC processes, initial and on-going engagement with iwi had to be face-to-face.

Natasha then outlined conversations which had been held with the Community Boards who expressed interest in being involved, but raised some concerns that the suggested 2 Panel approach based on a split somewhere north Waikanae did not fairly represent their communities of interest, which were quite distinct, in their view.

It was acknowledged that opportunities for community board members in the Community Assessment Panels should be explored further as part of the co-design process including the concept of a Community Board member being a co-chair (alongside iwi), which was raised at the meeting by Jo Rosier.

It was agreed that governance aspects needed to be carefully considered and the various roles of KCDC elected representatives made clear in the co-design groups recommendations.

Lyndsey again, reiterated that these discussions and decisions could not be made without iwi representation.

Al then outlined the “Whaitua” process that GWRC has been working on for the last few years. He explained that a whaitua is a community based process, which sets the community preferences for future freshwater management. GWRC was now in a position to plan for the Kāpiti Whaitua process. GWRC aims to finish the overall Whaitua work by 2022/23 to meet the Freshwater NPS requirements. It would be complemented by a Whaitua Implementation Programme

Tim then outlined that the Whaitua processes were all different and took into account local issues and preferences. They were progressed under ‘area agreements’ with specific Terms of Reference

Suze then spoke about how the Whaitua processes were linked with the GWRC’s climate change work programme, and there is cross over with this programme.

Iain then outlined the aim of Regional Natural Hazard Strategy as all district councils can work together. This went into the Proposed Natural Resources Plan and agreed by all councils 18 months ago. A Climate Change Working Group came out of this, and completed the Wellington Regional coastal vulnerability assessment.

	<p>The GWRC team outlined they were also interested in the 3 Coastal Community Panel concept and posed that there was good synergies and efficiencies for the 2 Councils and the various communities if the Kāpiti Whaitua could be integrated somehow with the coastal hazards adaptation work.</p> <p>It was agreed the group should continue to think about and liaise on this issue, and it should be discussed more formally at the 3 April co-design meeting.</p>
<p>Updates and Discussion on Takutai Kāpiti Summit.</p>	<p>Lyndsey explained she had discussed the Summit concept with CRU Chair, Paul Dunmore last year including the format of speaker conference in the morning with community event in the afternoon. Natasha also reminded the group that the general principles had been briefly discussed at the last co-design workshop.</p> <p>Quentin explained that CRU was deeply unhappy with climate summit overall including the timetable, and the choice of speakers which they considered was not balanced. He relayed that while CRU might have had agreed in principal to the idea, CRU members believe the Summit is being imposed by KCDC, without adequate consultation with them. Quentin raised particular concern from CRU at James Renwick being a conference speaker.</p> <p>Stephen noted that he had seen the programme and it seemed the Summit has various components that will allow a broad conversation around climate change with the community, with coastal hazards adaptation being a sub-set of KCDC's the wider Climate Change response programme.</p> <p>For context Natasha noted that the Mayor had announced a climate summit would be held prior to election and the summit is following through with his intention.</p> <p>Lyndsey stated that the purpose and ethos of the event had not changed since original discussions with CRU Chair and the co-design workshop group and that broad community engagement is a good place to start as not all of the community is as aware of the issues as those in the co-design group. There was agreement that there will be some in the community that are not aware of the issues with the notified District Plan and the coastal hazard provisions and it was timely to get the wider community about the coastal resilience issue generally.</p> <p>Quentin and Jo asked if there would be an opportunity for CRU to have their own stall and Lyndsey replied that KCDC did not support this, but she was planning for representatives from the co-design team to have a session in the speakers corner to discuss the co-design process currently being undertaken. Lyndsey noted that while the intention of the summit has not changed since the last co-design meeting in November 2019, she understood that there was some frustration that not all the speakers and programme had been finalised, but this was imminent and all of speakers and their bios would published on the website.</p>

Jo Rosier commented on behalf of NOBRG that she was were also unclear of the range of speakers for the summit, but she recognised that:

- Climate change/coastal change is a complex issue involving all operational areas of the Council;
- Communities need active involvement over the long term (alongside the Community Assessment Panels);
- The proposed Summit speakers Lyndsey had outlined were all high-level.

Quentin again expressed his concern on behalf of CRU over the Summit speaker balance raised by CRU and asked Lyndsey if any of the speakers suggested by CRU had been approached to speak. Lyndsey confirmed they had not been approached. Jo Rosier said NOBRG supported the overall speaker balance.

Lyndsey said KCDC hoped that the current Co-design stakeholders could be involved in the day (with a specific time allocated in the speaker's tent for the co-design workshop group to talk to the project and workshops to date). Quentin and Jo both advised they have reservations.

Jo raised again the confusion regarding the broad scope of the summit and how that fitted with sorting the coastal hazard provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Lyndsey clarified that the summit is to kick start the community dialogue and involvement in the Community Panel process.

Jo Poole asked Lyndsey how Council was planning to measure the success of the 'Summit' i.e. how would it determine if the summit was successful (or not). Lyndsey replied that they would use metrics such as the number of people attending, using the free shuttle, signing up to join the community-led panels, interacting with promotion on social media. Natasha explained that the Summit morning panel discussion to be chaired by Hon, Jim Bolger will only be 30 minutes with limited question time. She sought help from the co-design meeting attendees to formulate two questions for the panel speakers. Iwi would be approached to draft a third question.

Quentin opposed this request saying he wanted time to consider this and discuss it with the CRU team more broadly. Stephen said as facilitator we should at least get some draft questions down for further discussion before the summit.

The draft questions developed at the meeting are:

1. Given Bruce Glavovic's experience in forming governance structures and community input on coastal adaptation projects, can Bruce comment on some successful examples and criteria to achieve specific community outcomes?
2. Can John Lucas talk about how the insurance industry itself is adapting to the effects of climate change, and are designing their commercial policies and practices? What can communities learn from this?
3. Question for Aroha Spinks to come from ART/iwi

	The issue of questions from the floor was raised and it was noted that Hon. Jim Bolger would need to manage this aspect given the limited time.
Initial Discussion on Procurement Process	<p>This topic was not addressed in any detail at the meeting, but it was noted that technical assistance will need to be procured to support the Panels and the co-design team would be involved in this task.</p> <p>Lyndsey confirmed that a draft of the 'catalogue and bibliography' relating to available information regarding the Kāpiti coast was being reviewed by the KCDC staff team. This would be circulated once finalised, with an opportunity for the co-design team to add other information they are aware of.</p>
Meeting Close	The meeting concluded at 4.00 p.m. as per the Agenda.