

Final Minutes:

Community-led Coastal Adaptation Project co-design workshop

Date: Friday 15 May 2020 1.00-4.00pm

Location: Online via Zoom

Attendees: Mahina-a-rangi Baker (ARTCAG representative), Paul Dunmore (CRU Chair), Jo Rosier (NOBRG), Natasha Tod (KCDC), Lyndsey Craig (KCDC), Moko Morris (KCDC), Miriam Randall (KCDC) Tim Sharp (GWRC), Stephen Daysh (Mitchell Daysh), Jeff Taylor (Waikanae Estuary Care Group), Briar English (Friends of Queen Elizabeth Park), Jill Griggs (Waikanae Community Board), Shelley Warwick (Ōtaki Community Board).

Partial attendance: Quentin Poole (CRU), Al Cross (GWRC), Sophie Handford (KCDC Cllr), Thomas Nash (GWRC Cllr), Liana Cook-Auckram (KCDC), Max Lutz (Friends of Otaki River).

Apologies: Natalia Repia (Ngāti Toa Rangatira representative), Suze Keith (GWRC), Kathy Spiers (Raumati/Paraparaumu Community Board).

Agenda item	Comments
<p>Karakia</p> <p>Introductions</p> <p><i>Zoom recording: 00:00 - 10:50</i></p>	<p>Introducing new members of the working group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeff Taylor –Waikanae Estuary Care Group - focus on regenerating Waikanae scientific reserve • Briar English – Friends of Queen Elizabeth Park – focus on wetland restoration • Max Lutz (attended last part of meeting) - Friends of Ōtaki River <p>Introducing observers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Sophie Handford KCDC • Cllr Thomas Nash GW • Jill Griggs – Waikanae Community Board • Shelley Warwick – Ōtaki Community Board
<p>Agreement on Term of Reference</p> <p><i>Zoom recording: 10:50 - 36:15</i></p>	<p>Agreement on Term of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All parts of the 13 May 2020 version of the ToR were agreed with the exception of the <i>Purpose</i> statement. There was a request for more specific outcomes to be identified in the <i>Purpose</i> of the ToR in regard to District Plan provisions. It was noted there that too much specificity could lead to legislative risk (i.e. Planners need to be the ones to write the provisions). • Further changes to the purpose of the ToR have been made to reflect the discussions(updated version circulated with Draft Minutes).
<p>Discussion and recommendation on the number Community Assessment Panel(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representation from GWRC and Iwi partners allowed for more detailed discussion on the number of panels. These discussions demonstrated a clear preference for three-panels based upon: alignment with river catchments and iwi rohe/iwi areas of interest.

<p>Zoom recording: 36:15 - 1:32:00</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarification that a three-panel approach centered around water catchment areas, from an iwi perspective, is vital. GWRC supports this option as it aligns with the Whaitua process planned for the Kāpiti district. ● Further explanation was provided by Mahina-a-rangi on the iwi view on catchment areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Waikanae and Waimea catchments interact and should be included in the same wider catchment discussion/ therefore the same panel. However, the Kowhai catchment (Paetawa stream) is more closely aligned with the northern water catchments. Having a divide between the Waimea catchment and the Kowhai catchment would also align well with iwi jurisdictional areas. ○ The Whareroa stream catchment area has overlap of iwi interests between Te Atiawa and Ngāti Toa. Both iwi work together on issues relating to QE2 park. A suggested boundary between a southern and central panel would be the northern boundary of QE2 park and Raumati South. ● Community board and ward boundaries have different boundaries. If looking to align three panels with these boundaries there will need to be consideration of these differences in boundary lines. ● The Coastal vulnerability units (identified in the GW report <i>Preparing coastal communities for climate change</i>) show Peka Peka as having a low vulnerability, lending itself to a panel split here. ● There are financial considerations that will need to be taken into account with having a three-panel approach, rather than one or two panels. A staggering of panels may need to be considered -further work on financial modeling is required. ● Paul (CRU) provided a graph he had developed based on data from the Lumsden report. He used this to highlight historic beach profile data and how this may be used as possible natural divide lines for the panels. ● Mahina-a-rangi shared the vulnerability assessment map – It was suggested that if the panels are to be ‘staggered’ then the working group can use the vulnerability assessment to choose what part of the district comes first.
<p>Discussion and recommendation on the desired composition of the Community Assessment Panel(s) for The Takutai Kāpiti project</p> <p>Zoom recording: 1:32:00 - 1:34:22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Representation of iwi in the CAP(s) needs further discussion – The Kaumatua role having no voting rights is not feasible. ● Preference for iwi reps in the CAP(s) to be similar to that proposed in the ToR. i.e. flexibility for up to 4 iwi reps and leave it at discretion of respective iwi if they feel it is important to attend. ● Waikanae ki Uta ki Tai Iwi membership could be transposed onto this process.
<p>Discussion and recommendation on the Community Assessment Panel governance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Iwi partnership in the proposed governance models needs to be clarified. However, any model accommodating iwi partnership at all levels is generally supported.

<p>diagram options for The Takutai Kāpiti Project.</p> <p><i>Zoom recording: 1:34:22 - 2.53.12</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was discussion regarding a Joint Committee with GWRC along with iwi and DoC. However, it was acknowledged that a separate GWRC meeting is required to discuss regional involvement in the governance. ● Clarification required around the responsibilities and rights of a Joint Committee in this process and how it interacts with the work of the CAP(s). ● Group discussion around CRU's proposed governance model which provides for direct reporting from the CAP(s) to Council (rather than through a Steering Group involving representation from Senior Leadership Team (SLT), GWRC or Iwi). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion around the presence/absence of an SLT/ Steering group level in the project governance Model. Standard governance processes for decisions/recommendations were discussed and reflected that it is usual practice for a Steering Group function. These were demonstrated in the example diagrams circulated which were sourced from similar processes. ○ Discussion around procuring technical expertise vs. cost savings from utilising community expertise. The critical importance and legal responsibility of professional expert advice to underpin for the robustness of the process was discussed. ○ The absence of iwi from the proposed CRU model was discussed. Explanation of the model proposed iwi involvement as technical advice if required. Lyndsey advised that iwi at Tiriti Partners could not sit in a governance model as technical advisory only. ● More work is required to clarify the role of 'Council' in the governance model. ● More work is required on the Steering Group function and composition. ● Further discussion is required between KCDC and GWRC- involving ARTCAG representative. ● More detail requested around outputs on the governance model in relation to District Plan considerations, LTP's. Annual Plans, other statutory and community coastal functions etc.
ACTIONS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Coastal Team to update ToR based on discussions and circulate (attached) ● Coastal Team to update governance options based upon Working Group discussion and following further discussion with GWRC and Iwi partners- to be circulated ahead of next meeting ● Coastal Team to populate pros/cons table based upon Working Group discussion- to be circulated ahead of next meeting for further discussion. 	

**Takutai
Kāpiti.**

Our Community-Led Coastal Adaptation Project

FENVAAL