

**Minutes:**  
**Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Advisory Panel Meeting #5**

**Date:** Wednesday 30 March 2022  
**Time:** 5.00 pm – 8.00 pm  
**Location:** Kotare Room, Queen Elizabeth Park II  
 (MS teams- link in invite)

**Attendees:**

- Takutai Kāpiti panel Chair: Rt Hon James Bolger ONZ
- Takutai Kāpiti panel members: Lt Gen the Rt Hon Sir Jerry Mateparae, Don Day, Kelvin Nixon, Olivia Bird, Prof Martin Manning, Susie Mills, Heni Wirihihana.
- Takutai Kāpiti project team: Lyndsey Craig (Manager), Ashlyn Gallagher (Coastal Advisor).
- Technical Advisory Group: Elspeth McIntyre (Senior Comms Advisor), Derek Todd (Jacobs), Damian Debski (Jacobs).
- Facilitator: Stephen Daysh (Mitchell Daysh).

**Apologies:**

- Oriwia Mason, Heather Wright, Kahu Ropata, Councillor Sophie Handford, Iain Dawe.

Agenda Item	Comments
<b>Opening &amp; Introductions</b>	<p>1. <b>Opening remarks</b> from Jim Bolger (as Chair of the Takutai Kāpiti panel).</p>
<b>Actions from previous meeting</b>	<p><b>Motion:</b> That the Minutes of previous meetings held on 24 November 2021 and 15 December 2021 were considered and approved unanimously. The minutes for the meeting following the 11 March 2022 workshop that were prepared by Stephen Daysh were considered and approved unanimously. The Motion was moved by Jim Bolger as Chair of the panel. There were no matters arising.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Terms of Reference – final sign off</i></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> The final Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Takutai Kāpiti panel were considered and approved. The motion was moved (Jim Bolger), seconded (Susie Mills) and carried. Jerry Mateparae thought that Jim Bolgers’ name might be added as The Chair, but after some discussion it was agreed that this was already evident on the <u>Takutai Kāpiti website and in all the minutes etc, so this was not necessary.</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Iwi Representatives update</i></p> <p>Stephen and Lyndsey Craig provided an update on the process to select Iwi representatives from Āti Awa, and Ngāti Toa for the CAP. It was noted that Heni Wirihihana and Oriwia Mason have been confirmed as representatives for Nga Hapū o Ōtaki.</p> <p>Lyndsey has recently been in touch with Ngāti Toa, and Kahu Ropata (Iwi partnerships manager) and agreed that he will feed back relevant information to iwi until an official representative is appointed. Āti Awa will</p>

	<p>likely be the last iwi to join due to waiting for completion of their engagement plan with Council.</p> <p>Lyndsey informed the CAP that iwi may wish to add further items to the ToR as representatives are brought on. It was agreed by the wider CAP that it is important to have iwi representatives present as soon as possible and is a high priority point. Stephen and Lyndsey acknowledged that onboarding both Ngāti Toa and Āti Awa representatives is a current priority, as it would not be appropriate to move forward with work and decisions affecting their rohe without them. Jim Bolger noted that as a working model, if two representatives for each iwi are unable to be secured, the CAP would need at least one representative from each iwi when the assessment is undertaken for their areas of interest.</p> <p>The preparation of the cultural values assessment is currently being discussed with Dr Aroha Spinks and two of her colleagues who have been identified as good to do the assessment (1 to assist with research and 1 to assist with the final report). It was noted that Dr Spinks was meeting with those colleagues today. Lyndsey identified that Council already has an in-house record of much of the cultural value’s information, sites etc as a good starting point for this work.</p> <p><i>Outstanding questions on the Jacobs Stage 2 report</i></p> <p>Jim opened the floor to the CAP for any further questions. There were no further questions from the Panel regarding the report.</p>
<p><b>Presentation on GWRC modelling of effects of SLR on Groundwater</b></p> <p><i>Presented by Damian Debski</i></p>	<p>Damian Debski presented an overview of the further modelling and assessment he had undertaken based on the GWRC groundwater (GW) data and modelling for the Kāpiti District. Damian pointed out main inputs to the model were from recharge from rainfall, contributions from river flow, sea level (which can be tested to see what this does under different sea levels), and abstractions from bores.</p> <p>Jim asked if historically there was heavier rainfall than previously, and queried if this was programmed in. Damian pointed out that “yes” there is heavier rainfall predicted in the future and when Jacobs do flood maps they use rainfall data uplifted with the Climate Change predictions. Olivia Bird asked how much extreme flooding events are factored into the models. Damian pointed out the model gives an indication of increasing flood level risk in general areas, but will not give the exact details due to resolution.</p> <p>It was noted that the Panel would like to better understand why the blue area on slide 12 of the presentation is showing lowered GW levels in the north of the district, and the driving factors for this. <i>Damian advised that the input data to the groundwater model included the effects of climate change on seasonal rainfall as well as sea level and that reductions in rainfall and recharge of groundwater may be a reason for the lowering of groundwater levels, but this should be clarified.</i></p>

	<p>Damian made the CAP aware that this model looks at GW over a 50x50 m scale per cell on the images presented, and to keep in mind the scale of the map as well as the individual variation between each square. He proposed that LIDAR could also be used as it provides a 1x1m resolution.</p> <p>Damian also presented slides on the spatial extent of the effect of SLR on surface flooding using data from the existing KCDC flood models (e.g. not updated by the current AWA models).</p>
<p><b>Dynamic Adaptive Pathways Planning (DAPP) – Methodology and Approach Geographic Definition and Prioritisation of Adaptation Assessment Areas (cells).</b></p> <p><i>Presented by Damian Debski and Derek Todd</i></p>	<p>Damian presented the rationale for the inland boundaries of the Adaptation Assessment Areas, which is based on his further assessment discussed in his prior presentation. Areas were identified as far inland as the influence of SLR on groundwater and surface flooding levels associated with the 1.65 m sea level rise scenario.</p> <p>Derek Todd presented recommendations for the overall geographic extent of the five proposed Adaptation Assessment Areas (<i>See Attachment 1</i>). These have been grouped based on relative morphology and location. The northern adaptation area includes Otaki, Te Horo, and part of Peka Peka, due to beach responses being similar and anticipating relatively similar adaptation actions. The central area consists of Waikanae and Paraparaumu. Raumati and Paekakariki are separate Adaptation Assessment Areas, which are unique because they both have current seawall structures in place. They need to be assessed separately as they are split by the Queen Elizabeth Park area, which is managed by GWRC, currently under a managed retreat strategy.</p> <p>In response to questions, Stephen pointed out that one of the key criteria the CAP will need to test in their multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) will relate to potential cross-boundary consequences between each of the identified Adaptation Assessment Areas. Derek identified that there will be a range of timescales to look at, noting the 100 year planning horizon required by the NZCPS and also the importance of identifying the best short-term adaptation strategy as a priority for engagement with the communities of interest. It was noted that the identification of the five Adaptation Assessment areas provides the opportunity for the CAP to prioritise their work moving forward. Jim noted that the boundaries that have been presented are somewhat artificial but acknowledged their use for planning purposes.</p>
	<p>TEA BREAK</p>
<p><b>Dynamic Adaptive Pathways Planning (DAPP) – Methodology and Approach Geographic Definition and</b></p>	<p>Derek led a discussion regarding potential prioritisation of the adaptation assessment process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1 involves prioritising area(s) for assessment, either through starting with areas that are most vulnerable or beginning with the areas which may have lesser vulnerability and where iwi representation is already on the CAP.</li> </ul>

**Prioritisation of  
Adaptation  
Assessment Areas  
(cells). Continued.**

- Option 2 was to not prioritise any particular area, and undertake the adaptation assessment and engage with the whole community in all areas at a similar time.

Jim asked the TAG if the upcoming election had been factored into the community engagement schedule. Lyndsey Craig confirmed this, and noted that a CAP meeting schedule will be prepared shortly with this factored into the engagement and communications plan.

The Social Impact Assessment work being done by Maven was discussed, and noting the difficulties with Covid 19 affecting the face-to-face interviewing, the Maven report is anticipated to be available at the end of May 2022.

Stephen posed two key decisions for the Panel:

1. The Panel were asked if they were comfortable with the five Adaptation Assessment Areas proposed. Jim Bolger put the motion which was approved with consensus from all the CAP members present.
2. Does the Panel want to prioritise and complete their assessment process by sections or as a whole? Susie Mills stated she wished to work on one area at a time, starting with the identified Northern area, and moved this motion. Jerry Mateparae spoke in support of the motion, which Jim Bolger seconded. The motion was carried unanimously.

The Dynamic Adaptive Pathway process (DAPP) was discussed, and how it would look under the separate Adaptation Assessment Areas. Stephen reminded the Panel that they will be preparing an overall report for all the areas which will tie the assessment and recommendations all together. Lyndsey commented that the prioritisation approach would still need to be taken back to tāngata whenua. Heni Wirihana added that from an iwi perspective, there will still need to be a sit down with Āti Awa and Ngāti Toa relations. Nga Hapū o Ōtaki are currently prioritising getting the cultural assessment done for their area, and they have also had discussions with Āti Awa.

Stephen noted that now a decision has been made about proceeding with the five separate Adaptation Assessment Areas starting with the Northern area, it is now important to plan and confirm the overall CAP work plan. TAG will need to get together and develop the key workshop steps and dates moving forward.

Derek Todd provided a slide which showed the CAP process in relation to the MFE guidelines, and how CAP will follow these steps. NZCPS requires councils to do a 100-year plan, with Kelvin Nixon and Stephen discussing the importance of the immediate timeframe (20 years). Heni informed the CAP that iwi will plan with a focus on long-term scales. Lyndsey pointed out that the Panel will need to provide advice on the need to budget for future data monitoring, trigger points and sediment budgets, which Council currently do

	<p>not have. The CAP unanimously agreed that short-term decision-making on adaptation actions should not hinder viable longer-term strategies – i.e. the essence of DAPP.</p> <p>Stephen reminded the panel of the upcoming MCDA process.</p> <p>MCDA is a combination of technical and economic criteria (that would initially be assessed by the TAG and brought as recommendations to the CAP), Māori cultural criteria (that would initially be assessed by iwi and brought as recommendations to CAP), and environmental, social and community criteria, that will be assessed and “rated” by the CAP itself.</p> <p>Jim noted that the control of the future budget sat with the Council. Derek and Stephen both identified the importance of the economic value assessment and noted this as a key consideration in the overall MCDA process. The cost and loss associated with each potential adaptation action needed to be carefully considered, along with a “value for money” criteria.</p> <p>Jim asked if associated cost with any recommended adaptation action would be spread across the whole of the rate payers? Lyndsey said a paper had been recently been prepared for the Hawke’s Bay Councils on this matter by Asher Raynor QC, and this would be recirculated. Stephen relayed that in Hawke’s Bay the funding formula was still be worked on by the Council’s there under the Joint Coastal Hazard Committee. The general premise as he understood it being that depending on the effect of the adaptation action in each adaptation area, there would be a different split of funding required between private benefit and public good.</p> <p>Jim concluded that the Panel are advisors, however not the ones that determine the final adaptation actions, with the final decision on this to be made by the Council. Lyndsey added that there will be an Officers report provided separately at the end of the decision process, alongside the CAP recommendations in the CAP report.</p>
<p><b>Discussion and Confirmation of Programme schedule</b></p>	<p>Lyndsey will send out details regarding the dune hikoi in Otaki the following week.</p> <p>It was agreed the April CAP meeting be cancelled, due to the need for time for the TAG to do more work on developing the scheduling and the communications plan. The TAG also need to prepare a bespoke Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Assessment Report for consideration and input from the CAP.</p> <p>25 May 2022 was confirmed for the next meeting.</p>
	<p><b>The meeting closed at 7.50pm.</b></p>

<b>ACTIONS</b>		
Damian Debski	Find out if the United States sea water sub-model was used when looking at GW?	
Lyndsey Craig & Stephen Daysh.	Continue to work with Ngati Toa and Āti Awa to secure representation for the CAP.	
Damian Debski	Provide explanation to CAP why the area found in the north of the district is showing lower GW levels and what the driving factors.	
Heather S Wright	Put the two Jacobs Presentations received by CAP on the Takutai Kapiti website.	
Lyndsey Craig, Elspeth McIntyre, Stephen Daysh, Ashlyn Gallagher	Plan out future CAP schedules including, workshops meetings and engagement in a Communications Plan.	
Heather S Wright	Recirculate the funding report to prepared for the Hawke's Bay Councils by Asher Raynor QC.	
Derek Todd, Stephen Daysh and TAG	Develop a recommended bespoke Takutai Kapiti Adaptation Assessment Methodology for use by the CAP, based on the Jacobs presentation showing Hawke's Bay, Christchurch City and Dunedin City examples.	