

Meeting Notes

Meeting title	Whaka-Ora, Healthy Harbour – Lyttelton Targeted Feedback Meeting
Date	Tuesday 10th October 2017
Time	7.00 – 8.30 pm
Venue	The Board Room, 25 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton
Invitees	Community members who attended previous workshops in 2016, Stakeholders and organisations with an established interest in the harbour, Banks Peninsula Zone Committee members, Banks Peninsula Community Board members.
In attendance	<p>Invitees: Dana Dopleach, David Bennett, Robin Dawson, John McLister, Andy Thompson (DOC), David Collins (BPCT), Philippa Hay (Community governance CCC), Roger Allen (Boat Safety Group), Wendy Everingham (Timebank Co-ordinator & Lyttelton Review), Omar Seycell (Fulton Hogan), Richard Hopkins (LRMC), Kirsty Nicol (LRMC), James Tricker (BPZC & Ecan), Gill Jenkins (BPZC & Ecan).</p> <p>For the Whakaraupo Partnership: Elizabeth Cunningham (Governance), Yvette Couch-Lewis (Governance & Ngati Wheke), Kim Kelleher (LPC), Matthew Ross (TRONT), Bianca Sullivan (Ecan), Christina Robb (Project manager), Gillian Ensor (Ecan) .</p>

Meeting Notes
1. The meeting was opened by Yvette Couch-Lewis
2. There was a presentation by Christina Robb which outlined the process for developing <i>Whaka-Ora, Healthy Harbour</i> , its content and what we want feedback on.

3. There was an informal discussion about the plan with questions and points raised by attendees as follows:
- a. There was a discussion around the funding commitment from the Partnership. The Partners have committed funding of \$600,000 over a 3-year period ending in 2019 plus additional resourcing where required to develop the catchment plan and for its initial implementation. Future funding is yet to be finalised but discussions are underway. There is a willingness from the governance group to increase funding, and the project team are investigating other funding streams, such as the Ministry for the Environment Community Environment Fund.
 - b. Is this is statutory plan? No it isn't. It's a community plan that we can all pick up and use. It's hoped that all management plans in the catchment can become more integrated over time and that this is the catalyst.
 - c. An attendee noted that there are two Reserves that her group manages and they both need management plans. Could this plan be the overarching document for all reserves?
 - d. An attendee explained that the Conservation Trust has an ecological vision for Banks Peninsula and this document fits within that vision. From the point of view of the Trust the CMP and BPCT seem to be well aligned.
 - e. There was quite a bit of discussion around sediment within the catchment.
 - i. It was noted that sediment is a huge issue in the catchment and the Partnership were asked to explain the current understanding of harbour hydrodynamics.
 - ii. There is a lot of knowledge relating to hydrodynamics that has come from LPC through work that they've undertaken for specific projects (such as the reclamation, dredging of shipping channels etc.). Through the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan development process and resource consent applications, LPC's hydrodynamic work has been independently peer reviewed. While it does provide a good understanding of hydrodynamics, it was specifically undertaken to assess the effects of Port activities on the harbour, not the hydrodynamics of the wider harbour in general, and this is an area that the scientists are advising us needs some additional work.
 - iii. The Partnership team see the catchment management plan as facilitating an opportunity for a wider catchment understanding of harbour hydrodynamics that is not focused on the effects of specific activities and there is an opportunity for a broader research programme relating to hydrodynamics and sediment transport that could be picked up by (for example) a university.
 - f. Does the plan conflict with commercial interests within the harbour and how do they fit together? The plan recognises that the catchment includes people who want to live, work and play in the catchment and it's a balancing act to enable all to occur together. The plan didn't come from a basis of 'conflict', but has been written in an aspirational and positive tone.
 - g. Yvette asked the group to share some observations from their initial read of the document.

Meeting Notes

- h. An attendee commented that this plan is quite different from normal council regulatory documents and he thought the document is wonderful. He liked that it isn't about controlling stuff, but that it's complementary and empowering. He noted that we need money to implement the actions.
- i. Other attendees commented that it was nice not to read a regulatory plan. It was easy to read and understand and overall a great document. There are a lot of exciting things the plan can pick up on. It provided a good glimpse of how Ngai Tahu sees our environment. It is a learning document that teaches people.
- j. There was a discussion around the information relating to species and whether we have good baseline data.
 - i. The scientists have advised us that there is a gap in baseline data relating to species. That is why one of the key projects is to complete a state of the takiwa report (state of the environment) so that we know what species are present, where, and in what abundance. We can then establish appropriate monitoring programmes and set targets to measure progress towards achieving the outcomes we seek.
 - ii. Elizabeth explained that Koukourarata has had University of Otago undertaking research on species and sediment for a number of years.
- k. A resident asked about the expectations around community involvement, and suggested that individual involvement needs to be clearer. It would also be helpful if there was a te reo glossary.
- l. There was a comment that the document provides a good focus on why we're already doing what we are doing and suggested that it would re-energise staff and people. The document will be really useful.
- m. One attendee asked that if money were no object, what would we recommend is done in the catchment? What would accelerate the process to more quickly achieve the purpose of the plan. Are those potential projects in the document?
 - i. This question facilitated discussion around the head of the harbour area and land ownership. There was discussion around whether landownership is important, or focussing on how unproductive land is managed.
- n. Another attendee noted that this is a novel way to look at the catchment and thought that it was easier to read than a typical RMA type document.

4. The meeting closed at 8.30 by Yvette Couch-Lewis.