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Subject: New Zealand Parliament Environment Select Committee Request for Evidence - Kauri Dieback

Kia ora,

It is my pleasure as chair of Auckland Council's Environment and Community Committee to present the council's written evidence regarding kauri dieback.

As you will see from the attached documents Auckland Council has often been at the centre of this national challenge. We are appreciative of the support national agencies such as the Ministry for Primary Industries, Department of Conservation and the National Kauri Dieback Programme has provided for our regional activities to manage kauri dieback.

Auckland Council would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its position on the need for increased investment and delivery for research, public awareness and operational practice for kauri dieback control and management at the national level. The commitment from the joint programme for controlled area notices, a national pest management plan and a strategic advisory board are a promising start. Appropriate resources for these national initiatives is essential.

Next week Auckland Council's Environment and Community committee will consider the proposals to close the forested areas of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park and high-risk tracks in the Hunua Ranges Regional Park.

These decisions are significant with wide ranging impacts on parks users and those who rely on the ranges for their tourism enterprises. The discussion on these closures brings into sharp contrast the many challenges of managing kauri dieback, least of all the significant uncertainty in regards our understanding of the disease and the need for more science to work towards better management and treatment options.

We trust that the attached documents and appendices provide the level of detail the Environment Committee is looking for and we are happy to present to the committee or staff on any aspect of this work.

If you have any questions on any aspects of this evidence, please do not hesitate to contact Mara Bebich, Stakeholder Manager, Infrastructure & Environmental Services, mara.bebich@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or 02102011736.

Councillor Penny Hulse
Chair, Environment and Community Committee
Auckland Council
Written Evidence

For the New Zealand Parliament Environment Select Committee

on

Request to provide written evidence on kauri dieback

3 April 2018
MIHI MIHI

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-iwi take take mai, tauīwi atū.

Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini, wenerau a te mano.

Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place,
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time,

and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land
and the newcomers among us all.

Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands.

You are unique in the world.
INTRODUCTION

1. The Environment Committee (committee) has requested written evidence from Auckland Council on kauri dieback, including past and future actions to mitigate its spread. As this is a broad request, we are providing a high-level summary of the full range of mitigation actions the Auckland Council has undertaken.

2. We have interpreted the Committee’s question to be seeking information on real and practical mitigation actions Auckland Council has taken in response to kauri dieback, within its area of responsibility. This evidence is therefore structured into three broad categories: Auckland Council’s responsibilities and role in the kauri dieback response, past and present mitigation actions, and mitigation planning for the future.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MANAGING KAURI DIEBACK

3. As a unitary authority Auckland Council has the responsibilities of both a regional and local authority for the region. In managing unwanted organisms such as kauri dieback it can exercise its regional biosecurity functions, regulatory powers and work on both regional and local land within its control.

4. Auckland Council, in partnership with mana whenua and the community, has responsibility for the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity in the region, which includes protection of kauri. As manager and guardian of regional parklands and open spaces, the council has a responsibility to protect this native taonga under legislation including the Reserves Act 1977 and the Resource Management Act 1991.

5. Kauri dieback disease (*Phytophthora agathicida*) affects New Zealand kauri and can kill trees of all ages. Microscopic spores in the soil infect kauri roots and damage the tissues that carry nutrients within the tree. Infected trees show a range of symptoms including yellowing of foliage, loss of leaves, canopy thinning, dead branches and lesions that bleed gum at the base of the trunk. Some infected trees can show canopy dieback and even be killed without any gum showing on the trunks as kauri dieback also acts as a severe root rot below ground. There is currently no cure for this disease.

6. Kauri dieback is defined as an unwanted organism under the Biosecurity Act 1993. Auckland Council, as a unitary authority can use its regulatory powers under the
Biosecurity Act to eradicate or effectively manage pests in its region, including unwanted organisms.

7. Auckland Council’s biosecurity powers are currently operating under the Regional Pest Management Strategy (2007-2012) developed by the legacy Auckland Regional Council. As the development of this strategy pre-dated the confirmation of kauri dieback disease in the Waitākere Ranges in 2008 it does not include the unwanted organism - Phytophthora agathidicida. This strategy has been extended four times so that it could incorporate new legal requirements such as the National Policy Direction on Pest Management (NPD), which was gazetted in 2016.

8. Auckland Council has prepared a Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (RPMP) which is currently being consulted on alongside Auckland Council’s Long-term Plan 2018-2028 process. For kauri dieback, the proposed RPMP prioritises the protection of disease-free areas with the implementation of exclusion zones and increased hygiene measures. It is proposed this will be supported by a sustained control programme seeking to minimise spread around the remainder of the region.

9. In parallel Auckland Council has adopted rules to help prevent the spread of kauri dieback disease within its Operative (In Part) Unitary Plan. Under section E11, Land disturbance – Regional there are general standards which apply to most land disturbing activities. These activities must comply with a number of permitted activity standards, including standard 11.6.2 (6) which aims to prevent the spread of kauri dieback disease. This standard requires the following:

‘To prevent the spread of contaminated soil and organic material with kauri dieback disease, vehicle and equipment hygiene procedures must be adopted when working within 3 times the radius of the canopy drip line of a New Zealand kauri tree. Soil and organic material from land disturbance within 3 times the radius of the canopy drip line must not be transported beyond that area unless being transported to landfill for disposal’.

10. Auckland Council governance decision makers have considered the approach to kauri dieback at a political level, in forums such as the Environment and Community Committee, the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee, the Waitākere Ranges, Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards, and the earlier Parks and Heritage Forum.
11. There is also reference and consideration of the need to protect kauri from kauri dieback in other political fora and work such as through the development of a regional parks management plan or approving the use of parkland for recreational events.

12. A list of relevant committee reports and memos, since the creation of Auckland Council in 2010, is attached to this document (see Appendix 1). Copies of these reports will also be provided under separate cover.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL ROLE IN NATIONAL PROGRAMME

13. Auckland Council is part of the national Kauri Dieback Programme, which is a collaborative partnership between the Ministry for Primary Industries and the kaitiaki of those areas where kauri is found – tangata whenua (via the Tangata Whenua Rockpu), Department of Conservation, Waikato Regional Council, Northland Regional Council, Bay of Plenty Regional Council, and Auckland Council. Auckland Council has three representatives on the Programme Leadership Team: Barry Potter, Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services; Mace Ward, General Manager Regional Parks; and Phil Brown, Biosecurity Manager.

14. The national programme coordinates kauri dieback research, supports a consistent branding of kauri dieback efforts across affected areas, and provides guidance to partners on approaches to kauri dieback management.

REGIONAL INCIDENCE OF KAURI DIEBACK DISEASE IN AUCKLAND

15. Kauri dieback has been identified throughout the natural range of kauri trees across the upper North Island. Large high biodiversity areas outside the Auckland region that are known to be infected include Waipoua, Russell Forest, Omahuta, Raetea and Herekino.

16. It is now understood that kauri dieback disease has been on Aotea Great Barrier Island since the 1970s. The first instance of kauri dieback disease on mainland Auckland was first suspected on the Maungaroa Ridge Track in the Waitākere Ranges in 2006 and later confirmed in 2008.

17. As a consequence of Auckland Council-funded surveying and ground truthing we have a regional picture of the incidence of the disease within the region. Within the Auckland region kauri dieback is present throughout the Waitākere Ranges, in some
western local parks, numerous isolated sites on the Awhitu Peninsula, Department of Conservation reserves at Pakiri, Logue’s Bush (Tomarata), Albany and Okura Bush (Long Bay) and on many areas of private land. The disease is also present on Aotea (Great Barrier Island) in the Hauraki Gulf. The map in Appendix 2 shows the known extent of kauri dieback across the region in Auckland, based on surveys undertaken by council and the national kauri dieback programme.

18. The Waitākere Ranges Regional Park, located in west Auckland, is the most heavily infected kauri dieback area so far recorded in New Zealand. Nineteen per cent of the kauri trees in the Park are definitely infected and a further 4.7 per cent are possibly infected. More importantly, of the distinct stands of kauri forest within the regional park which are above 5 hectares in size, 58 per cent exhibit symptoms of kauri dieback infection.

19. Some areas of the Auckland region remain free of kauri dieback. The Hunua Ranges is the most significant area managed by Auckland Council that is currently considered to be free of the disease. The Hunua forest, including the regional parkland and contiguous Department of Conservation reserves and private land, contains some of the largest stands of kauri remaining free of the disease in the country.

20. Other areas that remain free of kauri dieback include private and council land on the North Shore, northern regional parks, Waiheke Island and various Hauraki Gulf Islands (excluding Aotea). While regional parks represent larger areas of kauri, there are also kauri forests of significant ecological value within local parks or private land that are currently thought to be disease free – this includes areas such as within the Kaipātiki Local Board area.

SURVEILLANCE

21. Auckland Council carries out both active and passive surveillance of the spread of kauri dieback. Active surveillance is conducted on a five yearly rotating cycle around the Auckland region. In the first stage of active surveillance, aerial survey is used to identify kauri exhibiting canopy decline. This is then verified directly by ground sampling at the sites to confirm disease presence.

22. In 2017/18 active surveillance is focused on the northern part of Auckland, an area covering 283,670 hectares from the North Shore to the northern boundary of the region. The high-level survey using a fixed-wing plane is funded by the national kauri
dieback programme. Council funded a more detailed aerial survey of high ecological value areas using a helicopter. The helicopter component is yet to be completed due to unsuitable weather conditions, but the surveys have already highlighted over 250 potentially infected sites across public and private land, which will be confirmed through ground surveillance over the next few months. Inspections of kauri in high risk locations across 150 parks in northern Auckland are also being conducted in 2018/2019.

23. Similar five yearly surveys were undertaken in 2017 in south eastern Auckland and the Awhitu Peninsula. The Hunua Ranges and areas nearby appear to continue to be kauri dieback free. This disease has continued to spread through the Awhitu Peninsula however. A report on this survey is being prepared.

24. A summary of areas surveyed over recent years is shown below in Table 1.

Table 1: Areas in the Auckland region surveyed for kauri dieback since 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area Surveyed</th>
<th>Kauri dieback status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>Hauraki Gulf Islands aerial and ground-truthing surveillance. Local park on-track surveillance.</td>
<td>Great Barrier Island had moderate levels of kauri dieback infection, concentrated on parkland. Waiheke and other Gulf islands was non-symptomatic of kauri dieback infection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>Waitakere Ranges Regional Park on-track surveillance. Waiheke Island on-track surveillance</td>
<td>Waitakere Ranges Regional Park had widespread kauri dieback infection. Waiheke was non-symptomatic of kauri dieback infection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>Waitakere Ranges Regional Park aerial and ground-truthing surveillance.</td>
<td>Widespread kauri dieback infection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>Hunua Ranges Regional Park and Awhitu Peninsula</td>
<td>Hunua Ranges Regional Park was non-symptomatic of kauri dieback. Awhitu Peninsula had widespread kauri dieback infection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Passive surveillance involves staff or members of the public reporting potential incidences of kauri dieback. Since 2008, staff have responded to over 700 reported instances of kauri dieback across private and public land. The 2017/18 year has been particularly busy with over 200 reports received from the public. This reflects the increased public awareness of kauri dieback as well as council support for community-based projects such as Kauri Rescue.

26. These surveillance programmes improve understanding of kauri dieback distribution. They also provide data to inform planning and management of the disease across the Auckland region.

AUCKLAND COUNCIL MANAGEMENT APPROACH

27. Auckland Council has had a proactive kauri dieback management programme since 2009. The early years of this programme were focused on learning more about the disease, beginning a public information programme, and rolling out hygiene stations in kauri forest reserves across the region.

28. Council now takes different management approaches in different parts of the region depending on factors including whether the area is infected or not, whether the land is council or privately owned, the amount of kauri forest on council land and the types of tracks and access the public has to that council land. A summary of the different approaches in outlined in Table 2.

Table 2: Auckland Council’s kauri dieback management approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of management Areas</th>
<th>Kauri dieback status</th>
<th>Last Surveyed</th>
<th>Management approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>Widespread infection</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Active management through track upgrades and closure of high risk tracks, phytosanitary stations, feral pig control. Community education. Entire forested area soon may be closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Status Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunua Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>Currently defined as non-symptomatic of kauri dieback</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Active management through track upgrades and closure of high risk tracks, phytosanitary stations, feral pig control. Community education. Added protection via proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (RPMP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke Island</td>
<td>Currently defined as non-symptomatic of kauri dieback</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Active management through track upgrades and closure of high risk tracks, phytosanitary stations. Community education. Added protection via proposed RPMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki area</td>
<td>Currently defined as non-symptomatic of kauri dieback</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Active management through track upgrades, phytosanitary stations. Community education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awhitu</td>
<td>Widespread infection</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Community education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. In recent years council’s priority has been to keep apparently disease-free areas, such as the Hunua Ranges, disease free, while reducing the risk of spread from and around other areas. Over time, council has continued to manage and gradually upgrade the more than 270 hygiene stations it manages on its own land.

30. Tracks that pass through kauri forest have been gradually upgraded to reduce the risk of users spreading the disease along the tracks. Some tracks have been closed in the Waitākere Ranges and Hunua Ranges to protect important areas of apparently disease-free kauri forest and stop the spread outside of affected areas.

31. There has been a proactive education and awareness programme, both regionally and with a particular focus on the communities located around the Waitākere Ranges. More details on this programme are provided below. As well as contributing to the national programme’s research activities, Auckland Council has also undertaken some of its own research.

32. While Auckland Council’s focus has been on managing kauri on its own land, it also tries to reduce the risk of kauri dieback spreading on private land. As outlined above, rules within the Unitary Plan restrict the spread of soil from and into areas around kauri. Kauri dieback mitigation is also a requirement in many rural subdivision...
consent conditions. Beyond regulatory approaches, council also supports owners of kauri forest with advice and, in some circumstances, supplies for hygiene stations.

33. Auckland Council is managing for kauri dieback in 17 regional and 156 local parks across Auckland. Some of the key methods used by the council to prevent the spread of kauri dieback and mitigate the impact of kauri dieback in infected forests are outlined below.

**Track upgrades and closures**

34. The organism that causes kauri dieback is spread through the forest in mud or soil, with major vectors being people and larger animals such as pigs or goats. Kauri surveys show that kauri dieback is more likely to spread around high risk tracks, that is those that are muddy, narrow or run across or close to kauri tree roots. Track upgrades are one of the main tools that the council has to manage kauri dieback disease.

35. Mitigation measures include upgrades that:
   - Provide a dry foot surface for visitors
   - Divert tracks away from roots of kauri trees
   - Provide boardwalks above tree roots or particularly muddy sections of track
   - Include construction to deter visitors moving off track
   - Widening tracks.

36. Track closures can also provide a valuable tool to prevent the spread of kauri dieback. In the Hunua Ranges one track has been permanently closed and ten tracks are temporarily closed (some are entire tracks and some are sections of tracks). Since December 2017 a total of 44 tracks have been closed in the Waitākere Ranges, equating to around 83 km of tracks, with nine tracks permanently closed and 35 tracks temporarily closed. Excluding service roads, this means that approximately one third of the Waitākere Ranges track network is now closed.

37. Auckland Council is currently considering two proposals to close the forested areas (and tracks within them) in the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park and high-risk tracks within the Hunua Ranges Regional Park to a) prevent the further spread of kauri dieback within the Waitākere Ranges and b) protect the Hunua Ranges and other uninfected sites from infection. This significant proposal has been consulted on with
impacted communities and will be considered by Auckland Council’s Environment and Community Committee on 10 April 2018.

Use of Hygiene Stations

38. Approximately 270 phytosanitary stations have been installed across Auckland on regional and local parks. The aim of these stations is to encourage users to clean any soil off their footwear before entering or leaving a forested area.

39. Compliance with both track closures and phytosanitary measures has been mixed. There is known low compliance with cleaning stations leading to communications campaigns and ambassador programmes in an attempt to increase the use of these measures.

40. In addition, practical experience has found the usability and effectiveness of phytosanitary procedures to be inadequate. Improvements in the design of the stations is ongoing, with four new station designs currently being trialled on council land. A range of designs is needed to allow for the different type of location and user.

41. Early results from the trials are favourable, indicating that the new designs result in improved compliance and positive feedback from the public. Further testing is underway to modify the designs for the best outcomes and to develop criteria for best practice use.

42. The council is also working with a number of providers to develop a free-to-use text service for members of the public to report damaged or malfunctioning phytosanitary stations. These will be trialled at strategic locations in the region from 1 May 2018.

Communications and Engagement

Local community education and engagement

43. Community education and behaviour change is a priority to prevent the spread of kauri dieback. Building on the messages and collateral developed by the national programme, council has delivered community engagement and education across the region, with a particular focus on kauri areas with high biodiversity values. The programme has included educational stands at community events, media releases, an ambassador programme and engagement with staff, contractors, developers and community groups.
Ambassador programme

44. In the Waitākere Ranges the local board has provided ongoing funding for a part-time kauri dieback community coordinator to engage in a range of community engagement activities, such as educating visitors to the area, running education programmes with schools and speaking to community groups.

45. In response to the doubling of the rate of kauri dieback in the Waitākere Ranges and known issues with park users ignoring hygiene measures Auckland Council initiated a summer kauri dieback ambassador programme in 2016.

46. Ambassadors have been deployed in key locations in the Waitākere Ranges, Kaipātiki, northern regional parks such as Shakespear and Tawharanui, and in the Hunua Ranges. Their role is to greet visitors and give them directions on how to prevent the spread of kauri dieback.

47. Ambassadors have also been deployed on Waiheke Island, at a ferry wharf in downtown Auckland and at Half Moon Bay car ferry terminal, to speak to visitors heading to the Hauraki Gulf Islands. Over the 2017/18 summer period, ambassadors spoke to nearly 50,000 people, including 35,000 within the Waitākere Ranges and approximately 15,000 at other locations.

48. Public surveys have also recently been completed at key locations to collect information on:
   - public awareness of kauri dieback
   - attitudes to kauri dieback mitigation measures
   - self-reported compliance with the measures.

49. Approximately 600 surveys have been completed, with more to come from Hunua. The ambassadors at Kaipātiki also carried out an awareness survey in local reserves over the summer period, with 247 surveys completed. Analysis of results is still underway but these will help inform future campaigns.

Education of council staff and developers

50. Auckland Council staff and contractors have been provided with guidelines and training to prevent the spread of kauri dieback during physical works. Over the 2017/18 financial year approximately 25 workshops have been provided to over 600
council staff, with additional sessions held for external operators such as Treescape
and Watercare.

51. Council staff also review and provide feedback on resource consent applications for
works in ecologically sensitive areas, to ensure that the correct procedures are in
place to prevent the spread of kauri dieback and they provide advice on the disposal
of infected trees and soil.

Treatment

52. Of a very small number of potential treatment options, phosphite (phosphorus acid,
phosphonate) appears to be the most promising. Following success with phosphite to
control Phytophthora lesion growth on inoculated kauri seedlings in glasshouse trials,
forest trials were conducted by Plant and Food Research at four affected sites in
early 2012.

53. The sites were at Huia and Whatipu in the Waitākere Ranges (Auckland) and Raetea
and Omahuta forests in the Mangamuka Ranges (Northland). A total of 163 trial trees
across the four sites showed symptoms of kauri dieback (canopy thinning/dieback
and/or basal truck lesions) at the start of the trial. A range of doses and
concentrations were tested during the trial, and results clearly demonstrate that
phosphite injections suppress kauri dieback infections.

54. While effectiveness of the treatment for suppressing the disease over a relatively
short timeframe has been confirmed, a strategy to translate that into a field-based
tool for wide scale use is still to be developed. As a first step, the council has
incorporated learnings from the trial into a treatment methodology which is currently
being tested on Maungaroa Ridge in Piha, with over 4000 individual kauri being
treated to date (refer to maps in Appendix 3).

55. A strategy for delivery of this treatment over larger areas is yet to be developed. In
future phosphite treatment could be delivered by a mixture of professional contractors
and volunteer groups, in the same way that other pest eradication activities (for
example possum trapping) are coordinated by council.

MANA WHENUA ENGAGEMENT

56. Kauri is a keystone species which supports a distinct New Zealand forest ecosystem,
sustaining indigenous flora and fauna. Kauri is a taonga species, and Auckland
Council in partnership with Māori, have a responsibility for the protection of the spiritual, economic and ecological values associated with this taonga and the ecosystems it supports.

57. In korero with Auckland Council mana whenua kaitiaki kaimahi representatives have stressed the importance of the kauri species and a desire to work more closely with council and the Department of Conservation on this kaupapa. Staff are working with mana whenua on the regional approach to kauri dieback on a site by site basis.

58. Council hosts a Kauri Dieback Co-Management Group with representatives from a number of iwi in the region. Department of Conservation representatives also attend. This group shares information about upcoming kauri dieback management actions and takes guidance from each other on how best to progress the work.

59. Wherever possible, mana whenua representatives are employed in various temporary roles, such as supporting kauri dieback surveillance and the phosphite research being undertaken in 2017/18.

60. Recent proposals to close the Waitākere Ranges and more tracks in the Hunua Ranges has seen council work closely with mana whenua in these areas. Staff have met regularly with Te Kawerau ā Maki in relation to the Waitākere Ranges protection measures.

61. The Waitākere Ranges Regional Park lies within the rohe of Te Kawerau ā Maki and Ngāti Whātua, which is acknowledged in the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008. It forms part of Te Waonui a Tiriwa, which is the heartland of Te Kawerau ā Maki. On this matter Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei has signalled support for the actions of Te Kawerau ā Maki.

62. Te Kawerau ā Maki view kauri in very high regards as ‘both living tupuna and as rangatira of the forest’. Te Kawerau mātāuranga also records that kauri support the growth of at least 17 plant species in addition to fungi and animals, and are integral to a healthy forest where food and medicine are collected. Their connection to the health of the forest is such that decline in kauri is an indicator that the mauri of the forest is at stake, and that ultimately ‘if Te Waonui a Tiriwa perishes so too does the iwi.’
63. Te Kawerau ā Maki have stated that kauri dieback and the declining health of Waitākere forest are existential threats to the iwi. Te Kawerau ā Maki have also stated they have a sacred obligation to protect the forest as kaitiaki. Consequently in early December 2017 Te Kawerau ā Maki placed a rāhui over the ‘Waitākere forest itself (the ‘ecological catchment’) to quarantine or prevent human access. They have described that ‘as a matter of tikanga the purpose of the rāhui is to enable the environment to recuperate and regenerate without the presence and impacts of humans. Its purpose is both physical and spiritual protection.’

64. The forested area of the Waitākere Ranges includes the regional park, local parks, Department of Conservation land, and private land covered by Te Waonui a Tiriwa (the Waitākere forest). The rāhui is a formal closure by mana whenua based on tikanga. This conservation measure was taken in response to the presence of kauri dieback, and the sacred obligation of kaitiakitanga, which is provided for under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the Te Kawerau ā Maki Claims Settlement Act (2015), the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act (2008), and the Resource Management Act (1991).

65. In addition, Te Kawerau ā Maki have also described that ‘the key concept of the rāhui is to close the forest completely in order to secure it from further human impact, to allow time for the environment to regenerate and to work through a program of risk assessment, mitigation design and implementation, research, and upgrades.’ This means that as tracks are upgraded and to a standard that reduces the spread of kauri dieback that precautionary ‘rolling openings’ may be appropriate.

66. Staff have been in discussions with Te Kawerau ā Maki about how to address the kauri dieback challenge in the Waitākere Ranges. While the forested area of the ranges remains closed under the rāhui, an exceptions list, as described above was agreed with representatives from Te Kawerau ā Maki for the purposes of engaging with the community and park users. This list takes a risk-based approach to openings and starts from the principle of closed. All tracks proposed to remain open, and in particular those marked with an asterisk, are subject to confirmation that they can meet the criteria outlined above by 1 May 2018.

67. Staff will continue to work with Te Kawerau ā Maki on the implementation of the kauri dieback protection programme for the Waitākere Ranges including tikanga and agreed communications around any rolling openings.
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68. In discussing the proposal to close tracks for kauri dieback protection in the Hunua Ranges, mana whenua representatives supported in principle the closure of tracks for kauri protection. They would however like to have a constructive, joined up discussion on managing forest health and the role of tikanga Māori (traditional cultural protocols, such as rāhui). A partnership discussion will be progressed by working towards an updated *Hunua Ranges Management Plan* that would include the management of all public lands. Council will work towards this with mana whenua and external partners, including the Department of Conservation.

**INVESTMENT IN KAURI DIEBACK**

69. Auckland Council’s kauri dieback programme is funded by both rates and a contribution from the Kauri Dieback Programme through the Ministry of Primary Industries. This contribution was specific to research and development outcomes that have benefit to the Kauri Dieback Programme, which the biosecurity unit has the expertise to deliver. These elements have been funded by a third party not rates.

70. The table below summarises the high-level budget figures for kauri dieback management by the biosecurity unit in council’s Environmental Services department.

**Table 3: Summary of Budget for Kauri Dieback Management 2015-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>Planned budget Full Year</th>
<th>Actual funded</th>
<th>Additional spend actual</th>
<th>Total Actual spend</th>
<th>Contribution to Kauri Dieback National program (included in total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$644,354</td>
<td>$644,354</td>
<td>$120,648</td>
<td>$765,002</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$562,848</td>
<td>$562,848</td>
<td>$137,483</td>
<td>$700,331</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$650,072</td>
<td>$621,899</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$621,899</td>
<td>$63,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The additional $137,483 in 2016 and $120,648 in 2017 are reprioritised expenditure over the baseline budget for these years.

Please note that the figures include full staff costs including overheads and some programme spend on contractors and equipment, but do not include the following costs:

- Parks department staff time, for maintaining stations, advocacy and management of the visitor centre
- Contract costs within the Community Facilities department for managing the hygiene stations
- Parks costs for track upgrades and maintenance, in which kauri dieback is taken into account when prioritising this work
• Communications staff time

• Planning staff time in developing the rules within the Unitary Plan regarding the movement of soil via earthworks, or consents compliance staff time for monitoring compliance with those rules.

*Long-term Plan investment in kauri dieback management*

71. Auckland Council is currently consulting on its next ten-year budget (the Long-term Plan 2019-2028), which includes a proposal for a targeted rate that would provide increased funding for the management of the natural environment.

72. Two options for increased investment in kauri dieback management are included in the plan, both of which provide for over 150km of track upgrades across regional and local parkland, of which approximately 100km is within the Waitākere Ranges. Option A allows for the majority of track upgrades to be to metal aggregate, while Option B provides for a greater proportion of tracks to be upgraded to boardwalks or geomesh.

73. Both options provide for approximately 300 new hygiene stations, of which approximately 100 would be within the Waitākere Ranges. The two options differ primarily in the quality of the hygiene stations provided for, with no large walk-through stations included in Option A but up to 100 of this style provided for in Option B.

74. If the targeted rate is confirmed by Council in June 2018, funding for kauri dieback would increase from approximately $500,000 per annum to an average of $9-$10 million per annum for the next 10 years. A significant proportion of this extra funding would be allocated immediately to allow for significant upgrades or re-routing of tracks that currently run through kauri forest. In addition, there would be significantly higher investment in ongoing track maintenance; upgraded and improved management of hygiene stations; the introduction of vehicle washdown facilities in key locations on our parks, and the implementation of behaviour change programmes.

75. The Long-term Plan options do not factor in the costs of enforcement of a Controlled Area Notice or large-scale closures of parks as these were not considerations at the time of developing the Long-term Plan scenarios. In the event council needs to fund these costs it will need to prioritise investment of such.
Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

76. Auckland Council’s role in managing kauri dieback disease has been recognised by its Environment and Community Committee through its endorsement of the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan for consultation, which includes a programme for kauri dieback. This plan was notified for public feedback in parallel with the Long-term Plan (submissions closed on 28 March 2018).

77. The proposed plan prioritises keeping the Hunua Ranges and most Hauraki Gulf islands free of kauri dieback and aims to reduce the spread of the disease in other parts of the region. Specific rules are proposed that would, for example, make hygiene stations mandatory at departure points to the Hauraki Gulf islands; ban the transport of kauri to the islands; ban the movement of soil into the Hunua Ranges Regional Park, and put restrictions on the movement of plant material into the Hunua Regional Park.

78. The proposed Regional Pest Management Plan was developed prior to the announcement of the intention to develop a National Pest Management Plan for kauri dieback, and it is not yet clear what impact a national plan would have on council’s proposed plan.

WORKING WITH CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

79. At its December 2017 Environment and Community Committee meeting, under consideration of the Kauri Dieback Challenge in Auckland, this committee resolved

h) that the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee make urgent representations to the Minister of Biosecurity and Minister for Conservation to advocate for increasing the investment and delivery for research, public awareness and operational practice for kauri dieback control and management (Resolution ENV/2017/1).

80. In February 2018, when the Environment and Community Committee proposed to close the forested areas of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park and high-risk tracks in the Hunua Ranges Regional Park this committee requested staff:

‘to formally seek the Ministry for Primary Industries support for the proposed closure with the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park and track closure within the Hunua Ranges Regional Park, by initiating controlled area notices, once targeted engagement and consultation has been completed.’ (Resolution ENV/2018/9)
81. These resolutions demonstrate some of the national challenges and opportunities for kauri dieback management. Auckland Council continues to appreciate the opportunity the national programme presents and is supportive of the three measures announced in early 2018 to strengthen efforts to save kauri trees from dieback disease being:
   - A Controlled Area Notice for kauri dieback
   - A National Pest Management Plan, and
   - A Strategic Science Advisory Group.

82. As the first controlled area notices will be implemented in Auckland, council is working closely with both central government agencies on planning to support these.

83. Understanding the national challenge through the development of National Pest Management Plan and investing in science at a national level is strongly supported by Auckland Council. Funding for these three initiatives will be critical to the successful management of the disease.

FUTURE APPROACH

84. As outlined above, Auckland Council’s regional approach to kauri dieback is to:
   - focus prevention efforts on areas that are not currently infected, such as the Hunua Ranges and Hauraki Gulf islands
   - use activities such as behaviour change programmes, track mitigation measures and hygiene stations to reduce the impact and spread of kauri dieback in areas that are currently infected, such as in the Waitākere Ranges
   - trial treatment methods that can then be used across the region to suppress disease symptoms in infected trees.

85. The future regional approach is dependent on a number of factors, including decisions made on the closure of tracks, and the availability of funding through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

86. Specific milestones in the coming months include:
   - the council’s decision on the appropriate levels of closures in the Waitakere and Hunua Ranges Regional Parks and associated Controlled Area Notices (expected April 2018)
   - the council’s decision on investment in kauri dieback management through the Long-term Plan (expected in June 2018)
• the adoption of a new Regional Pest Management Plan that will give the council more powers to manage kauri dieback (expected before mid-2019, subject to Long-term Plan funding being confirmed)

• The review of the national programme’s strategy and the development of a National Pest Management Plan (expected to take 18 – 24 months from now).

87. All these decisions will influence the future approach to kauri dieback management, as well as growth in our knowledge about the disease itself. However, it is expected that in Auckland council’s strategy will remain focused on protecting disease-free areas as a priority and limiting the spread elsewhere as we can.
## Appendix 1

List of Auckland Council Reports and Memos relating to Kauri Dieback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of meeting (committee or local board)</th>
<th>Title of report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20/02/18</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td>Kauri Dieback Management – Report Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20/02/18</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td>Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 – variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20/02/18</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td>A strategy for Auckland’s urban ngahere (forest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>08/02/18</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Local Board</td>
<td>Kauri in Waitākere Ranges parkland information memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>03/08/17</td>
<td>Memo to Environment and Community Committee members</td>
<td>Kauri dieback update -- February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14/01/17</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Local Board</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Local Parks Design Guidelines Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11/12/17</td>
<td>Finance and Performance Committee</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-2028 – Mayoral Proposal items for consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>05/12/17</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td>Kauri Dieback Management - Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23/11/17</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Local Board</td>
<td>Request for landowner approval – ‘The Hillary’ Trial Run 2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17/10/17</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td>Healthy Hunua – Kohukohunui (Hunua Ranges) Pest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28/09/17</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Local Board</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Six Monthly Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14/09/17</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Local Board</td>
<td>Kauri Dieback Monitoring Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14/07/17</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Local Board</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Programme Allocation for 2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12/11/17</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td>A strategic framework for Auckland’s urban ngahere (forest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25/08/16</td>
<td>Waiheke Local Board</td>
<td>Kauri Health and Protection at Te Matuku Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28/05/16</td>
<td>Regional Strategy and Policy Committee</td>
<td>Update on Draft Auckland Kauri Dieback Management Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>25/02/15</td>
<td>Attachment C of a report to Great Barrier Local Board Environment Committee</td>
<td>Groundtruthing survey for kauri dieback on Aotearoa/Great Barrier Island 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>04/12/14</td>
<td>Regional Strategy and Policy Committee</td>
<td>Draft Auckland Kauri Dieback Management Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>07/08/14</td>
<td>Regional Strategy and Policy Committee</td>
<td>Kauri Dieback Management Strategy – report and resolution from the Environment, Climate Change and Natural Heritage Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>09/07/14</td>
<td>Environment, Climate Change and Natural Heritage Committee</td>
<td>Draft Auckland Kauri Dieback Management Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24/07/14</td>
<td>Regional Development and Operations Committee</td>
<td>Recommendation from the Parks, Recreation and Heritage Forum meeting of 9 July 2013 – Kauri protection areas in the Waitakere and Hunua Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>09/07/13</td>
<td>Parks Recreation and Heritage Forum</td>
<td>Interim report back on kauri protection areas in the Waitakere and Hunua Ranges Regional Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td>Regional Development and Operations Committee</td>
<td>Recommendation from the Parks, Recreation and Heritage Forum meeting of 5 March 2013 – Funding long term management of Kauri Dieback disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29/08/12</td>
<td>Great Barrier Environment Strategy Planning Committee</td>
<td>Kauri dieback disease media release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>16/08/12</td>
<td>Regional Development and Operations Committee</td>
<td>Extraordinary Business – Recommendations from the Parks, Recreation and Heritage Forum – Kauri Health in the Hunua Ranges Regional Parkland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13/03/12</td>
<td>Parks Recreation and Heritage Forum</td>
<td>Kauri Health in Regional Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18/10/11</td>
<td>Parks Recreation and Heritage Forum</td>
<td>Kauri Health in the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park 2008-2011 – Update Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7 March 2018

Auckland Council
Stephen Town
Chief Executive

Dear Mr Town

Briefing on kauri dieback – request to provide written evidence

The Environment Committee has opened a briefing to consider the issue of kauri dieback. The committee is interested in hearing from a range of perspectives regarding this issue, including past and future actions to mitigate the spread of kauri dieback.

To assist with our consideration, the committee would like to request Auckland Council provide written evidence regarding kauri dieback.

Please send your evidence to the Clerk of Committee, Megan Robins, at megan.robins@parliament.govt.nz by midday Tuesday 3 April.

If you have any questions please contact the clerk on 04 817 9536.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Deborah Russell
Chairperson
Environment Committee
Memo

3 April 2018

To: Mayor Phil Goff, Councillors, Independent Maori Statutory Board Members, Executive Leadership Team
Cc: Jacques Victor, GM - Auckland Plan Strategy & Research
From: David Shamy, Manager Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit (GPS)

Subject: Global Engagement Activity Update – April 2018

Summary:
The purpose of this memo is to outline Auckland Council’s key upcoming global engagement activity during the month of April 2018. It notes key activity undertaken last month and outcomes achieved through this activity.

Action: for information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Activity – April 2018</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Apr</td>
<td>Newly appointed Korean Consul General Bae-kwan HONG introductory call on Mayor Goff</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Apr</td>
<td>Clare Fearnley, NZ Ambassador-designate to China pre-posting call on Mayor Goff</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 Apr</td>
<td>US Congressional House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure delegation – briefing and site visit of City Rail Link</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11 Apr</td>
<td>Mayor Goff official visit to Hong Kong on the Hong Kong Government Sponsored Visitors Programme</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11 Apr</td>
<td>Speech Contest Winner Ami Kamata from Fukuoka visit to Orewa College and Auckland Council</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15 Apr</td>
<td>Brisbane Mayoral Business Mission visit to Auckland to mark 30th anniversary of the city to city partnership</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-16 Apr</td>
<td>Annual visit for Korean Day by a Busan Municipal Delegation</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Apr</td>
<td>Newly appointed Consul General of Colombia to New Zealand Mr. Lennin Hernandez -Alarcon introductory call on Mayor Goff</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Activity - March 2018
The following is a list of key global activity facilitated by GPS and outcomes achieved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 Mar</td>
<td>Auckland Lantern Festival (ATEED-led)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• Mayor participated at opening ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Highlighted Auckland’s diversity and stronger intercultural connection through the Festival with over 200,000 attendees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mar</td>
<td>Visit to Auckland Council Investment Office, Panuku, ATEED and IMSB by Mr Jin Liqun, President of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Fund (AIIIB)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• Updated discussions on the potential of the AIIIB to investment in New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gained an understanding of the AIIIB fund and its potential application in Auckland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Mar</td>
<td>Director Raymond Fan of the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Office (HKETO) call on Mayor Goff</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Discussed Hong Kong’s economic, trade and cultural ties with Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed the Mayor’s upcoming visit to Hong Kong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-18 Mar</td>
<td>Visit to Auckland by Volnei José Morastoni, the Mayor of Itajaí, (the Brazilian city that will host the next leg of the Volvo Ocean Race) and delegation</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Mayor Goff engaged in the ceremonial handover of the Volvo Ocean Race to the Mayor of Itajaí and farewelled the sailors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best practice sharing of Auckland’s experience on waste management; attracting &amp; hosting of events; Auckland Plan, and Port development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mar</td>
<td>Adrienne van der Sar, Deputy Director of the Delta Committee of the Netherlands roundtable discussion with Auckland Council</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Exchanged best practice with a leading global actor on dealing with the impacts of climate change on cities including flooding and coastal inundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mar</td>
<td>Viet Nam Prime Minister H.E. Nguyen Xuan Phuc called on Mayor Goff</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Deepened understandings between Vietnam and Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed geopolitical and trade issues in the Asia-Pacific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16 Mar</td>
<td>Mr Anutin Charnvirakul - Thai politician and business leader called on Deputy Mayor Cashmore and visited City Rail Link</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Showcased Auckland’s infrastructure and sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raised Auckland’s profile with an influential Thai political leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 Mar</td>
<td>Councillor Chris Darby visited Taiwan at the official invitation by the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Auckland</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Presented at 2018 Smart City Summit and Expo Mayors’ Summit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engaged with the Council of Indigenous Peoples, Taichung and Taipei City Governments. Discussed opportunities for indigenous exchanges with iwi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban development learnings: electronic toll collection system and urban rejuvenation project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 Mar</td>
<td>Global Partnerships and Strategy and Block House Bay Intermediate School co-hosted a visit by Asian Pacific Children's Conference &quot;Mission Project&quot; delegation from Fukuoka, Japan</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Strengthened Fukuoka and Auckland partner city relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced young students’ global understanding through cultural exchange and school visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Mar – 1 Apr</td>
<td>Visit to Auckland Council by Prof. Jens Bley - eCultureLab Hafencity University of Hamburg</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Discussed upcoming roadshow visit from Hamburg in early 2019 on “Smart City Applications in the Cultural Realm”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next steps

- The Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit will provide an update on key global activity each month.
- Requests for additional information or enquiries about the information listed above can be directed to Tao Chen, Advisor Global Partnerships and Strategy; (tao.chen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz Mobile: 021 853 948).
Memorandum

28 March 2018

To: Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Setting Draft Swimmability Targets for Larger Rivers and Lakes in the Auckland region

From: Jonathan Benge, Wai Ora Partnerships Team Manager

Purpose

1. To inform the committee of a draft target for swimmability for Auckland’s larger rivers.

Summary

- The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management requires regional councils and unitary authorities to prepare draft regional targets to improve the quality of fresh water. The draft regional targets must be made publicly available by 31 March 2018, with final regional targets publicly available by 31 December 2018.

- Draft regional targets only apply to E. coli (for rivers) and cyanobacteria (for lakes). See the full list of applicable rivers and lakes in Attachment A and map in Attachment B.

- A governance group and taskforce were created comprising Ministry for the Environment and Ministry for Primary Industries officials and staff from regional councils and unitary authorities. This taskforce supported councils to set the draft targets. They have developed information for each region in a technical report that will be made publicly available before 31 March 2018.

- Currently, 23 per cent of the length of applicable rivers and 97 per cent of applicable lakes in Auckland are classified as swimmable, according to criteria used by the Ministry for the Environment.

- A draft regional target for the Auckland region of 30.5 per cent by 2030 has been identified based on initial modelling by the governance group, with input from Auckland Council staff. This is an increase in swimmable length of river of 7.5 per cent. Lakes were not modelled and therefore the target only applies to rivers.

- Auckland Council is currently undertaking its own modelling work, including the development of a regional contaminant load model, which will enable final targets to be set with a higher degree of accuracy.

- The final targets will be bought to Environment and Community Committee for their approval by December 2018.

- Attachment C provides an overview of the draft regional target and Auckland Council priorities and work programmes to improve freshwater quality. This attachment will be published on the Auckland Council website on 31 March 2018.

Context/Background

National Context and Background

1. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management requires regional councils and unitary authorities to prepare draft regional targets to improve the quality of fresh water (Policy A6). The draft regional targets must be made publicly available by 31 March 2018, with final regional targets publicly available by 31 December 2018.

2. The regional targets must contribute to achieving the following national targets:
   - 80 per cent of specified rivers and lakes are suitable for primary contact (e.g. swimming) by 2030; and
3. The term “specified rivers and lakes” is defined in the national policy statement as rivers that are fourth order or above\(^1\), i.e. larger rivers and lakes with a perimeter greater than 1,500 metres.

4. A full list of applicable rivers in Auckland is shown in Attachment A and a map in Attachment B.

5. There are a wide range of factors and contaminants that affect swimming, however, the requirement to set a draft regional target relates only to E. coli (for rivers) and cyanobacteria (for lakes) as indicators of the risk to human health.

6. To help develop these regional targets central and local government established a governance group and taskforce comprising Ministry for the Environment and Ministry for Primary Industries officials and staff from regional councils and unitary authorities.

7. The taskforce has recently prepared the report ‘Regional information for setting draft targets for swimmable lakes and rivers’. The report provides information on progress across the country towards the national targets as a result of councils’ work programmes. It will be released publicly when draft targets are published on 31 March 2018.

8. The report relies on scientific modelling by the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) using a national version of the Catchment Land Use for Environmental Sustainability water quality model, which is relevant to rivers only.

9. The report identifies the work committed in each region and gives an indication of the expected improvement in water quality for swimming. It forms the basis for the taskforce’s recommendation for an interim (draft) target for the Auckland region.

10. Attachment C provides an overview of the draft regional target and Auckland Council priorities and work programmes to improve freshwater quality. This attachment will be published on the Auckland Council website on 31 March 2018.

11. Further detail regarding the national context and background is available in Attachment D.

**Discussion**

**Current State of Auckland’s Applicable Rivers and Lakes**

12. Based on the national scale modelling, as of 2017, 23 per cent of applicable rivers in Auckland are considered safe for swimming (based only on modelled concentrations of E. coli). For lakes (with a perimeter greater than 1500m), 97 per cent are considered to be safe for swimming (based on biovolume of toxic algae and E. coli in any streams which feed the lakes). Figure 1 shows the percentage of rivers in Auckland in each swimmability category, whilst Figure 2 does the same for lakes.

![Diagram showing swimmability categories of rivers and lakes](image)

**Figure 1. Percentage of length of Auckland river in each swimmability category.**

---

\(^1\) A first order stream is the smallest of the streams and has no tributaries. First order streams, which may not be permanently flowing, flow into second order streams, which flow into third order streams and so on.
Figure 2. Percentage of Auckland lake perimeter in each swimmability category.

Taskforce Recommendation

13. Modelling carried out on behalf of the governance group and taskforce has shown that a projected improvement of 7.5 per cent of the total river length being swimmable is realistic and achievable for Auckland’s rivers by 2030. Lakes were not modelled and therefore the target only applies to Auckland’s rivers.

14. The recommended draft target is based on the best available information as of late 2017, based on the current work programmes the council has in place.

15. Attachment C provides an overview of the draft target and Auckland Council’s current priorities and work programmes to improve water quality. It will be published on the Auckland Council website on 31 March 2018.

Next steps/implementation

Final Targets and Improved Data

16. The final targets will be bought to Environment and Community Committee for their approval by December 2018.

17. Auckland Council is developing a regional contaminant load model, with initial outputs due to be delivered in September 2018. The model will enable us to better calculate the pathogen inputs to Auckland’s rivers and develop effective solutions. In turn, this will inform the setting of final targets for primary contact.

18. Staff will use the regional contaminant load model to determine whether an improvement of 7.5 per cent is realistic, and what additional projects or interventions might be needed to further increase freshwater swimmability.

19. The regional modelling will be supported by investigations such as microbial source tracking to identify sources of faecal contamination to enable appropriate targeting of interventions.

20. Whilst recognising that significantly more swimming occurs in coastal waters, Auckland Council is currently identifying freshwater sites where Aucklanders swim. We can use this to take a public health risk-based approach to prioritising projects and activities to improve swimmability.

Costs

21. The draft target improvement of 7.5 per cent assumes that planned work and existing initiatives (for example, the regional Waterway Protection Fund and similar local board initiatives) will continue until 2030. However, when setting the final targets council will have a more detailed understanding of the costs required to achieve an agreed level of improvement.

22. In addition, prior to setting the final targets, Auckland Council will have certainty on any increased level of funding through the draft Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and on the status of national regulations for stock exclusion. These can then be factored into the modelling of potential increases in freshwater swimmability.
Local Board Engagement

23. Staff have sought feedback on the draft target from the following local boards which have applicable rivers within their boundaries:
   - Franklin
   - Great Barrier
   - Henderson – Massey
   - Manurewa
   - Maungakiekie – Tāmaki
   - Ōtara-Papatoetoe
   - Papakura
   - Rodney
   - Upper Harbour
   - Waitakere Ranges.

24. Staff received similar feedback from each local board which has been summarised as:
   - All local boards understand the constraints for setting a draft target different to that recommended by the taskforce.
   - Concern expressed that the swimmability target only addresses E. coli and no other contaminants that may affect swimming.
   - All local boards would like to be kept informed and given the opportunity to contribute to the setting of final targets later in 2018.

25. A follow up workshop will be scheduled with affected local boards for late 2018 when final swimmability targets can be refined.

 Mana Whenua Engagement

26. Wai Māori (freshwater) has an inherent mauri (life-force) and is valued for its fundamental role as a life-sustaining force for all life.

27. Mana whenua representatives were engaged through the Infrastructure and Environmental Services Monthly Information Hui in February 2018. Feedback can be summarised as:
   - The group acknowledged the rationale for the draft target and the need for better data to inform the setting of final targets.
   - They would like to understand the contaminant load model that is under development.
   - They want to help develop the final targets.

28. A workshop with mana whenua will be scheduled for June 2018 to provide an overview of the contaminant load model and a follow up workshop will be scheduled for late 2018 when final swimmability targets can be refined.

Adoption of Final Targets

29. In addition to the work above, Auckland Council staff will continue to work with the national taskforce and other regional councils to enable sharing of information and best practice. This will ensure Auckland is taking a consistent approach to other councils and utilising the best information available.

30. Once the final targets have been identified, these will be presented to Environment and Community Committee for their adoption. They will then be published by 31 December 2018.

Attachments

- Attachment A: List of applicable rivers and the local board in which they are situated.
- Attachment B: Map of applicable rivers and lakes.
- Attachment C: Draft Swimmability Target.
- Attachment D: National Context and Background.
**Attachment A**

Applicable rivers and the local board in which they are situated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosseys Creek</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hingaia Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunua Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangawheau Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Name</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngakoroa Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orere River</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orere Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symonds Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taitaia Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turanga Creek</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutaenui Stream</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairoa River</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangapouri Creek</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitoke Creek</td>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangapoua Creek</td>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Creek</td>
<td>Henderson - Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momutu Stream</td>
<td>Henderson - Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opanuku Stream</td>
<td>Henderson - Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oratia Stream</td>
<td>Henderson - Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanson Stream</td>
<td>Henderson - Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura Stream</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Name</td>
<td>Maungakiekie - Tāmāki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otara Creek</td>
<td>Ōtara - Papatoetoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays Stream</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hingaia Stream</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngakoroa Stream</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura Stream</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Creek</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symonds Stream</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araparera River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararimu Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Creek</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haruru Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoteo River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipara River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitoto Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaukapakapa River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourawhero Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumeu/Kaipara River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahurangi River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahurangi River (Left Branch)</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahurangi River (Right Branch)</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Name</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makarau River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matakana River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onehunga Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakiri River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poutawa Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puhoi River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitopuni Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauhori Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahekeroa River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikokopu Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikoukou Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitapu Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitetei Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitoki Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiwera River</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihi Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaripo Stream</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Creek</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Creek</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huia Stream</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karekare Stream</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumeu/Kaipara River</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opanuku Stream</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere River</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C. Draft Regional Targets for the Auckland Region

Introduction

The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (as amended in August 2017) directs all regional councils (including unitary authorities) to set draft regional targets to improve the quality of rivers and lakes so they are suitable for swimming and other activities that require immersion in water.

There are a wide range of factors and contaminants that affect swimming. However, the requirement to set a draft regional target relates only to E.coli (for rivers) and cyanobacteria (for lakes) as indicators of the risk to human health.

All regional councils and unitary authorities have worked together to use the best information available to identify:

- The improvements that will be made to water quality in rivers in their respective regions under programmes that are planned or underway – i.e. current commitments.
- When the anticipated water quality improvements will be achieved.
- The likely costs of all interventions and where these costs will fall.

A report on these theoretical improvements and costs, presented region by region, is available on the Ministry for the Environment’s website. The assumptions and limitations of the modelling approaches taken are described in the report.

This document sets out the draft target for Auckland’s major (fourth order or higher) rivers and the process Auckland Council will follow to develop a final regional target, as required by 31st December 2018.

Regional context and focus

Auckland Context

Auckland is mostly known for its urban centre, however this only represents about 11 per cent of the region’s land area.\(^1\) Nearly half the region is farmland, and the rich soils around Pukekohe and Franklin are among the nation’s most productive for agriculture. Another quarter of Auckland is covered by native vegetation, with the remainder being exotic forests and other uses.\(^2\)

 Catchments in the Auckland region are generally small, with short first- or second-order rivers, and intermittent streams. Fewer than 10 per cent of these drain urban areas. Most come from rural farmland, native bush or exotic forests.\(^3\)

Despite covering less than 2 per cent of New Zealand’s total land area, the Auckland region contains over a third of the population and is growing at a very high rate. This population growth is driving significant land use change in Auckland’s rural areas with productive rural land uses such as dairying, pastoral and horticulture declining in favour of suburban development and lifestyle blocks. The resulting housing and infrastructure development,

---


\(^3\) LAW A
increasing vehicle numbers and delivery of wastewater services places severe pressures on freshwater quality, particularly with regard to sediment, metals and other contaminants associated with urban areas.⁴

E. coli levels do not meet guidelines for swimming or other primary contact recreation in many Auckland rivers. Health risks are also evident at popular beaches, to varying degrees, where the majority of swimming takes place. In urban areas, this is typically the result of wastewater overflows and contaminated stormwater during rainstorms. Rural streams generally have better water quality, although they also face problems with elevated levels of nutrients, sediment and E. coli in some areas of more intensive agriculture and towns with aging or improperly maintained septic systems.

The overall swimmable state of the Auckland region’s rivers is 23% swimmable (that is, 23% of rivers that are fourth order or larger are currently considered safe in terms of E. coli levels). For lakes with perimeters greater than 1500 metres, 97% are currently considered safe in terms of cyanobacteria levels.

Regional Priorities:

Auckland Council’s priority is to manage faecal contamination using a public-health, risk-based approach. The approach is to minimise the risk of people getting sick as a result of being in contact with water containing faecal contamination.

In the Auckland region the risk is not limited to rivers and is often heightened in coastal waters where the majority of swimming occurs.

Auckland Council launched Safeswim in 2017 to report on bathing beach water quality on an almost live basis. Safeswim communicates health risk to the public from immersion and highlights areas for investigation, remediation and investment. Safeswim currently focusses on coastal waters as this is where the majority of swimming takes place in Auckland.

Auckland Council has proposed a water quality targeted rate in the long term plan for 2018-2028. This would generate $400 million towards funding a Water Quality Improvements Programme including:

- reducing wastewater overflows into the Waitamata Harbour from hundreds of events to six or less each year.
- reducing stormwater volumes into the Manukau Harbour.
- reducing contaminates such as litter, sediments, metals and oils in stormwater across the region, and in the South Kaipara Harbour.
- improving water quality and creating healthy habitats for plants and animals in streams across the region.
- establishing a system for proactive monitoring of onsite waste water treatment systems such as septic tanks.

Existing Work Programme:

Auckland Council is currently implementing a range of measures to reduce health risk from faecal contamination associated with swimming.

Upgrades are planned for both of Auckland’s major point sources:

---

⁴ Implementation Review, Auckland Chapter
The Warkworth wastewater treatment plant will stop discharging treated wastewater to the Mahurangi River. Instead, wastewater will be transferred to an upgraded treatment plant at Snells Beach and discharged into coastal waters adjacent to Martins Bay. Construction is expected to be complete by 2022.

The Wellsford wastewater treatment plant will be upgraded to an advanced wetland treatment process. This upgrade was successfully consented in November 2017.

In areas with combined wastewater and stormwater networks, the council has placed emphasis on the use of enlarged interceptor systems to manage wastewater overflows, combined with localised sewer separation as part of long-term infrastructure upgrades. Projects include:

- The Central Interceptor, a wastewater tunnel that will run between Western Springs and the Mangere Wastewater Treatment Plant.
- Okahu Bay stormwater and wastewater separation project.

Auckland Council is currently supporting rural communities on a number of stock exclusion and riparian planting projects (to better manage sediment, E. coli and other contaminants entering waterways) throughout rural Auckland, such as:

- Auckland Council’s Waterway Protection Fund for fencing and planting, to prevent livestock having free access to waterways, will match up to 50 per cent of project costs on private land in priority catchments.
- The Rodney Local Board’s Healthy Harbours and Waterways Fund will provide $230,000 to match fund 46,000 new plants and 322 km of new fencing aimed at increasing swimmability in Mahurangi, Makarau and Upper Kaipara River catchments.
- The Lower Kaipara River Land Owner Collective Project supports land owners to manage river banks.
- Support community organisations such as the Wairoa landcare community group and Forest Bridge Trust to work with local land owners to increase planting and fencing.

The Auckland Unitary Plan requires stock exclusion from water sources on intensively grazed farm land (where a stocking rate is equal or more than 18 stock units) from 2021 onwards and from intermittent streams from 2026 onwards. The Auckland Unitary Plan also introduces new rules for farm effluent storage and disposal. The measures and behaviours required by the plan should reduce levels of E. coli originating from farms.

**Draft regional targets**

The draft swimmability targets for the Auckland region, based on the predictive modelling of programmes underway, are for 30.5% of rivers that are fourth order or larger to be in the blue, green or yellow category in terms of E. coli by 2030, shown in the graph below.

E. coli is used as an indicator of the risk to human health presented when swimming in a river, represented as five attribute states (i.e. A, B, C, D and E) each represented by colour blue, green, yellow, orange and red respectively.

The draft target of 30.5% is based on modelling using the best available information as of late 2017 which indicates that Auckland can, under current commitments, achieve an increase in swimmable length of river of 7.5 per cent by 2030.
Regional process from here

Improved Data
Auckland Council is developing a regional contaminant load model, due to be delivered in September 2018. The model will enable Auckland Council to better calculate the pathogen inputs to Auckland’s rivers and develop effective solutions. In turn, this will inform the setting of final targets for swimmability by 31st December 2018.

Staff will use the regional contaminant load model to determine whether an improvement of 7.5 per cent is realistic, and what additional projects or interventions might be needed to further increase freshwater swimmability.

The regional modelling will be supported where applicable, by investigations such as microbial source tracking to identify sources of faecal contamination to enable appropriate targeting of interventions.

Whilst recognising that significantly more swimming occurs in coastal waters, Auckland Council is currently identifying freshwater sites where Aucklanders swim. We can use this to take a public health risk based approach to prioritising projects and activities to improve swimmability.

Costs
The draft target improvement of 7.5% in large rivers assumes that planned work and existing initiatives (for example, the Waterway Protection Fund and similar Local Board initiatives) will continue until 2030. However, on setting the final targets we will have a more detailed understanding of the costs required to achieve an agreed level of improvement.

In addition, prior to setting the final targets, Auckland Council will have certainty on any increased level of funding through the proposed water quality targeted rate included in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and on the status of national regulations for stock exclusion. These can then be factored into the modelling of potential increases in freshwater swimmability.
Attachment D

National Context and Background

On 23 February 2017, the Government announced its proposals to amend the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and introduce a national (non-statutory) target for swimmable lakes and rivers (*Clean Water: 90% of lakes and rivers swimmable by 2040*). The Hon Dr Nick Smith (as Minister for the Environment) wrote to all regional councils and unitary authorities on 28 February 2017 to inform them of the national target and to “encourage input and an early start to the implementation of these ambitious goals.”

After considering submissions to the proposals in *Clean Water*, the Government made a suite of amendments to the NPS-FM, which were gazetted in August 2017. These amendments included setting a national target for water quality improvement in rivers and lakes as follows:

- 80% of specified rivers and lakes are suitable for primary contact (e.g. swimming) by 2030; and
- 90% are suitable by 2040.

The term “specified rivers and lakes” is defined in the NPS-FM as rivers that are fourth order or above and lakes with a perimeter greater than 1,500 metres.¹ Primary contact is defined as people’s contact with water that involves immersion, including swimming.

To achieve the national targets, the NPS-FM directs regional councils and unitary authorities to set regional targets. Draft regional targets must be made available to the public by 31 March 2018 and final targets made available by 31 December 2018. The NPS-FM does not specify whether these regional targets should be for the 2030 or 2040 timeframe.

To help councils respond to the requests for information and develop their regional targets as directed in the NPS-FM, central and local government established a governance group and taskforce comprising MFE and MPI officials and staff from regional councils and unitary authorities. The governance group has been responsible for coordinating the sector’s response to the policy proposals more generally and overseeing the work of the taskforce. The taskforce has focused on a programme of work to collect the information needed to achieve the deadlines set by government.

Some regional councils have raised concerns with the taskforce about the national targets. The concerns include:

- The target’s focus on *E. coli* and cyanobacteria (human health attributes in the NPS-FM) as measures of suitability for swimming. In some regions, the community outcomes sought will mean other contaminants such as nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment may be a higher priority.
- There is a risk that prioritising actions to achieve the national targets for swimming will affect the process of identifying other community values (such as irrigation or mahinga kai) and setting freshwater objectives and limits for those values as required under the NPS-FM.
- The method of assessing and reporting *E. coli* takes no account of seasonal effects that influence when people swim, or whether there is any public access to the rivers and lakes that are part of the target.

¹ A first order stream is the smallest of the streams and has no tributaries. First order streams, which may not be permanently flowing, flow into second order streams, which flow into third order streams and so on.
The taskforce will continue to discuss these wider issues related to setting and achieving the targets and work with government officials to resolve them.

Developing regional targets is a challenging process because of delays and uncertainties relating to the Government regulation on stock exclusion, and the work committed to by the coalition Government on seasonality for swimming. Furthermore, while there are areas where the science can be improved, for example, the ability to model all four criteria for *E. coli* results in rivers. It is unlikely these matters will be resolved over the next six months.

The taskforce feel that these uncertainties should not prevent councils making the best estimations possible with the tools and knowledge available to meet the deadline set in the NPS-FM.

The governance group has interpreted the NPS-FM direction as being that the draft targets should be set for the 2030 target date, with the final targets, which must be made available by 31 December 2018, to be for both 2030 and 2040. This reflects that there has been insufficient time for consultation on where water quality improvements should be focussed and how quickly any mitigations works should be implemented. Because of the timing issue the taskforce modelled the impact on water quality of existing programmes and initiatives.

The taskforce used the “water quality for swimming map” on the Ministry for the Environment website as a basis for establishing the extent of water quality improvements that will be required region by region, and the associated costs. Auckland Council along with other councils provided information on areas where the maps were inaccurate; the maps were adjusted accordingly and taken as a baseline of national river “swimmability”. We also provided the taskforce with information about the commitments to water quality mitigation work in the Auckland region in regional plans, long term plans, annual plans and asset management plans - the “committed work”. This committed work included investment in infrastructure and was assumed by the taskforce to include the stock exclusion requirements proposed by the Government in *Clean Water* in February 2017, although these have not yet been promulgated as national regulations.

The National Institute of Water and Atmosphere (NIWA) used the regional information to model the water quality improvements in rivers that should be achieved. The modelled improvements relate only to improvements in *E. coli* concentrations (a measure of the risk to human health) in rivers. They do not relate to improvements in lake water quality (due to modelling limitations) which are also required as part of achieving the swimmable lakes and rivers target, or to associated water quality improvements (such as nutrient levels or water clarity).

Estimations of the costs of the committed work have been modelled by Professor Graeme Doole of Waikato University.

The draft regional targets and how they fit with the wider programme of freshwater management for the Auckland region are set out in Attachment A.

The taskforce’s report “Regional information for setting draft targets for swimmable lakes and rivers” provides information on progress towards the national targets as a result of committed work programmes. It will be released publicly when draft targets are published on 31 March 2018. The report identifies the work committed in each region, and gives an indication of the expected improvement in water quality for swimming and the associated costs arising form that committed work.

The report relies on scientific modelling by NIWA using a national version of the Catchment Land Use for Environmental Sustainability (CLUES) water quality model, which is relevant to rivers only. Water quality improvements related to point-source discharge upgrades were included in the modelled estimations. For improvements that will arise from non-point source discharges, relevant information was provided to a mitigation expert panel who worked with
NIWA to determine the effectiveness of mitigations in our region. The mitigation interventions largely fell into three categories: stock exclusion, riparian planting and management of farm dairy effluent.

The water quality and economic modelling provides an estimate of how far each council’s existing work programmes will go to meet the national targets and provides an informed interim (draft) target.

The assumptions and limitations of the modelling approaches taken are described in the report. The report was distributed to all regional councils and unitary authorities in December 2017 for review and comments.
Memorandum

19 March 2018

To: Chair and members of the Environment and Community Committee
Local board chairs and members

Subject: Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2)

From: Michael Sinclair, Unit Manager, Social Policy & Bylaws

Purpose
1. To provide a summary of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2),
   and an opportunity for elected members to present their views on the bill.

Background

Outline of the bill
2. The Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2) ("Bill") has been introduced
to Parliament. The Bill amends the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 ("Act") by amending section 133
which addresses the renewal of licences where a relevant local alcohol policy exists.

3. The purpose of the Bill is to require the licensing authority and licensing committee to take a relevant
local alcohol policy into account when considering the renewal of an alcohol licence. It also allows the
licensing authority and licensing committee to exercise its discretion to refuse to renew a licence if it
would be inconsistent with location and density policies contained in a local alcohol policy.

Outline of Supplementary Order Paper 21 February 2018
4. During the first reading on 21 February 2018, a Supplementary Order Paper ("SOP") was tabled. The SOP
seeks to amend the Bill by limiting its application to only off-licences renewals.
5. Attachment A is a comparison of section 133 as it appears in the Act, the Bill, and as it would appear if
the amendments referred to in the SOP were incorporated.
6. A copy of the Bill, relevant sections of the Act and the SOP are attached.

Auckland Council’s Provisional Local Alcohol Policy
7. The council has developed a local alcohol policy. The council’s local alcohol policy is currently provisional
and is not in force as it is subject to legal challenges.

8. The proposed changes to section 133 as referred to in the Bill would not affect the council’s provisional
local alcohol policy. The current version of section 133 is specifically referred to in the local alcohol
policy.

9. Elements relating to location and density such as the temporary freeze on the issuing of off-licences and
rebuttable presumption against the issuing of off-licences in Priority Overlay Areas\(^1\) only apply to new
alcohol licences. However, the Bill may affect any future local alcohol policy which is developed.

10. In addition, this is the first time that a Bill which touches on local alcohol policies has been put forward
and it provides a timely opportunity to comment on the local alcohol policy process. Issues identified
with the process include:
   - The significant cost and delay in developing and implementing a local alcohol policy due to legal
     challenges

\(^1\) 23 areas identified as at most risk of alcohol-related harm
item 13

- The process required by the court system when negotiating amendments to a policy
- The inability to address the delivery times of remote sales in a local alcohol policy.

Process and draft submission

11. The Bill passed its first reading on 21 February 2018. Submissions have opened and are due 25 April 2018. The Governance Administration Committee is to report on the Bill in August 2018.

12. A staff working group consisting of staff from Social Policy and Bylaws, Local Board Services, Community Empowerment, Alcohol Licensing, Legal and Hearings (Democracy Services) has been formed to discuss the Bill and submission.

13. Staff advised local board chairs at a local board chairs forum on 12 March 2018 of the Bill and how local board input can be included into a submission.

14. The below dates provide an approximate timeframe of the Council’s submission process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 March 2018</td>
<td>Local board chairs forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March 2018*</td>
<td>Drop in session for elected members to provide feedback on the draft submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 March 2018</td>
<td>Date for elected members to provide feedback on the draft submission via email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 March 2018</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee agenda report submitted to management for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April 2018</td>
<td>Report to the Environment and Community Committee for submission approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 16 April 2018</td>
<td>Send approved submission to the Select Committee (minor amendments may be required by Committee and approved by the chair before submission)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*dates subject to councillors availability.

15. A first draft of the submission is attached. Staff have identified:

- While the principle behind the Bill is positive for communities, there are problems with the Bill which need to be addressed to ensure there are not unintended consequences.
- The Bill has no practical application for Auckland Council’s Provisional Local Alcohol Policy. While the provisional local alcohol policy contains elements relating to location and density of off-licences, these specifically relate to new off-licences.
- The Bill would only have practical application when a local alcohol policy containing elements relating to location and density on the renewal of licences is brought into force.
- The process for developing a local alcohol policy and subsequent legal challenges means significant cost and delay for councils. Local alcohol policies which include elements which vary too much from the default rules in the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 are often appealed

16. Staff are seeking feedback on the draft submission.

Next steps:

17. For elected members who are interested in attending the drop in session, please contact Tam White before close of business on 20 March 2018.

18. For questions or responses regarding the bill or submission, contact Mike Sinclair, Manager – Social Policy and Bylaws on 027 473 8723 or michael.sinclair@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.
### Table one: comparison of section 133 –key differences highlighted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version of s133</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 133 as it appears in the Act</strong></td>
<td>133 Renewal of licences where relevant local alcohol policy exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) In considering whether to renew a licence, the licensing authority or licensing committee concerned <em>must not take into account</em> any inconsistency between a relevant local alcohol policy and—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) the renewal of the licence; or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) the consequences of its renewal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The licensing authority or licensing committee concerned may impose particular conditions on any licence it renews if—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) there is any relevant local alcohol policy; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) it considers that the renewal of the licence, or the consequences of the renewal of the licence, without those conditions imposed on it would be inconsistent with the policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 133 as it appears in the Bill</strong></td>
<td>133 Renewal of licences where relevant local alcohol policy exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) A licensing authority or licensing committee may refuse to renew a licence if, in its opinion, the renewal of the licence or the consequences of its renewal would be inconsistent with policies, on any or all of the matters set out in paragraphs (a) to (d) of section 77(1), that are contained in any relevant local alcohol policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) A licensing authority or licensing committee may impose particular conditions on any licence it renews if, in its opinion, the renewal of the licence, or the consequences of its renewal without those conditions would be inconsistent with policies, on any or all of the matters set out in paragraphs (e) to (g) of section 77(1), that are contained in any relevant local alcohol policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 133 as it would appear if incorporating the provisions of the SOP</strong></td>
<td>133 Renewal of licences where relevant local alcohol policy exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) A licensing authority or licensing committee may refuse to renew an off-licence if, in its opinion, the renewal of the off-licence or the consequences of its renewal would be inconsistent with policies, on any or all of the matters set out in paragraphs (a) to (d) of section 77(1), that are contained in any relevant local alcohol policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) A licensing authority or licensing committee may impose particular conditions on any off-licence it renews if, in its opinion, the renewal of the off-licence, or the consequences of its renewal without those conditions would be inconsistent with policies, on any or all of the matters set out in paragraphs (e) to (g) of section 77(1), that are contained in any relevant local alcohol policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) <em>In considering whether to renew a licence other than an off-licence,</em> the licensing authority or licensing committee concerned <em>must not take into account</em> any inconsistency between a relevant local alcohol policy and—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) the renewal of the licence; or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) the consequences of its renewal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The licensing authority or licensing committee concerned may impose particular conditions on any licence it renews, other than an off-licence, if—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) there is any relevant local alcohol policy; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) it considers that the renewal of the licence, or the consequences of the renewal of the licence, without those conditions imposed on it would be inconsistent with the policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission to Governance Administration Select Committee

In the matter of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2)

Auckland Council, April 2018
Mihimihī*

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
kī ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-iwi taketake mai, tauīwi atu.
Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,
wenerau a te mano.
Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place,
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time,
and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land
and the newcomers among us all.
Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands.
You are unique in the world.

*Note Mihimihī may be amended as part of finalising the submission
Title: Auckland Council Submission on the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2)

Submission to the Governance Administration Committee

1 Introduction

1.1 This submission relates to both the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2) ("the bill") and the Supplementary Order Paper dated 21 February 2018 tabled by MP Louisa Walls ("the paper").

2 Executive Summary

2.1 Alcohol related harm is a concern in Auckland and Auckland Council has developed a local alcohol policy in response.

2.2 The council recognises concerns have been raised by communities with location and density of off-licences.

2.3 The council supports the principle behind the bill and the paper but wants to ensure minimisation of unintended consequences. The current wording of the bill and the paper raise concerns about complexity and potentially introduces unintended consequences which need to be addressed.

2.4 The council questions the bill’s practical application. The bill would have no immediate practical effect within Auckland because:

2.4.1 The council does not have a local alcohol policy in force.

2.4.2 Auckland Council’s Provisional Local Alcohol Policy currently excludes renewals from density provisions.

2.5 The council has concerns about the local alcohol policy process, including:

2.5.1 The court process is lengthy and delayed through costly legal challenges. This has the effect of undermining community voices and expectations.

2.5.2 Elements relating to delivery times for remote sellers are unable to be included in a local alcohol policy.

2.6 More central government guidance is needed to strengthen the voice of the community in the development of a local alcohol policy.
3 Alcohol-related harm is a concern in Auckland

3.1 Research conducted by the council when considering whether to develop a local alcohol policy identified issues of alcohol-related harm in Auckland. This research fed into the development of Auckland Council’s Provisional Local Alcohol Policy.

4 Council recognises concerns have been raised with location and density of off-licences

4.1 Communities in Auckland have made it clear to the council that they have serious concerns about the number and location of off-licences in some parts of Auckland. The council also recognises the difficulties that communities have raised when objecting to renewal applications, especially in relation to the location and density of off-licences.

4.2 The Auckland Council Provisional Local Alcohol Policy addresses location and density elements which apply to off-licences differently to on- or club-licences. This was as a result of research into alcohol-related harm in the context of Auckland. Other communities may have different contributors to harm and in those communities this may require a focus on the location, or density of, on- or club-licences to reduce alcohol-related harm in their area.

5 Council supports the principle behind the bill but wants to ensure the minimisation of unintended consequences

5.1 The council supports the principle of the community having a voice in alcohol licensing decisions, including renewal applications, new licence applications and input into the development of local alcohol policies.

5.2 However, the bill needs to be balanced to minimise potential negative impacts on established businesses, employment and economic growth. Potential negative impacts may include:

5.2.1 Established businesses, which are located in an area where location or density provisions apply, may face an uncertain future. This may be due to the businesses current location, or as a result of a facility defined as a sensitive site subsequently opening nearby.

5.2.2 Loss of ‘good operators’. Where density provisions are intended to reduce numbers, consideration is needed to determine which established businesses
may have their licence renewed and which would be refused. This is difficult for decision makers to assess in terms of applications for renewal of individual licences.

5.3 The paper does seek to address this balance in part by only applying the changes to off-licences, however this adds complexity to the legislation.

5.4 If a concern is about ‘bad operators’, the Act in section 131 has mandatory criteria that a licensing decision maker must have regard to on renewal applications. Two of these are:

5.4.1 Whether the amenity and good order of the location would be likely to be increased by more than a minor extent by the effects of a refusal to renew a licence

5.4.2 The applicant’s prior conduct (i.e. how it has sold, supplied, displayed, advertised or promoted alcohol).

5.5 While these are not location or density elements, if the concern is bad operators in particular areas, they would be caught by section 131.

6 Council questions the bill’s practical application

6.1 The bill and paper allows the licensing authority or a licensing committee to exercise its discretion to refuse to renew an off-licence if it would be inconsistent with location and density policies in a local alcohol policy. To have any practical application, there needs to be a local alcohol policy which:

6.1.1 Includes elements relating to location and density

6.1.2 Allows those elements relating to location and density to apply for off-licence renewals

6.1.3 Has survived all legal challenges and is in force.

6.2 The bill would have no effect for Auckland Council’s Provisional Local Alcohol Policy because:

6.2.1 The elements in the provisional policy relating to location and density only apply to new licence applications

6.2.2 It is still subject to legal challenges and is not in force.
7 Council has concerns about the local alcohol policy process

7.1 This bill presents an opportunity to address issues with the local alcohol policy process. Having a local alcohol policy in force is vital to this bill having practical application.

7.2 There has been significant cost and delay in developing and progressing Auckland Council's Provisional Local Alcohol Policy. The social and public health issues that the policy intended to address continue to occur at similar levels.

7.3 Nationwide, there are difficulties in developing and bringing a local alcohol policy into force. A December 2017 publication from Alcohol Healthwatch\(^{1}\) summarises progress of local alcohol policy development to date. The publication highlights that as at 1 August 2017, of the 40 draft local alcohol policies which have been developed and notified, 21 were in force. Large urban centres such as Wellington City, Christchurch City, Dunedin City and Hamilton City have all developed a draft local alcohol policy which have been subject to various legal challenges and are not in force.

7.4 From council experience the level of evidence and legal challenges faced when a local alcohol policy departs from the default provisions of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 requires a substantial level of resources to defend.

7.5 A further unintended consequence of the bill is that changes to the legislative framework at this point may provide another opportunity for further legal challenges. This may have the unintended consequence of actually further delaying the implementation of local alcohol policies.

Elements relating to delivery times for remote sellers unable to be included in a local alcohol policy

7.6 The primary focus of the bill and paper is to enable a reduction in opportunities to access alcohol from off-licences in local communities. This reduction in availability could be superseded by alcohol being available through immediate delivery of remote sales.

7.7 Section 59 of the Act provides that alcohol sold by remote sale is not to be delivered to a buyer any time after 11pm and before 6am.

7.8 The Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority has determined that section 59 of the Act cannot be subject to, or be overridden by, a local alcohol policy.\(^{2}\)

---


7.9 Where a local alcohol policy is in force which changes the maximum trading hours to a
time before 11pm, this provision undermines any change to maximum trading hours, as
alcohol could still be obtained up to 11pm through remote sales and a fast-turnaround
delivery service. This is an issue which a local alcohol policy should be able to address if
it is not addressed by central government.

Court process

7.10 Legal challenges against local alcohol policies are common. In the council's case, these
are ongoing and continue to delay implementation.

7.11 Table 1 below sets out the timeline for development of Auckland Council's Provisional
Local Alcohol Policy.

Table 1 – timeline for Auckland Council’s Provisional Local Alcohol Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>As a result of a paper presented on alcohol-related harm in Auckland, confirmation obtained to develop a local alcohol policy on the basis the Alcohol Reform Bill passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013 -</td>
<td>Work on developing local alcohol policy. Draft local alcohol policy approved in May 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – November</td>
<td>Special consultative procedure with 2688 submissions received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Development and approval of the Provisional Local Alcohol Policy. Public notification of Provisional Local Alcohol Policy in May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– May 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Appeals lodged in the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (&quot;Authority&quot;) by eight parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – March</td>
<td>Appeals heard in Authority (approximately four weeks of hearing time required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>Decision from Authority released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Decision from Authority considered by councillors and Provisional Local Alcohol Policy amended to address the decision from the Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>Provisional Local Alcohol Policy resubmitted to the Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>Appeals lodged in the Authority by three parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>Judicial review proceedings filed against Authority's decision of July 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.12 Other amendments which could be made to the Act to improve communities' input and
the effectiveness of the development and implementation of local alcohol polices are:

7.12.1 Enabling territorial authorities to negotiate amendments to their policy to address
issues raised in appeals without having to concede that an element is
unreasonable (as is currently required in the Authority).

7.12.2 Allowing elements of a local alcohol policy which have not been appealed against
to be brought into force immediately. The effect of an appeal against a local
alcohol policy delays the application of all of the policy until all appeals are finally
dealt with.
7.12.3 Confirming the matters a territorial authority must have regard to when a territorial authority is directed by the Authority to reconsider an element.

7.12.4 Reducing the number of opportunities for appeals to be made or at least making it clear that only specific parts of a local alcohol policy which have been amended by a territorial authority following direction from the Authority can be appealed.

8 More central government guidance needed

8.1 The local alcohol policy process which is intended to give communities more input into alcohol licensing matters has been met with legal challenges and six years later, none of the large urban centres in New Zealand have one in force. More central government guidance is needed to address what is a complex, lengthy and expensive process for councils to undertake.

8.2 Auckland Council applauds the Government for their willingness to amend components of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 in order to strengthen the voice of the community in the development of a local alcohol policy. However, the council considers that the bill and paper in their current form falls short of delivering on this and that there are other changes that could be made to the Act which would have a far greater impact on this intent.
Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2)

Member’s Bill

Explanatory note

General policy statement

This Bill provides that where a local alcohol policy is in place under the provisions of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 any renewal of a licence under the Act must not be inconsistent with the provisions of that local alcohol policy. This Bill replaces a previous Bill that contained a drafting error, referring to section 71 instead of section 77, in the replaced section 133 of the Act.

The process of adopting a local alcohol policy is a consultative process that provides for community input in respect of numbers of licences issued in a community, the location of premises and their proximity to other facilities identified by the Council. Examples have been schools, early childhood education centres, places of worship, and public services.

The object of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 is contained in section 4 and is that both the sale, supply, and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly, and the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised. That harm includes—

- any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behaviour, illness, or injury, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol, and
- any harm to society generally or the community, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behaviour, illness, or injury.

The aim of this Bill is to allow the Act to meet its stated object.

That alcohol causes harm to society or the community is a given and the only effective tool offered to communities to control that harm is the local alcohol policy process. Section 78 of the Act requires Councils, in drafting a local alcohol policy, to
have regard to the demography of the district's residents, the health indicators of the residents and the nature and severity of alcohol related problems in the district. The main concerns expressed by communities are the proliferation of liquor outlets and their proximity to sensitive facilities such as schools and early childhood education centres.

There is no rational base on which existing off-licence renewals should not be assessed against a local alcohol policy that has been through a rigorous process that takes specific account of the harm caused directly or indirectly to the community by alcohol. To not assess existing off-licence renewals against local alcohol policies concerning density and location is to render the basis of a local alcohol policy nugatory and to ignore that existing outlets may have contributed to the identification of areas in a local alcohol policy where there is excessive harm caused by alcohol consumption to the community. For those matters not concerning location and density, conditions can be imposed to bring the operation of a licence into conformity with a local alcohol policy, that is trading hours, particular licences, and one-way door restrictions.

Clause by clause analysis

Clause 1 is the Title clause.

Clause 2 provides for the Bill to come into force on the day after the date on which it receives the Royal assent.

Clause 3 states that the Bill amends the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (the principal Act).

Clause 4 states that the purpose of the Bill is to amend the Act to ensure that a decision on the renewal of an existing licence considers matters in a local alcohol policy, that has been adopted or is in force, that relates to location and density.

Clause 5 replaces section 133, which relates to the renewal of licences where a relevant local alcohol policy exists.

Clause 6 amends section 135, which relates to decisions on renewal of licences.
Louisa Wall

Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2)
Member’s Bill

Contents

<table>
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The Parliament of New Zealand enacts as follows:

1 Title
This Act is the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Act 2018.

2 Commencement
This Act comes into force on the day after the date on which it receives the Royal assent.

3 Principal Act
This Act amends the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (the principal Act).
4 **Purpose**
The purpose of this Act is to amend the principal Act to provide that, in considering a renewal of licence where a relevant local alcohol policy exists, a licensing authority or licensing committee must take into account any inconsistency between any location and density matters contained in a relevant local alcohol policy and the renewal of a licence or the consequences of that renewal.

5 **Section 133 replaced (Renewal of licences where relevant local alcohol policy exists)**
Replace section 133 with:

133 **Renewal of licences where relevant local alcohol policy exists**

(1) A licensing authority or licensing committee may refuse to renew a licence if, in its opinion, the renewal of the licence or the consequences of its renewal would be inconsistent with policies, on any or all of the matters set out in paragraphs (a) to (d) of section 77(1), that are contained in any relevant local alcohol policy.

(2) A licensing authority or licensing committee may impose particular conditions on any licence it renews if, in its opinion, the renewal of the licence, or the consequences of its renewal without those conditions would be inconsistent with policies, on any or all of the matters set out in paragraphs (e) to (g) of section 77(1), that are contained in any relevant local alcohol policy.

6 **Section 135 amended (Decision on renewal)**
In section 135(1), delete “, subject to section **133**,.”
House of Representatives
Supplementary Order Paper

Wednesday, 21 February 2018

Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill
(No 2)

Proposed amendments

Louisa Wall, in Committee, to move the following amendments:

Clause 4
In clause 4, replace “renewal of licence” (page 2, line 3) with “renewal of an off-licence”.
In clause 4, replace “a licence” (page 2, line 6) with “an off-licence”.

Clause 5
In clause 5, new section 133(1) replace “a licence” (page 2, line 11) with “an off-licence”.
In clause 5, new section 133(1) replace “the licence” (page 2, line 12) with “the off-licence”.
In clause 5, new section 133(2) replace “licence” (page 2, line 17) with “off-licence” in both places it occurs.

After clause 5, new section 133(2) (page 2, after line 20), insert:

(3) In considering whether to renew a licence other than an off-licence, the licensing authority or licensing committee concerned must not take into account any inconsistency between a relevant local alcohol policy and—
(a) the renewal of the licence; or
(b) the consequences of its renewal.

(4) The licensing authority or licensing committee concerned may impose particular conditions on any licence it renews, other than an off-licence, if—
Proposed amendments to
Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences)
Amendment Bill (No 2)

(a) there is any relevant local alcohol policy; and
(b) it considers that the renewal of the licence, or the consequences of the renewal of the licence, without those conditions imposed on it would be inconsistent with the policy.

Explanatory note
This Supplementary Order Paper clarifies that the discretion to refuse the renewal of a licence for sale and supply of alcohol that is inconsistent with a relevant local alcohol policy applies only to existing off-licences. This Supplementary Order Paper reinserts existing section 133(1) and (2) of the principal Act in respect of renewal of licences other than off-licences.

Wellington, New Zealand.
Published under the authority of the House of Representatives—2018
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Memo

To: His Worship the Mayor, Councillors, Local Board members, Independent Māori Statutory Board members
Executive Leadership Team
cc: Koro Dickinson, Manager, Global Partnerships and Strategy
From: Niels Meinderts, Global Partnerships and Strategy - Advisor
Date: 14 March 2018
Subject: Auckland Council update on the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership

Summary

1. This memo follows up on our 19 December update on New Zealand’s involvement in the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) and why it is relevant to Auckland Council.

2. CPTPP negotiations reached their conclusion on 23 January and the Agreement was signed on 8 March in Santiago, Chile. The Government had earlier released the text along with a National Interest Analysis (NIA) that assessed the likely costs and benefits for New Zealand of entering into the Agreement.

3. The Agreement will eliminate over 95 percent of all tariffs in a grouping worth US$10 trillion, covering 13.5% of the world’s GDP. Minister of Trade David Parker said the importance to New Zealand of CPTPP had recently grown because of rising trade protectionism in the world – the latest example being the proposed tariffs on steel and aluminium imported into the United States (US).

4. CPTPP will now be submitted to parliamentary Treaty examination - both Labour and National have committed to supporting the implementing legislation meaning it will likely pass through Parliament. Entry into force will occur when at least six countries notify their readiness – which according to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) is likely to be 12-18 months from now.

From TPP to CPTPP

5. The text confirms the CPTPP will incorporate much of the original TPP signed in Auckland in February 2016, but with some important differences. All the goods market access outcomes between the 11 remaining parties have been retained, 19 provisions have been suspended, one provision amended, and two provisions have been clarified.

---


2 The National Interest Analysis is available online at [https://www.mfat.govt.nz/cptpp](https://www.mfat.govt.nz/cptpp). It will be updated in March 2018 with more details of side letters that will be signed along with the agreement.

3 With 11 signatories including: New Zealand, Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Singapore, and Viet Nam.

6. The CPTPP has the potential to deliver an estimated NZ$222.4 million of tariff savings for New Zealand annually once fully implemented. Once the overall impact of the deal is fully realised, it will add between NZ$1.2 billion and NZ$4 billion to annual GDP growth – that’s between 0.3% and 1% extra growth a year.\(^5\)

7. The NIA document concludes that it would be in New Zealand’s national interest to sign the CPTPP, despite economic benefits not being as substantive after the withdrawal of the United States. The NIA emphasises that the importance of CPTPP has increased because of current threats to the World Trade Organisation and the effective operation of global trade rules - important for a small export dependent nation such as New Zealand.

**Why is the CPTPP relevant to Auckland Council?**

8. The relevance of the CPTPP to Auckland Council was outlined in our 19 December 2017 Memo. We provide a further update below on these issues.

9. **Economic development** – Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development (ATEED) in a recent article\(^6\) outlined the importance of international trade for Auckland after hosting the APEC Business Advisory Council’s meeting in early February. Auckland’s continued GDP growth is dependent on generating international revenues - taking full advantage of current and future Free Trade Agreements is therefore essential. ATEED emphasises that a partnership approach is central to achieving this, both domestically and internationally - fostering collaboration between city, government, and business.

10. **Right to regulate** – Auckland Councillors said in a 2013 Council Resolution\(^7\) that it was important the Government continues to protect Council’s ability to be able to adopt procurement policies that provide for a degree of local preference; or to require higher health and safety, environmental protection, employment rights and conditions, or community participation in procurement policy. Following the release of the CPTPP text - Minister Parker and MFAT officials continue to emphasise that the Government’s right to regulate has been adequated protected under the CPTPP with a series of exceptions that preserve the right to regulate in the interests of public welfare or the environment.

11. **Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS)** – The ISDS provision in CPTPP that allows overseas investors to bring a claim against central government (and potentially local governments indirectly) for breach of an investment agreement has been narrowed in scope. However, Minister Parker confirmed that “there remains a potential for an ISDS claim to be brought under CPTPP, although we don’t think these can ever succeed based on what regulations the Government brings in”.

12. He said to further protect New Zealand “Side Letters” had been negotiated with five countries\(^8\) to exclude the use of the ISDS clause in CPTPP. This will exclude access to ISDS for 80% of CPTPP Foreign Direct Investment currently coming into New Zealand. Furthermore, Canada and Chile have agreed to use ISDS clauses “responsibly” with New Zealand. It therefore appears that our Government will be subject to ISDS claims from companies based in Mexico, Japan, and Singapore. Leading commentators have been sceptical about the ability of the Side Letters negotiated to adequately protect the Government from being subject to ISDS claims.\(^9\) Despite this, it is important to note that New Zealand has had ISDS clauses in agreements with 13 countries over the past 27 years and has never been subject to an ISDS claim.

---

\(^5\) See National Interest Analysis above.

\(^6\) Refer to 5 March Stuff article: [https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/101971866/tapping-into-aucklands-potential-trade-is-the-fastest-route-to-prosperity?flp=ur%3A%2C34at%2Cpage%3A3rd_flagship%3_feed%3BAH1Uoaauy%20Bg%2Bd%3ElH50WA%3D%3D](https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/101971866/tapping-into-aucklands-potential-trade-is-the-fastest-route-to-prosperity?flp=ur%3A%2C34at%2Cpage%3A3rd_flagship%3_feed%3BAH1Uoaauy%20Bg%2Bd%3ElH50WA%3D%3D)


\(^8\) These countries are Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, Peru and Vietnam.

13. Ban on non-resident ownership of existing homes – The Overseas Investment Amendment Bill was presented to Parliament on 14 December 2017 and submissions opened in early March 2018. This Bill will amend the Overseas Investment Act to classify housing as ‘sensitive’ and introduces a ‘residency test’ for purchasing existing housing stock. According to Minister Parker, the Bill will need to be passed prior to CPTPP entering into force as the changes would otherwise breach the Agreement. Several Local Councils, companies, and lobby groups have provided submissions to the Select Committee currently overseeing the Bill – many have questioned the workability of the new Bill and provided suggestions to improve it.

Next Steps

14. The CPTPP will now be submitted for parliamentary Treaty examination. The Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Select Committee (made up of 4 National, 3 Labour and 1 Green MP – of note no NZ First MP) will further scrutinize the necessary legislative changes needed to give effect to the Agreement and provide a forum for public submissions. Entry into force will occur when at least six signatories notify their readiness - this is expected to be 12-18 months from now.

15. Looking ahead, Auckland Council staff will regularly report on the CPTPP’s implementation and maintain Council’s working relationship with MFAT to ensure Auckland’s interests are represented. As New Zealand is the elected depositary for the CPTPP, ATEED has also shown interest in pitching for Auckland to host the CPTPP Secretariat - should this be established.

16. Any immediate enquiries can be directed to Council’s Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit: Niels Meinderts, Advisor (niels.meinderts@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz; 021 508 114).

March 2018
Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit
Auckland Council
Memorandum

27 March 2018

To: Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Update on Implementation of the Weed Management Policy

From: Rod Sheridan, Director Community Facilities
Barry Potter, Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services
Key contact: Jenny Gargiulo, Senior Environmental Quality Assurance Specialist

Purpose

1. To update the Environment and Community Committee on the ongoing implementation of the Weed Management Policy.

Summary

- This update on the ongoing implementation of the Weed Management Policy outlines the work programme for Auckland Council over the last six months.

- Highlights include:
  - Council units are reporting on agrichemical use across the council family. This will be used to measure contractors’ performance on the key performance indicator included in the Community Facilities maintenance contracts, to track down on agrichemical use from a baseline established in the first year. An annual report on agrichemical use by board area will be provided after July 2018.
  - A vegetation management trial has been developed to assess different weed management methodologies at the Auckland Botanic Gardens. This will provide valuable information about the effectiveness, cost and health and safety implications of different weed management methodologies.
  - Work is underway to ensure continued best practice in vegetation management and pest plant control. This includes holding workshops with council contractors involved in weed management to promote shared innovation, development of a best practice pest plant control manual for community groups and a regular newsletter.
  - Education and support for community conservation groups through programmes in regional and local parks, Pest Free Auckland and targeted support to groups working on private land.

- Overall, implementation of the policy is continuing across the council family with a focus on achieving best practice and ongoing improvements in weed management.

Context/Background

1. Weed management is a priority for Auckland Council as Auckland is one of the weediest cities in the world. Auckland’s warm and wet climate makes it particularly vulnerable to weeds. Exotic plants with no natural enemies can spread unchecked, displacing native plants and threatening biodiversity.

2. Auckland Council’s Weed Management Policy was adopted by the Regional Development and Operations Committee in 2013 (resolution RDO/2013/137) and provides operational guidance for weed management across the council group. It was developed following a review of the weed management policies of Auckland’s legacy councils, national and international best practice, and the current trends in weed management, and iwi, stakeholder and public consultation.
3. The policy drives best practice weed management with eight objectives to be applied when determining weed management methodologies:
   - Take an integrated approach to weed management and vegetation control (prevention, control, education, restoration, and cooperation).
   - Ensure best practice in weed management and vegetation control.
   - Minimise agrichemical use.
   - Minimise non-target effects of agrichemical use.
   - Ensure public health and safety.
   - Protect and enhance the environment.
   - Empower the community to manage weeds in accordance with the policy.
   - Deliver weed management and vegetation control which is value for money.

4. These objectives apply to multiple departments across the Auckland Council group that are involved in weed management, with activities ranging from vegetation management (including grass edging), to pest plant control and ecological restoration. The Weed Management Policy also includes an action plan, which is being addressed through ongoing council work programmes.

5. This memo provides an update on activities since the last report back on 17 October 2017 to the Environment and Community Committee.

6. Over the last six months the weed management work programme has included:
   - reporting on agrichemical use across the council family
   - vegetation management trial
   - community empowerment - herbicide reduction in the road corridor
   - ensuring continued best practice in vegetation management and pest plant control
   - education and support for community conservation groups.

7. A more detailed update on each of these areas is provided below.

Discussion

Reporting on agrichemical use across the council family

8. Council units are reporting on the amount of agrichemical used for weed control. Types of weed control activities captured through this reporting system include:
   - pest plant control as required by the Biosecurity Act and Regional Pest Management Strategy
   - vegetation management in areas such as pathways – for health and safety and amenity values
   - sportsfield maintenance and renovation to ensure community have usable playing surfaces
   - asset protection - preventing the denigration of built assets such as pavements or buildings.

9. A reporting template for local boards is being developed that will breakdown agrichemical usage by active ingredient. As weed control fluctuates seasonally agrichemical usage will be reported annually to local boards after July 2018.

10. The report will be used to measure the key performance indicator included in Community Facilities maintenance contracts, to track down on agrichemical use from a baseline established in the first year.

11. For the use of agrichemicals Auckland Council takes direction from the Environmental Protection Authority. Should the Environmental Protection Authority update its position on the use of any agrichemical, Auckland Council will ensure it is fully considered when making any decisions and changes to operational procedures.
Vegetation management trial

12. The weed management policy states that 'Best practice weed control requires constant research to keep up to date with evolving weed management techniques, both locally and internationally, and continual innovation to achieve effective, efficient and sustainable outcomes.'

13. In line with the policy, a trial on existing and new weed control methodologies has been developed by the council. The trial will run for a minimum of one year and will be conducted at the Auckland Botanic Gardens event site lawn.

14. The aim is to determine the efficacy and cost of seven different weed control methods with a focus on non-chemical alternatives. Some of these methods are well established and regularly used in Auckland (for example, mechanical control) while others are more innovative (for example, electrothermal control).

15. Each treatment will be judged on the following criteria:
   - health and safety
   - accessibility to the site with equipment
   - costs (of product, equipment and staff time)
   - practicalities relating to use of product
   - effectiveness in terms of weed control.

16. The trial will provide information on efficacy, impacts and costs of different weed management methodologies. This information will support local board decision-making on vegetation control.

Ensure continued best practice in vegetation management and pest plant control

17. Best practice in the weed management policy is defined as ‘a method or technique that has consistently shown results superior to those achieved with other means, and that is used as a benchmark. In addition, a ‘best’ practice can evolve to become better as improvements are discovered.’

18. Since October 2017 Auckland Council has carried out multiple activities to support best practice including:
   - two community facilities innovation workshops held in November 2017 and February 2018. These provided an opportunity for council contractors to share innovations and discuss best practice techniques.
   - contractors and staff attended a presentation on thermal weed management techniques held by For the Love of Bees.
   - a regular Weed Management Newsletter has been developed and is being sent to council’s weed management contractors (see Attachment A)
   - a weed manual to provide guidance on best practise weed management techniques is being prepared for community groups.

19. On 28 March 2018 the next Best Practice Reference group meeting will be held. The agenda includes landscape weed control, vegetation management strategies and requirements for electro weed control on council and biocontrol.

20. Māori representation on the Best Practice Reference Group is also being sought to support ongoing best practice for the operational implementation of the Weed Management Policy. A working group with mana whenua has been established to recruit these Matauranga Māori representatives.

21. Meetings have also been scheduled with other regional councils to discuss methods for weed management to drive best practice and coordination across regions.
Community empowerment – agrichemical reduction in the road corridor

22. Weed control and berm maintenance is currently completed by Auckland Transport in the road corridor to:
   - prevent degradation of hard surfaces
   - ensure that drains are clear
   - ensure walkways are free of trip hazards
   - reduce the visual impact of weeds.

23. Auckland Council is taking over berm maintenance from Auckland Transport as part of the streetscape project. The contracts will be outcome-based, meaning weed control is not required on berms that are weed free and have no grass overhanging onto the footpath. Communicating this to residents can support the reduction in the amount of agrichemicals required to manage weeds in the road corridor.

24. The no spray register identifying sensitive residents will be moving from the Auckland Transport website to the Auckland Council website as part of the handover of the streetscape contracts.

Education and support for community conservation groups

25. Council offers support to community groups that are involved in weed management through many different channels, including programmes in regional and local parks, Pest Free Auckland and targeted support to groups working on private land.

26. In late 2017 the Community of Practice for Community-led Conservation was established. This working group from council and Department of Conservation business units was formed to support the coordination of conservation activities including community-led pest plant control.

27. A number of local boards are also supporting community groups in their area to carry out weed management activities in specific areas. For example, the Waitākere Ranges Local Board is supporting a long-term project with the communities at Piha, Karekare and Huia to reduce the density of climbing asparagus on private property and Kaipātiki Local Board is supporting various weed management initiatives delivered by the Pest Free Kaipātiki Network.

Attachment A

Weed management newsletter.
Collective innovation

A quarterly update - Weed Management Policy

We had our first Project 17 weed management supplier workshop in November. This workshop is one of the activities towards the implementation of the policy and the eight objectives that guide Auckland Council’s weed management requirements.

1. Take an integrated approach to weed management and vegetation control
2. Ensure best practice in weed management and vegetation control
3. Minimise agrichemical use
4. Minimise non-target effects of agrichemical use
5. Ensure public health and safety
6. Protect and enhance the environment
7. Empower the community to manage weeds in accordance with the policy
8. Deliver weed management and vegetation control which is value for money

Best practice in weed management

The weed management policy drives best practice in weed management including the formation of a best practice reference group made up of council staff and external weed management experts.

We discussed at the Project 17 workshop the development of a matrix of recommended methodologies to achieve vegetation maintenance contract outcomes. This will be a living document to communicate what we do and why we do it. The development of this tool will include the best practice reference group recommendations.

The next meeting of the best practice reference group is planned for February 2018. I will be following up with staff and contractors involved in weed management to identify challenges to be discussed in that forum.

If you have anything you would like included or you would like to present please contact me at Jenny.gargiulo@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.
Weed management innovations

On the 13th December a demonstration of thermal technology was held by “The Love of Bees” at Highwic.

This included a presentation from Charles Merfield and demonstrations on steam technology by Jeremy from Weedtech [www.weedtechnics.co.nz](http://www.weedtechnics.co.nz) and electric weeding by Kazel from hotgrass [www.hotgrass.co.nz](http://www.hotgrass.co.nz).

A few of the highlights were the demonstration of the multiple uses of steam for weed management, water blasting and managing moss and lichen.

Hotgrass is an exciting new technology, and this was a great opportunity to see it in the prototype stage.

Staff are developing a process to review technology and gather robust data on different methodologies.

No spray register – data update

The No-Spray data from both Auckland Transport and Council registers is being mapped on GIS.

In January this will be available as a layer to be supplied to Contractors.
Community groups – pest plant control

At the Project 17 vendor workshop Paul Duffy, Volunteering & Programmes Team Leader, led the discussion on community groups. We identified the need for a clear process for green waste pick up and litter collection.

Auckland Council’s coordination and assistance of community groups for weed control is supportive of the Pest Free Auckland initiative which includes the development of a centralised customer relationship management system to optimise shared outcomes.

Glyphosate formulations

Auckland council has completed a review of the formulations of glyphosate based commercially available agrichemicals in NZ. Surfactants, penetrants and marker dyes have been assessed as part of this research including POEA.

2018 and beyond.

We have an exciting year next year with council taking over berm management from Auckland Transport as well as the ongoing forward work programme for the weed management policy.

Merry Xmas everyone – and I look forward to seeing you all in the New Year.
Environment and Community Committee
and Local Board Chairs
Fit for the Future

MINUTES

Minutes of a workshop held in Meeting Room 1, Level 26, 135 Albert Street at 3.05pm

PRESENT

Chairperson
Cr Penny Hulse
Cr Josephine Bartley
Cr Dr Cathy Casey
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore
Left at 3.30pm returned at 3.32pm until 4.11pm on council business
Cr Linda Cooper, JP
Until 4.11pm on council business
Cr Chris Darby
Left at 3.55pm returned at 3.56pm
Cr Hon Christine Fletcher, QSO
From 3.15pm, left at 3.59pm, returned at 4.05pm
Cr Daniel Newman, JP
From 3.29pm, left at 4.01pm, returned at 4.15pm
Cr Desley Simpson, JP
present
Cr Sharon Stewart, QSM
From 3.27pm until 3.35pm
Cr Wayne Walker
Left at 3.28pm returned at 3.3pm
Cr John Watson

Local Board Chairs
Angela Fulljames, Chair, Franklin Local Board
Mike Cohen, Member, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board (From 4.06pm)

Apologies
IMSB Member Renata Blair
IMSB Member James Brown
Cr Fa’anana Efeso Collins
Cr Alf Filipaina
Mayor Hon Phil Goff, JP
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Dick Quax
Lemauga Lydia Sosene, Chair, Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board
Lisa Whyte, Chair, Upper Harbour Local Board

Agenda
**Purpose:** To provide a Fit for the Future update post implementation and to seek feedback on the proposal to expand the Mobile Library and Access service from the Committee and Local Board Chairs so that we can shape and agree a final design to deliver to Auckland.

**CONTENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Declaration of Interest  
There were no declarations. |
| 2    | Fit for the Future update  
A powerpoint presentation was presented by staff on the Fit for the Future programme and provided an overview on the evolution of the mobile library and access unit. |

The workshop ended at 4.23pm.
Purpose – to seek feedback on an expanded Mobile Library and Access service that will deliver more impact to more Aucklanders more often
This is a story of more for Auckland, not less. Why change?

- It is unlikely that building new community facilities will keep pace with Auckland’s growth - a more agile Mobile Library & Access service can help fill the gap and do so in a more responsive & cost effective way
- Aucklanders in isolated communities are missing out on library services
- At the same time, 60% of our mobile customers also use a community library!
- There is too much focus on ‘the bus’ not the service – in many cases, especially with older Aucklanders, ‘the bus’ is totally the wrong solution!
- The ‘current picture’ is one of uneven and sometimes inappropriate use that is not making the impact or delivering the value to Auckland that it should be.
What we are proposing for Auckland

- More (and more meaningful) services to more older Aucklanders – not necessarily always using a ‘bus’.

- More services to those Aucklanders who are ‘housebound’.

- Treating rural libraries more like community libraries and supporting more volunteers.

- Supporting substantially more schools, pre-schools, marae and kohanga reo in order to lift literacy, collect and share Auckland stories and introduce children to the world of libraries and information.
What we are proposing for Auckland

- Reaching more Māori, more young people, more older Aucklanders and more isolated communities
- Attending more events and being ‘where and when’ people are – transport hubs, malls etc
- 7 day service with extended hours
Environment and Community Committee
MINUTES

Minutes of a workshop held in Meeting Room 1, Level 26, 135 Albert Street on 13 March 2018 at 11.15am

Attendees:

Chairperson
Cr Penny Hulse
Cr Josephine Bartley
IMSB Member Renata Blair
IMSB Member James Brown
Cr Dr Cathy Casey
Cr Ross Clow
Cr Fa’anana Efeso Collins
Cr Linda Cooper, JP
Cr Chris Darby
Cr Hon Christine Fletcher, QSO
Mayor Hon Phil Goff, JP
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Daniel Newman, JP
Cr Desley Simpson, JP
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson
Lisa Whyte, Upper Harbour Local Board

Members

Apologies
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore on council business
Cr Mike Lee
Cr Dick Quax leave of absence
Cr Greg Sayers on council business
Cr Sharon Stewart, QSM on council business
George Wood, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board – on council business
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no declarations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kauri Dieback update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An update presentation was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Myrtle Rust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An update presentation was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safeswim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An update presentation was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fire Foam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An update presentation was provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An update presentation was provided from Ministry for the Environment, NZ Defence Force and Auckland Council staff.

The workshop ended at 3.05pm
Environment and Community Committee workshop

Kauri Dieback Management

13 March 2018
Context

On 20 February 2018 the Environment and Community Committee resolved to (in brief):

- Propose closures of high risk tracks in the Hunua and forested areas of the Waitakere Ranges Regional Parks subject to consultation with mana whenua, local boards, and targeted groups in the Waitākere Ranges.
- Request staff seek support from Ministry of Primary Industries for the closures through controlled area notices.
- Approve a targeted enforcement approach for the proposed closures.
- Request that staff report back on the closures for final decision making to Environment and Community Committee on 10 April 2018.
- Request staff to provide an update on kauri dieback management across the region and the implications for closures by 10 April 2018.
Content

- Update on consultation
- Update on Controlled Area Notices
- Regional approach to kauri dieback management
- Next steps
Consultation on Waitākere Ranges

- Met with Te Kāwerau ā Maki on Friday 2 March to agree the closed forest area and potential open tracks for consultation/engagement.
- Workshop with Waitākere Ranges Local Board on proposed open tracks and to seek initial feedback, formal committee meeting item scheduled for 22 March 2018.
- Online survey on the proposal opened 8 March 2018 – open until 19 March.
- Presentations to New Zealand Recreation Association/Federated Mountain Clubs and Waitakere Experience Network committee.
- Targeted workshops with user groups planned.
- Email: kauri@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz established to manage queries.
Proposed Open Tracks

Criteria for open tracks as agreed with Te Kawerau ā Maki and technical teams:

- outside the closed forested area (beaches, pastures etc.)
- track surface is to a standard where a person can walk that track in any weather conditions and not have soil on their shoes as they leave the track and after using a hygiene station. (Would reach standard under Controlled Area Notice)
- in an area away from kauri
- provides a stand alone visitor experience
Proposed Open Tracks – Waitākere Ranges

Refer to map and track list
Consultation on Hunua Ranges

- Some tracks have already been closed for kauri protection
- Workshop with Franklin Local Board on further track closures on 13 March
- Board will give formal feedback at business meeting on 27 March
- Initial consultation with mana whenua underway
- Main meeting with iwi on 26 March - Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Paoa, and Ngāti Whanaunga
Update on Controlled Area Notices and Compliance

- Working with MPI and DOC on the drafting of the controlled area notices for Waitākere and Hunua ranges and associated effectiveness monitoring plans and aligning implementation from 1 May 2018
- Developing a compliance plan for enforcing closures and the CAN (including working with DOC on Goldie Bush compliance plan)
- Designing barriers for making track closures more obvious
- Working with AT on how to close car parks on their land and closing paper roads into the forest
Regional state and approach for kauri dieback

• Kauri is at risk of national extinction.
• Disease is widespread regionally, except in pockets e.g. Hunua, Kaipātiki, Waiheke.
• Priority to keep Hunua and Hauraki Gulf islands (except GBI) kauri dieback-free.
• Slow the rate of spread elsewhere in region – prioritised hygiene station and track upgrade/maintenance in NETR
• Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan:
  • Restrictions on movement of plants, soil to Hunua parks.
  • Restrictions on movement of kauri plants to islands.
  • Hygiene stations mandatory at entry points to islands.
Next Steps

- Engagement continues – iwi, community and local boards
- Analyse feedback
- Report back to 10 April 2018 Environment and Community Committee meeting
- Pending approval, implement track closures from 1 May 2018
- Implement Controlled Area Notice once in place by Ministry of Primary Industries
- If investment approved through Long-term Plan, upgrade tracks, hygiene stations, vehicle washdown stations etc.
Myrtle rust in Auckland

Update for Environment and Community Committee

Phil Brown, Biosecurity Manager

13 March, 2018
Outline

• Myrtle rust intro
• Current state of invasion
• Potential impacts
• Council’s role
**Myrtle rust** (*Austropuccinia psidii*)

- Tree disease impacting on a range of native and exotic species
- Native to Brazil
- Infect living plant tissues, especially new growth (leaf/buds/stems)
- Continually reinfests plant/tree, potentially leading to death if untreated
- Rate of plant decline depends on plant health, level of infection

![Urediniospores and teliospores of myrtle rust](image_url)
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Myrtle rust – symptoms

pohutukawa leaf

Ramarama

bush cherry
How is it spread?

- By wind - airborne spores can survive for 2-3 months
- Insects (e.g. bees) and animals (e.g. nectar feeding birds)
- On/with people e.g. on clothing, gardening equipment
- On plants e.g. revegetation programmes, nursery trade
What do we know?

- Worldwide infects >400 species from 65 genera
- Some species tracking towards extinction
- Myrtaceae family in NZ - 6 native genera (~48 species)
  - Ramaraama, pohutukawa, rata, kanuka, manuka
- Some threatened or uncommon species e.g. Bartlett’s rata
What do we know?

- In cooler climates, has been more confined to gardens, nurseries etc but not wild sites
- However recently found in the wild in Taranaki
- Impacts tend to be worse in warmer, more humid areas
What do we know?

- There is no cure for the disease
- Individual plants can be treated with fungicides in perpetuity as a prophylactic or to reduce disease impact
- Concerns about the safety of these fungicides
- Some success with protecting individual trees in Brisbane using a safer alternative spray and ensuring plant health
Found in 7 NZ regions, over 350 sites

Auckland (53 sites)
Northland (4)
Taranaki (172)
Waikato (32)
Bay of Plenty (87)
Wellington (15)
Raoul (many)

Aucklanders reporting many sightings.
Use of myrtle rust reporter app.
Infestations confirmed in Auckland
Infestations on council land

- Confirmed on 3x pohutukawa in Waitakere Reserve, Remuera
- Infection on 2x Lophomyrtus obcordata in Taylors Park in Balmoral
Potential impact in Auckland

• Risk of loss of Notable Trees: e.g. pohutukawa (1430 out of 6988).
• H&S from dying street trees & specimen trees:
  – 17,400++ pohutukawa
  – 3,000++ Willow Myrtle
  – Bottlebrush, Syzygium hedges
• Impacts on native forest areas dominated by myrtles:
  – 137,000 ha of forest and scrub
    • 40% native forest & scrub
    • 32% of Significant Ecological Areas
• Other species e.g. ramara, rata vines, eucalypts...
Potential impacts on plants in Auckland

- Not yet clear how disease will progress
- Some species will be worse affected than others
- Likely to have different levels of impact depending on weather and climate
- Impacts may change as spore loads increase
National response to date

- MPI-led response, goal was to eradicate or contain the disease
- No cure, so focus has been on removal of infected plants
- Science programme underway
- Communications programme
- Advice for specific groups (& developing more)
- DOC leading surveys on DOC land and national ‘insurance’ seed banking
National response changing

- Some movement controls of myrtles in Taranaki, but controls were recently lifted
- Cabinet expected to consider next steps in late March
- May move to Long Term Management – more responsibility on landowners and councils
## Council's potential roles

- As an asset owner
- As a regulator
- Supporting central government and community
Funding council’s role

• Cost to council is likely to be significant over time
  – Increased arbory costs
  – Potential impacts on planting programmes
  – Any other proactive role we take

• Not costed in Long Term Plan targeted rate

• Yet to determine best funding approach
Council’s role – as an asset owner

Exact role will depend on cabinet’s decision, but council’s role as an asset owner is likely to be:

- Manage any affected trees on council land and in roadside reserves ourselves
- Ensure the safety of the public around dying trees
- Ensure proper disposal of infected material
- Don’t spread via our staff and contractors
Council’s role – as a regulator

Exact role will depend on cabinet’s decision, but options include:

• Including it in our RPMP so we can set rules (pros and cons though)
• Establishing movement controls e.g. ban movement of myrtles to Hauraki Gulf islands
• Mandatory nursery registration if growing myrtles and making nursery protocols mandatory
Council’s role – other potential roles

Council may also want/need to:

- Contribute to comms and advisory programmes e.g. to arbory, gardening companies
- Answer enquiries from the public
- Work with DOC to safeguard impacted species
- Supporting research e.g. on disease management, screening for resistance, plant health
- Work with nursery industry on their protocols
- Protection of notable trees e.g. fungicide treatment
Programme Objective

• Provide substantially more accurate information about ‘swimmability’ at Auckland’s bathing beaches
• Make that information easily accessible and integrate it with advice on safety hazards
• Create a culture of ‘checking before swimming’
• Build partnerships with other agencies
Model Performance

- Models significantly more accurate than the old system
- Accuracy improved from circa 5% to circa 80%
- Programme partners have confirmed their continued support and comfort with Safeswim’s performance
Website Metrics

- 280,000+ total visits and 128,000+ unique visitors
- 20,000% increase 😊
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Signage
Learnings from the first season

- Relatively smooth launch
- High profile contamination events identified areas for improvement
- A very wet February caused widespread water quality issues
- Significant media attention but misunderstanding persists - education required
Programme Targets for Summer 2018/19

- Use the period of Easter – to November to review summer plan for 2018/19
- Increase coverage of both marine and freshwater swimming sites
- Progressively improve model performance and extent
- Work with Auckland Regional Public Health around quantifying level of risk
- Improved communications
- Improved signage
- Lift understanding of water quality issues, what is being done to address them and how to use forecasts
- Utilise Safeswim outcomes to prioritise future investment
Next steps

- Continue to enhance and refine existing models
- Compile feedback on, and identify possible new sites (areas of high use and identified water quality or safety risk)
  - Includes local board feedback on potential new sites
- Build and test models at new sites
- Continue to enhance and refine traffic light settings
- Redesign signage, and identify sites for digital sign rollout
- Refine website design and content
- Environment and Community Committee decision making on future programme scheduled for April / May 2018 committee meeting
Presentation to Auckland Council
Environment and Community Committee – 13 March 2018
Poly- and Per-Fluoro-Alkyl Substances (PFAS)
Introductions
1. Context

- What are per- and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances (PFAS)?
- What has PFAS been used for?
- Why is PFAS an issue?
- Why have NZ Defence Force sites been the focus of investigation in NZ?
2. AOG PFAS Programme

- All of Government Approach – agencies that make up this group and their roles
- Investigations by the Environmental Protection Authority
- Health and food safety guidance
2. AOG PFAS Programme

- Next steps
- Working in partnership with Councils across NZ, including Auckland Council (Crown and non-Crown sites)
3. Auckland

- Testing – past, present and future NZDF sites
- Identification of non-Crown sites (national programme)
- Role of Government and Auckland Council
- Working with Iwi, Mana Whenua, Maataawaka
- Local and wider community communication and engagement
4. Questions and Answers
5. Next Steps

- Working together
PER AND POLY-FLUORINATED ALKYL SUBSTANCES (PFAS) – FACT SHEET 1

PFAS Advice for Councils

This fact sheet provides information to be considered when identifying, assessing and investigating land where PFAS was manufactured, used or disposed. This guidance is intended to be consistent with the PFAS National Environmental Management Plan (PNEMP) developed by the Heads of EPAs Australia and New Zealand (HEPA) and released in February 2018.

Introduction

What is PFAS:

PFAS is an acronym for a group of chemical compounds known as per- and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances that have been extensively manufactured and used worldwide.

PFAS compounds have been used since the 1950s to give a wide range of products some unique physical and chemical properties. These products can resist heat, stains, grease and water, and include furniture protectants, floor wax, treated fabrics and leather, paper products, non-stick cookware, food packaging, insecticides and specialised firefighting foams.

PFAS compounds are a complex family of more than 3,000 synthetic fluorinated organic chemicals, although not all are currently in use or production. PFAS include both per- and polyfluorinated chemicals. Perfluorinated chemicals, such as perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS), are a subset of PFAS with carbon chain atoms that are totally fluorinated, while polyfluorinated chemicals have at least one carbon chain atom that is not totally fluorinated.

PFOA and PFOS are chemicals that have been used in firefighting over the last 50 years to improve the ability of fire-fighting foams to smother fire. These foams have been used for flammable liquid fires at airports and other fire training sites across New Zealand.

Why are PFAS important?

The scientific community is rapidly recognising and evolving its understanding of PFAS in the environment. PFAS compounds in the environment are considered to be emerging contaminants of concern. Some PFAS are environmentally stable, mobile, persistent, and bioaccumulative.

PFAS are found globally in both remote and urban environments, and some PFAS compounds are present in various matrices including humans, soils, sediments, surface and groundwater, and
wildlife. There is evidence there may be health effects associated with sustained exposure to some PFAS.

PFAS industries and activities

PFAS has been used in a range of production and manufacturing industries. Many of these may have used other hazardous substances and potentially have already been identified on regional council HAIL registers. However, not all PFAS sites clearly align with the existing HAIL categories and these sites may require additional work to identify. Examples include the use of Class B fire-fighting foams for flammable liquid fires that occurred at a non-industrial location (e.g. vehicle fires) and where fire suppressant systems have been manufactured and tested.

It is not thought that PFAS compounds have been manufactured in New Zealand. PFAS compounds have been used to make fluoropolymer coatings and products that are oil and water repellant such as Teflon®, StainMaster® carpets, Scotchgard®, and GoreTex®. Therefore it is expected that many industries/manufacturing facilities will have used PFAS to produce goods.

Potential sources of PFAS releases to the New Zealand environment based on the manufacturing and other sectors are detailed in the table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 - Potential sources of PFAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry and/or activity Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HAIL category)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire-fighting - Events and Training (F1.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11: Petroleum or petrochemical industries (F5. Port activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metal Plating &amp; Etching (D3.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16. Skin or wool processing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textiles, Upholstery &amp; Leather</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15. Printing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper Products</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Metal treatment or coating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial Surfactants, Resins, Moulds, Plastics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Chemical manufacture, formulation or bulk storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17. Storage tanks or drums for fuel, chemicals or liquid waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13: Petroleum or petrochemical industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8. Transport depots or yards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photolithography, Semiconductor Industry
(A15. Printing
83. Electronics commercial manufacturing, reconditioning or recycling)

Waste Disposal
(G3. Landfill sites)

Waste Water Treatment Plants
(G6. Waste recycling or waste or wastewater treatment)

Bio-solids
(G6. Waste recycling or waste or wastewater treatment)

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities

Pesticide manufacturing or formulation
(A12. Pesticide manufacture)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment I</th>
<th>Page 135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>Attachment 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors to consider when assessing PFAS sites

**PFAS properties**

Originally, all PFAS were considered relatively inert and non-hazardous substances. However due to the solubility and persistence of many PFAS, environmental release mechanisms include air emission and dispersion, spills, and disposal of manufacturing wastes and wastewater. Potential impacts to air, soil, surface water, stormwater, and groundwater are present not only at release areas but have the potential to migrate to the surrounding area.

These substances are chemically very inert, resistant to high temperatures, they reduce surface tension and are water and dirt repellent and grease proof. These properties made PFAS an industrial success, but have also led to persistence, bio-accumulation and, in some cases, toxicity in the environment. Their persistence in the environment (100+ years) and in the human body (4-8 years) has made them contaminants of concern both nationally and internationally.

Chemical properties common to PFAS are that they are water soluble, have low volatility and resistant to biodegradation. PFAS do not degrade in the environment and are not removed by conventional water treatment methods, such as in-situ pump and treat, soil vapour extraction and air sparging. These properties can make PFAS a significant groundwater contaminant.

**PFAS toxicity and eco-toxicity**

Currently there is no consistent evidence that environmental exposures at the low levels New Zealanders are generally exposed to will cause harmful health effects. There is no conclusive evidence that PFOS and PFOA exposure will result in future health problems. The evidence of health effects is not clear, and some effects may not be clinically significant. However, the long-term accumulation of these chemicals in the body has prompted concerns about possible health effects. Long-term the best way to avoid exposure to PFOS and PFOA is to limit their use in New Zealand.

Available data on PFAS toxicity is dominated by PFOS, PFOA and also perfluorohexane sulfonate (PFHxS) due to the widespread detection, mainly overseas, of these compounds in humans and the environment, and concern that these could biomagnify to a level whereby humans may be adversely affected. Much less data is available on the toxicology of other PFAS, and this is often inconsistent and fragmentary.
Human exposure to PFAS is mainly by ingestion of contaminated food or water. These compounds are not metabolised, bind to proteins (not to fats) and are mainly detected in blood, liver and kidneys. Elimination of PFOS, PFHxS and PFOA from the human body takes some years, whereas elimination of shorter chain PFAS is in the range of days.

The potential effects of exposure to PFOS and PFOA to human health continue to be studied. These studies involve laboratory animal studies, as well as occupationally exposed workers, residents in communities with higher exposure and studies of the general population in the USA and other countries.

In 2010, the Ministry of Health commissioned Massey University's Centre for Public Health Research to carry out a biomonitoring study to quantify the concentrations of selected persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in the blood serum of adult New Zealanders. The study was completed in 2013 and the results showed that the concentrations of PFOA in adult serum are generally similar to, or lower than, those in the USA, Canada, Germany, and Australia, while the concentrations of PFOS are considerably lower than those in USA, Canada, Germany, and Australia.

The World Health Organization (WHO) has not recommended a guideline level for PFAS compounds in drinking-water. The Ministry of Health has recommended interim guidance levels for PFOS and PFOA in drinking-water, which are the same values being proposed in Australia.

The interim guidance levels for PFOS and PFOA in drinking water were derived from effects found at certain doses in animal studies. The calculation of the guidance levels included appropriate uncertainty factors to take account of issues like differences between humans and animals. The guidance levels are based on a person weighing 70 kg drinking 2 litres of water every day over a lifetime without any significant risk to health. Although there is no consistent evidence that the effects in animals also occur in humans, the Ministry of Health recommends that an alternative drinking water source is used to protect health if the interim guidance levels are exceeded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Guidance Levels for Drinking-Water</th>
<th>Units µg/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFOS + PFHxS</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFOA</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the multiple global sources of PFAS and the stability and persistency of these compounds they are detected across the globe, even in remote places. Concentrations have been detected in a variety of wildlife (seals, polar bears, fish, dolphins, birds) on all continents. They also bio-accumulate in the food chain.

Ecotoxicity data were primarily identified for aquatic organisms such as algae, aquatic plants, invertebrates and fish, and birds. Ecotoxicity tests of PFAS are mostly limited to PFOS and PFOA, and the dataset is small in comparison to established pollutants, but also to many other emerging chemicals of concern.

PFOS has been categorised as moderately acutely and slightly chronically toxic to aquatic organisms. Because many PFAS and especially PFOS are persistent, longer-term exposures may occur in the environment. Acute invertebrate toxicity data show that marine invertebrates are more sensitive to short-term PFOS exposure than freshwater invertebrates.

Acute toxicity testing with aquatic species indicates that PFOA is generally less toxic than PFOS. There is about a factor of 10 difference. Some studies in aquatic organisms show the potential of PFOA to...
affect endocrine function. Other studies show toxicity in other different organisms such as shellfish, marine mammals, turtles and rats. PFDA also exhibits low chronic toxicities in benthic organisms.

Environmental Guidelines

The PNEMP contains the latest series of human health and environmental guidelines. The guidelines for soil investigation, freshwater and marine water are summarised below.

Soil criteria for investigation – human health based guidance values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>PFOS/PFHpS</th>
<th>PFOA</th>
<th>Land use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil – Human health screening values</td>
<td>0.009 mg/kg</td>
<td>0.1 mg/kg</td>
<td>Residential with garden/ accessible soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mg/kg</td>
<td>20 mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential with minimal opportunities for soil access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mg/kg</td>
<td>10 mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mg/kg</td>
<td>50 mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial/ commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aquatic ecosystems: freshwater and marine water guideline values for ecological protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>PFOS</th>
<th>PFOA</th>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td>0.00023 µg/L</td>
<td>19 µg/L</td>
<td>99% species protection – high conservation value systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.13 µg/L</td>
<td>220 µg/L</td>
<td>95% species protection – slightly to moderately disturbed systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 µg/L</td>
<td>632 µg/L</td>
<td>90% species protection – highly disturbed systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 µg/L</td>
<td>1824 µg/L</td>
<td>80% species protection – highly disturbed systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim marine</td>
<td>0.00023 µg/L</td>
<td>19 µg/L</td>
<td>99% species protection – high conservation value systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.13 µg/L</td>
<td>220 µg/L</td>
<td>95% species protection – slightly to moderately disturbed systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 µg/L</td>
<td>632 µg/L</td>
<td>90% species protection – highly disturbed systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 µg/L</td>
<td>1824 µg/L</td>
<td>80% species protection – highly disturbed systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PFAS Sampling and Analysis

Because of the potential presence of PFAS in common consumer products and in equipment often used to collect groundwater samples, special handling and care must be taken when collecting PFAS samples. Sampling should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced person.

Currently, in New Zealand only AsureQuality is accredited to analyse the various environmental media for PFAS with the limit of detection required for environmental assessments. It is
recommended that you discuss your analysis requirements with the laboratory prior to undertaking any sampling and analysis.

Environmental Protection Authority Investigations

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) is investigating fire-fighting foams manufactured using PFOS or PFOA that are held or being used at airports and other locations. All hazardous substances, including fire-fighting foams, that are imported, manufactured or used in New Zealand require approval by the EPA under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996.

Foams manufactured using PFOS or PFOA have not been legal for use in New Zealand since 2006. The EPA’s initial priority has been to identify the types of foam held, whether they have been used or not, and how and where they are stored. If any do not have an appropriate approval the EPA will check that they are safely stored. Provided these foams are safely stored, they pose no immediate risk to people or the environment.

As part of its inquiry, the EPA is visiting airports across the country. It is taking samples of fire-fighting foams and having them tested by an independent, qualified laboratory. On the basis of test results being positive for PFOS, the EPA has served a Compliance Order on one airport. This requires the airport to stop using fire-fighting foam containing PFOS when responding to emergencies as soon as practicable. In the interim, the airport may continue using the foam for emergencies, in the interests of safety. The Compliance Order also requires the airport to cease using the foam for training or testing purposes, and to submit a plan detailing steps that will be taken to ensure the foam is no longer used.

The EPA is not involved in assessing the environmental consequences arising from use of PFAS substances, nor in their remediation.

For further information and guidance we have attached the following links below

PFAS National Environmental Management Plan, HEPA January 2018
PFAS (per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances), MFE 2018
PFAS — Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances, ITRC November 2017
Environmental fate and effects of poly and perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) Concawe June 2016
PFOS & PFOA guidelines, CRCCARE
Health Based Guidance Values for Per- and Poly-Fluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS), Department of Health September 2017
Procedural Review of Health Reference Values Established by enHealth for PFAS, Department of Health
Managing fire-fighting foams manufactured with PFAS chemicals, EPA 2018
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