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Our project invites you to dream big about the potential of our spaces to support all living systems to thrive, including pollinators, soil biology and humans. What better way to regenerate our commons at scale than by transforming our large inner city Parks?

**Our project Regenerative Parks – Living Playgrounds will offer a means to turn our inner city parks into Spray Free, Biological Pollinator Sanctuaries and Boosted Carbon Sinks by the end of 2018.**

Our plan is to make this transformation a large scale learning opportunity for everyone, so we may all come to understand how to regenerate any space, including our own backyards.

**What is a Regenerative Park?**

Regenerative systems return what is lost and increase biodiversity now and into the future.

We don’t just want to conserve soil and conserve life, but build and enhance it. Instead of only treading lightly, we pile on love and care to produce glowing health and abundance. We help nature help itself, by laying down the groundwork for biodiversity and biological resilience. In this way, our parks can be fully activated to nurture native species, capture carbon and facilitate collective learning.

We have come up with four criteria that make a Regenerative Park:
We invite you to achieve one or all of these with the space you have!

We help nature help itself, by laying down the groundwork for biodiversity and biological resilience

We're talking about a holistic approach that supports all biological life within the system, including soil biology, pollinators, mammals, and aquatic life - which residual runoff eventually finds. Living soil supports the entire ecosystem and begins to sequester carbon, which is what we must do urgently. By using this integrated system, you ensure that every action you take within the system is positive for biology. When you take this approach and eliminate any negative actions, you create the capacity for that ecosystem to fully restore itself within 7 years. Each time a negative is introduced to the environment you stall that potential.

Meeting these criteria will lay the groundwork for increased biodiversity as organisms will encounter safer spaces, and increased habitat and food opportunities.

Of course, our definition of a Regenerative Park and the strategies involved in making one may well change as we discover what works and what doesn't, and as new collaborators share new ideas and wisdom. Perhaps you are one such collaborator? We encourage you to email us.

Expanding on these criteria:

1. **Spray Free:** This means no synthetic chemicals are used at any time, which often have detrimental effects on microbiology and ecosystems. Even certified organic applications will be minimised, as some have been found to be damaging to soil microbiology and pollinators.

2. **Biological Pollinator Sanctuary:** As we know, bees know no boundaries. To make a city safe for them, we need a citywide approach that crucially includes parks. Why focus on catering to pollinators? While our name ‘For the Love of Bees’ may seem like we’re picking favourites, it actually makes sense to hone in on them. This is because in making a sanctuary for pollinators, one must look to cultivating soil life that allows plants to build natural strength. This, along with a number of other necessary actions, creates conditions conducive to other beneficial insect.
inventories every season and have public facing educational signage. Info cards next to pollinator food plantings will educate park goers on what to plant each season at home. In this way, Regenerative Parks will function as exemplars on how to shape one’s own space to foster biodiversity.

3. **Boosted Carbon Sinks**: By planting alongside pathways and fence lines with certain deep rooted plants, and by treating the grass differently we can increase the carbon sequestration capacity of our Parks. We are currently compiling information on this.

4. **Generating own fertility**: A regenerative system restores, renews or revitalises its own sources of energy and materials. We can make mineral rich compost from material onsite to continuously build rich soil and support soil life. Ways to do this is with a hot compost heap, Bokashi and worm farms. Composting in public spaces will also teach communities and help establish a new norm of prizing our green material and our soil. Additional green waste could be put to use with the help of ShareWaste.com

---

**Regenerative Parks will function as exemplars on how to shape one’s own space to foster biodiversity**

**Implementation strategies:**

- Mechanical weed control (including Pull Together)
- Thermal weed control – Hot Grass and Hot water and/or steam
- Weed assessments – redefining weeds and creating strategies for different types (creating a knowledge base)
- Mulching and strategic planting
- Pollinator Paths and Pasture Painting tools
- Signage for learning and engagement
- Community adventures that invite and enable participation

---

**What our role is**

- Collaborating with academic experts and businesses testing new generation technologies in
Setting up testing sites to become places of free experimentation and playful open learning.

Designing and facilitating meetings and community engagement workshops or what we call “learning adventures”, which allow new networks to form and excitement at what is possible to flourish.

Helping to develop a sense of ownership in local communities that can champion these spaces and assist with upkeep.

Connecting different providers and stakeholders together under the umbrella of Biology-First thinking, using the pollinator as our focus.

Our collaborators include:

- Charles Merfield from The BHU Future Farming Centre in Canterbury, who has a broad ecological and agronomic research background, with specialist knowledge in weed management.
- Kazel Cass, tutor of Organic Horticulture and NZ’s resident RootWave Pro electrothermal weeder expert, distributed by HotGrass.
- Jeremy Winer, who founded Weedtech in Australia, where councils have used their technologies for the last 10 years.
- Sebastian Kramer, who started Weedtech NZ Ltd which is the New Zealand Distribution arm of Weedtech.
- Daniel Shuurman from Biologix.
- The Compost Collective.

Testing sites

Highwic

Highwic in Newmarket is on its way to becoming the first inner-city Regenerative Park. Testing of HotGrass technology is already underway here, and council members have been able to watch a Weedtech demonstration. See more about the other amazing things happening there as part of our collaboration here.

AUT Northern Campus

AUT is committed to sustainability, with their Sustainability Action Plan to be released later this year. Their Design for Sustainability (DESN702) class, led by Amabel Hunting, collaborated with us last year to explore how the city campus could become friendlier for bees, which raised the conversation around how AUT could become spray-free. Estates management at the North Shore campus are taking action with a scientific research project on alternative methods for weed management, which would collect useful data to support investment decisions.
There are approx 4000 parks in Auckland city alone. There are 2530 schools in New Zealand. Imagine how many landscapes we could repair by holding hands together across our great nation.

Why entertain such an ambitious project and come on this adventure with us?

Climate change is here now and requires bold action. Pollinators and other insects are under threat now, evolved resistance to chemical interventions is growing, and communities are increasingly requesting council to stop using harmful chemicals in our common spaces. Our artwork will create an action plan and a story to empower the whole community and create a sense that we are capable of responding to these large and overwhelming issues in our own backyards. By aiming for a transformation that is not far off into the future, we can excite people to see the potential of collaborative action to generate the changes we need to see now.

- THE INSTAGRAM -
THE FACEBOOK PAGE -

POWERED BY SQUARESPACE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5.10</th>
<th>Urban Weed Management Methodologies Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chemical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infiltration</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation Management</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Health</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Quality</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Quality</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Erosion</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Compaction</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Tillage</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Aeration</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Nutrient Management</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Moisture Management</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Physical Properties</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Biological Properties</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Chemical Properties</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- **Y** indicates the method is used.
- **N** indicates the method is not used.
- **Low** indicates low cost per hour.
- **Medium** indicates medium cost per hour.
- **High** indicates high cost per hour.
- **NA** indicates not applicable.

**Efficiency:**
- **Low**
- **Medium**
- **High**

**Contact Information:**
- **Weedtech:**
  - Address: 155b Waitemata Rd, Mt Eden, Auckland 1066
  - Phone: 09 376 7111
  - Email: info@weedtech.co.nz

**Auckland Council:**
- Address: 300 Queen St, Auckland 1010
  - Phone: 09 376 7111
  - Email: info@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

**Safety:**
- Ensure all safety protocols are followed.
- Wear appropriate personal protective equipment.

**Environmental Impact:**
- Minimize the use of chemicals to reduce environmental impact.
- Implement sustainable practices to promote ecological balance.

**Cost:**
- Consider long-term costs versus short-term savings.
- Prioritize cost-effective methods that provide sustainable results.

**Community Engagement:**
- Involve local communities in decision-making processes.
- Educate communities on the importance of sustainable practices.

**Sustainability:**
- Promote environmentally friendly methods.
- Encourage the use of renewable resources.

**Regulatory Compliance:**
- Ensure compliance with all relevant regulations and standards.

**Monitoring:**
- Regularly monitor the effectiveness of implemented methods.
- Adjust strategies based on monitoring results.

**Reporting:**
- Provide regular updates on progress and achievements.
- Report any deviations from planned strategies to the management team.

**Review:**
- Conduct periodic reviews to assess the ongoing effectiveness of strategies.
- Evaluate the need for any adjustments or modifications to methods.

---

**Additional Notes:**
- Reference external resources for detailed information on specific methodologies.
- Collaborate with experts and stakeholders to enhance the success of initiatives.
- Prioritize methods that align with the organization's strategic goals.

**Conclusion:**
- Implement a balanced approach incorporating a range of methodologies.
- Continuously monitor and adapt strategies to optimize outcomes.

---
## Development of herbicide resistance in New Zealand

### Background
- In New Zealand, herbicide resistant weeds were first found in 1979 in maize which was grown as a monoculture.
- This was quickly followed by the occurrence of several herbicide resistant weeds in pasture land. Although there has been a steady trickle of resistance cases since then, they have mostly been found in minor crops or turf.
- Recently however, several instances of herbicide resistance have been found in situations where they are likely to have a greater impact. These include resistance to glyphosate in permanent crops (vineyards) and to both ALS inhibitors and ACCase inhibitors in cereal crops.
- The latter have occurred in our rotational cropping systems which until now were thought to be relatively safe from the evolution of herbicide resistance.

### Table: Herbicide Resistance in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year resistance identified</th>
<th>Weed</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Resistance to ...</th>
<th>Crop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Chenopodium album</td>
<td>Common Lambsquarters</td>
<td>Photosystem II inhibitors (C15)</td>
<td>Maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Polygonum persicaria</td>
<td>Lady’s-thumb</td>
<td>Photosystem II inhibitors (C15)</td>
<td>Maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Carduus nutans</td>
<td>Musk Thistle</td>
<td>Synthetic Auxins (OA)</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Ranunculus acris</td>
<td>Tall Buttercup</td>
<td>Synthetic Auxins (OA)</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Atriplex hortensis</td>
<td>Chilean or Uruguayan Needlegrass</td>
<td>Lipid Inhibitors (N/26)</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Stellaria media</td>
<td>Common Chickweed</td>
<td>ALS Inhibitors (R/2)</td>
<td>Cereals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Carduus acanthoides</td>
<td>Italian Thistle</td>
<td>Synthetic Auxins (OA)</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Solanum nigrum</td>
<td>Black Nightshade</td>
<td>Photosystem II inhibitors (C15/5)</td>
<td>Pea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Soliva sessilis</td>
<td>Lawn Burweed</td>
<td>Synthetic Auxins (OA)</td>
<td>Turf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Chenopodium album</td>
<td>Common Lambsquarters</td>
<td>Synthetic Auxins (OA)</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Solanum americanum</td>
<td>American Black Nightshade</td>
<td>PSI Electron Diverter (0/22)</td>
<td>Sweet potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Solanum nigrum</td>
<td>Black Nightshade</td>
<td>PSI Electron Diverter (0/22)</td>
<td>Sweet potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Ranunculus acris</td>
<td>Tall Buttercup</td>
<td>Multiple Resistance: 2 Sites of Action</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS Inhibitors (R/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Lolium perenne sup. multiform</td>
<td>Italian Ryegrass</td>
<td>EPSP synthase inhibitors (S/8/9)</td>
<td>Vineyards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Lolium perenne</td>
<td>Perennial Ryegrass</td>
<td>EPSP synthase inhibitors (S/8/9)</td>
<td>Vineyards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Avena fatua</td>
<td>Wild oat</td>
<td>ACCase Inhibitors (A/1)</td>
<td>Cereals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Lolium perenne</td>
<td>Perennial Ryegrass</td>
<td>Multiple Resistance: 3 Sites of Action</td>
<td>Vineyards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centenoide biosynthesis (unknown target) (E/3/11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSP synthase inhibitors (S/9/9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glutamine synthase inhibitors (R/1/10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Lolium perenne sup. multiform</td>
<td>Italian Ryegrass</td>
<td>Multiple Resistance: 3 Sites of Action</td>
<td>Vineyards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centenoide biosynthesis (unknown target) (E/3/11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSP synthase inhibitors (S/9/9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glutamine synthase inhibitors (R/1/10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Lolium perenne</td>
<td>Perennial Ryegrass</td>
<td>ALS Inhibitors (R/2)</td>
<td>Cereals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Lolium perenne sup. multiform</td>
<td>Italian Ryegrass</td>
<td>ACCase Inhibitors (A/1)</td>
<td>Cereals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General findings
- In New Zealand until recently, nearly all cases of herbicide resistance resulted from overuse of a single herbicide due to lack of broad spectrum alternative MOA’s.
- Intensification is now leading to growers using fewer crop rotation options, particularly a pasture phase, and more concentrated use of herbicides.
Non Chemical Weed Management of Leichhardt in Australia by Weedtechnics

Based on our experience of 14 years of working in Leichhardt municipality, our contract required maintenance on a 6 times a year cycle to keep weeds less than 100mm tall with less than 5% coverage at any time.

This was achieved with 4-5 treatments a year on paved surfaces and 6 times a year in garden areas.

Total footpath area maintained (average 1.8m wide, concrete footpath plus kerb and gutter) 55km. Average treatment cycle took 160-200 hours.

There were 150 road islands that took on average 3 min each or a total of 7 hrs.

We maintained 360 various sized garden beds within parks across the city totalling an area of 61042 sq.m This took on average 160 hrs per cycle

There was an additional 200 or so miscellaneous areas in alleyways and street walls etc totalling 5200 sq.m that took 24hrs per treatment cycle.

2 machines and a team of 4 people FTE managed this with time to spare. All areas were kept within spec, except in periods of spring flush when the garden areas in low profile parks fell behind. These were caught up within a few weeks.

BACKGROUND
Leichhardt Municipal Council

Leichhardt was incorporated as a local government area in 1871. In 1949 the municipalities of Annandale and Balmain were amalgamated with Leichhardt. In 1967, the municipality boundary was varied to include Glebe and parts of Camperdown. In 2003, the municipal boundary was again varied, this time to exclude Glebe and Forest Lodge which are now part of the City of Sydney. The suburbs within the Leichhardt local government area are Leichhardt, Lilyfield, Balmain (including Balmain East), Birchgrove, Rozelle and Annandale. The municipality of Leichhardt has an estimated resident population of 51,142 (ABS June 2005 preliminary figures) within an area of 1,003 hectares. There are 79 parks, gardens or reserves covering 84 hectares providing both active and passive recreation. The municipality also has a 17km frontage to Sydney Harbour and Parramatta River.

Background to this Request for Tender and desired outcomes
The intention of the Contract is to ensure that weeds are eradicated from Council's parks and streets. The Contract is for Management of vegetation by non chemical means within the Leichhardt Municipality. The Tenderer must provide all labour, materials, plant, equipment and everything necessary for the Works to be undertaken as and to the standard required by the Contract.

Information provided by Jeremy Winer, Managing Director of Weedtechnics
FAQs

In the video, it creates sparks – are these possibly a fire risk?
Yes, while the spark itself has no thermal mass, the treatment wand can heat up and set fire to dry leaves. In dry conditions, our recommendation is not to treat directly onto dry grass, clear out dried leaves near target weeds, wet down the area with water before operation and check carefully for signs of smoldering before leaving an operating area.

What are the differences in effectiveness when the soil is dry, to when the soil and surrounding plants are wet?
Dry conditions are better as more energy is used treating the weed rather than heating any water in the soil. You might get an issue with the earth return not being able to find a route if your fixed earth is 25m away in extremely dry soil, however, we have had success in summer on sand dunes.

How far down does the effect travel? So if you have a plant that has underground runners, how far deep would the plants be controlled? eg. blackberry runners.
The RootWave Pro has been treating Japanese Knotweed in the UK which has a really deep root structure. We cannot control the path of electricity and therefore guarantee it will kill all the roots, but the longer you treat the weed, the more likely it is to do the necessary damage, especially since the hypocotyl and meristem (control and growth centres) of many plants are found just below the surface of the ground.

Does the plant need to be in an active growth phase?
You can shock the weed anytime. It is best if the plant has plenty of water in its tissues, and some plants will change their water holding seasonally.

Can you cut back and then treat without waiting for regrowth? (eg cut down gorse and treat the cut stem to reach the roots?)
Yes, this would be our advice for large infestations as there is no point in wasting energy on the overall bush. We recommend for all weeds to be cut back to below gumboot height prior to operation, however, some regrowth may allow the operator to target the plant more accurately.

Have you done any studies/trials on the effect of the soil biology after treatment? In particular, what is the effect on worms or fungal mycorrhiza?
RootWave are doing this as part of an EU Grant project with NIAB. Evidence to-date suggests no issues as the surrounding soil heats up less than on a hot summers day, and initial results (of a 2-year programme) are expected at the end of 2018.

Worms, due to their soft body contact with the soil water, can be affected by the electricity, and are frequently seen coming to the surface and leaving the treatment area. Worms will be more greatly affected when the soil is wet. Unfortunately, the mortality rate the worms that come to the surface in wet condition is around 18%, although that is considerably lower than those affected by rotary hoeing, stock compacting soil, or tractors.

What trials have been conducted?
Contact us for a copy of the case studies. So far there have been detailed trials in NZ on lawn edges, agapanthus, acanthus mollis, and wooly nightshade. We have more informal ‘before and after’ photos of various other key invasive weed species, including wild ginger, tradescantia and wild asparagus.

What is the environmental impact of the construction of the device? Have you incorporated any recycled material in the construction, or traced the source of the materials and checked for sustainable practices? Do you have a ‘cradle to cradle’ policy?
This is our intention, but at the moment, we have not. Assume no recycled materials in the construction. The lease model allows us to follow reverse logistics and recycle any components that have reached their end point.

Do you have as part of your mission statement any further environmental or sustainable practices other than the replacement of chemicals by the use of the RootWave Pro?
Yes, Hot Grass owns only electric/hybrid vehicles, we use 100% renewable energy to power our offices and cars, recycle, and we do choose green solutions wherever we have a choice. At the moment, our focus is on reducing the use of chemical herbicides.

Is there an operator risk from electromagnetic radiation?
There is no comparable risk because the operator would not have continuous exposure and currents and therefore field densities are orders of magnitude lower than high voltage power pylons.
Safety Regulatory Bodies

Energy Safety’s position is that:
• The electrical testing lab that I employ (Spectrum Laboratories) will decide which standards and risks apply to the device.
• Worksafe NZ are involved with the health and safety requirements
• To be ‘Electrically safe’ is shown by testing and if the device is tested and tagged to show that it is working as intended then it will be considered electrically safe.
Worksafe NZ has said that:
• Training needs to be “reasonable to demonstrate that operators have competency”. There is no need for training to be linked to NZQA or to be given by a registered training institute.
• The safety gear required could be recommended by the Electrical Lab. The main safety gear recommended by the manufacturer is the dielectric safety boots, tagged and tested every 6 months.
• Because this is a new device with no legislation specifically concerning it, Worksafe stated that it is up to Hot Grass to determine what is ‘reasonable and practical to minimise risk’.
• Hot Grass should keep a record all documentation of training.

Information provided by Kazel Cass from Hot Grass
kazelcass@gmail.com
By creating spaces that are safe for bees, we create spaces that are safe for all of us. A Biological Pollinator Sanctuary is not only a safe space, but a place for pollinators to thrive. Creating one lays the groundwork for abundance - abundant colour, abundant nutrient dense food, abundant carbon sequestration and abundant life that lifts our wellbeing.

The word “Biological” in Biological Pollinator Sanctuary is key. To become a pollinators best friend you begin to embrace biological growing that uses a ‘biology-first’ method. This is a way of thinking and working with nature that nurtures beneficial microbiology and soil life.

**The Wonder of Microbes**

Every day, plants use the sun’s rays to photosynthesize and produce sugar. Every evening, plants flush over half of what they make out through their roots to feed the microbes hanging out around their root ball. How generous!

Microbes reprocess the sugar plants release for them, turning it into complex micronutrients that the plants can then reabsorb. Both are happy as they get their feed, and the plants are able to produce high sugar content that makes them more pest resistant.

Insects detect high sugar content from a constant, rather than flashing, infrared light that the plant emits. This repels them, as they cannot digest such high sugar content. It would ferment in their stomach and kill them. In this way, these plants are less vulnerable and require less intervention with products that are harmful for bees.

---

**for the love of bees**

**How to create a Biological Pollinator Sanctuary**

Join the City Bee Collaboration transforming The Commons to be safe for bees and all pollinators, using regenerative and biology-first methodologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Take a stocktake of what you already have blooming. Then use this table to plan your pollinator planting.

Look for plants with long blooming cycles or choose those with successive blooms.

Did you know it takes close to a billion flowers to feed a single honey bee colony for a single year?
1. GO NATURAL
Avoid pesticides, herbicides and fungicides. For a space to be safe for bees and pollinators, it must be free of synthetic chemicals, which can kill unintended creatures and leave residues that linger. The good news is, the Biology-First method will minimise pest struggles in your space.

2. RETHINK WEEDS
Weeds can be great food sources for bees and other creatures. Their decomposition nourishes the soil, giving soil organisms a more diverse diet. Weeds or wild plants extend fungal networks in the soil, known as the ‘internet of the soil,’ which facilitates resource exchange amongst plants.

3. ACTIVATE LAWN
Pick a section of grass to go from vacant to vibrant. Put in a garden bed or create a Pasture Painting, which is like a mini contained meadow. See how to make one on our website. The easiest option is to simply let wildflowers grow. Create a ‘Bee Strip’ by mowing around where they grow the most.

4. LET IT FLOWER
Let plants bolt. This is when a plant grows rapidly, going from being mostly leaf based to mostly flower and seed based. Many species will flower if you leave them - including a variety of lettuces, kale, arugula, basil, radishes, and cilantro. "Deadhead" wilting flowers to encourage new flower growth.

For the odd pest problem:
Mince garlic up and put into water with chilli (fresh or powdered). Add a blob of olive oil and organic detergent. Option is to soak overnight. Spray or wipe onto pest affected areas.

5. PROVIDE FRESH WATER
While bees don’t drink, they collect water to use within the hive. Fill a shallow dish and add marbles, stones or cork for bees to perch on. Once they have found a source of water they will likely return to it, so make sure to clean and refill it regularly. This will minimise visits to unsafe sources like pools.

6. USE ORGANIC SEEDS
Avoid treated seeds with coatings you can scrape off. These are systemic pesticides that incorporate into the tissues and nectar of the plant, that once accumulated in the hive can kill. Source organic seeds from Koanga Institute, Kings Seeds or Griffith’s Seed Saving Bank and save your own.

7. AVOID TILLING
Tilling disturbs microbiology and breaks up mycorrhizal fungi. Picture an underground spider web that sources water and nutrients for plants, and helps them chemically communicate. Instead, snap stems off at the base, leaving the roots in the soil. Plant a little further over next time.

8. KEEP GROUND COVER
Bare soil leaves microbes without food and they will migrate away. Remember, a biological grower looks after soil life. Plant green manure crops like mustard, broad beans, lupins and clover. These will condition your soil and fix nitrogen which will have been lost. Leave some to flower for pollinators.

9. USE HOMEMADE COMPOST
This is a surefire way to get life into your soil. A lot of store bought compost hasn’t gone through a belly of a worm, which is an essential step. Pour liquid over each new dry carbon layer to stop minerals escaping into the atmosphere – like comfrey tea. HungryBins and Bokashi are great for small spaces.

WHAT TO PLANT
Credit to the wonderful Trees for Bees NZ

Remember to select “single” flowers not “doubles” or “triples” and choose simple traditional flowers, not highly modified flowers.

Herbaceous
Basil (Ocimum basilicum)
Chives (Allium schoenoprasum)
Cucumber, melon (Cucumis spp.)
Echinacea (Echinacea purpurea)
Pot marigold (Calendula officinalis)
Sage (Salvia officinalis)
Squash, pumpkin (Cucurbita spp.)
Sunflower (Helianthus annuus)
Sweetcorn (Zea mays)
Balsam (Impatiens glandulifera)
Cornflower (Centaurea spp.)
Hollyhock (Alcea spp.)
Michaelmas daisy (Aster novae-angliae)
Penstemon (Penstemon spp.)
Phacelia (Phacelia tanacetifolia)
Salvia (Salvia spp.)
Sweet alyssum (Lobularia maritima)
Zinnia (Zinnia spp.)

Trees, shrubs and climbers
Apple (Malus spp.)
Bay laurel (Laurus nobilis)
Kiwifruit (Actinidia delicosa)
Lavender (Lavandula spp.)
Lemon, orange, grapefruit (Citrus spp.)
Pear (Pyrus spp.)
Plum, peach (Prunus spp.)
Rosemary (Rosmarinus officinalis)

see more at treesforbeesnz.org

see more at fortheloveofbees.co.nz

@fortheloveofbeesnz For the Love of Bees - a City Bee Collaboration
@LoveofBeesNZ
CleanSwim Auckland

8 April 2018

To: The Chairperson, Environment and Community Committee, Auckland Council
By Email to: Tam White  Tam.White@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

CleanSwim Auckland has requested a meeting with Mayor Phil Goff to: “Present its views and discuss the measures that we believe are necessary to restore sea water quality to a level that Auckland beaches are swimmable for everyone.”

In the interim, we requested to speak at a Devonport-Takapuna Local Board meeting, and were directed instead to the Environment and Community Committee (ECC). We are unable to attend the 8 April meeting, and feel that the five minutes routinely allocated to public groups is too short to present and discuss our points of view. We have now been given the opportunity to provide in writing the issues we want the ECC to consider. These will be discussed alongside the SafeSwim report that is already on the ECC agenda.

We support the SafeSwim objective to improve sea/freshwater quality to be swimmable, while acknowledging that there are improvements in progress with the predictive computer models. We also support Council’s investment in the Western Isthmus ‘Central Interceptor’ Project, as it is overdue and necessary to improve sea water quality.

In summary, we are focussed on the 84 Auckland beaches being monitored by SafeSwim that will not be receiving a significant share of the $452m 10 Year Council Budget from its ‘Water Quality Improvement Programme’.

Our key objective is to ensure that Council identifies and removes the pollutants at source, before they enter the stormwater network, by providing the resources necessary to improve the sea water quality at Auckland beaches. The key issues for CleanSwim Auckland, to be addressed by Council with a real sense of urgency, are that:

1) Storm-water runoff to Auckland beaches is being polluted by contaminants entering the stormwater network. The only viable solution is to stop the pollutants entering the stormwater before it is discharged to the sea. E.g. 5 of the 10 stormwater drains at Takapuna are discharging high E. Coli levels, which should not be there.
2) The high numbers of Red ‘High Risk’ ‘No Swim’ Alerts being posted by SafeSwim at Auckland beaches is at a crisis level, and is affecting the thousands of Aucklanders and visitors that enjoy swimming in the sea. E.g. Takapuna beach was under Red Alerts for 32% of the time / 39 days, for the 4 months to February 2018. Takapuna beach hosting World Masters Games-type events would now be prevented by water-quality issues.
3) Council has noted ‘it will take at least a decade to tackle the issues causing dozens of health warnings and no-swim notices around the city’s beaches’. This is way too long to endure Red ‘High Risk’ ‘no swim’ Alerts. And the international image of Auckland would be damaged by ongoing polluted sea water at our beaches.
4) Council has accepted that it has underinvested in its storm-water network for 25 years. CleanSwim Auckland has lodged a Submission (copy attached) to support its contention that 10 per cent of the $452m 10-Year Council Budget for its ‘Water Quality Improvement Programme’, that is available for storm-water remediation, is inadequate. E.g. Only $9m pa is available from the ‘Targeted Rate’ to clean up the 6,000km storm-water network.
5) Council needs an integrated plan to stop pollutants entering stormwater drains, to be discharged to the sea. A ‘Scoping Study’ needs to be prepared urgently to ascertain the full cost of cleaning up the storm-water network, to prevent pollutants improperly or illegally entering the network in the first place.
6) Council will need to find the funding that will be required to be able to improve sea water quality at Auckland beaches to a level that will ensure that the water is swimmable for the majority of the time. SafeSwim needs to be posting Green ‘Low Risk’ or at worst Orange ‘Fair’ Alerts for the majority of the time.

CleanSwim Auckland wants to engage with the Council to support an improved budget to ensure that the storm-water network will be upgraded through a programme — that must include a significant increase in funding, more resources, clear targets and accountability, effective communication and a unified approach from Watercare and the Council — that acknowledges the seriousness and extent of the pollution problems emanating from the storm-water network on a regular basis.

On behalf of CleanSwim Auckland: Alton Jamieson - Ian Gunthorp - Jo Hammer - Simon Walter
CleanSwim Auckland Submission on the Water Quality Improvement Programme (WQIP) proposals in the 10-year Budget

Attachment to Feedback Form lodged by Alton Jamieson on behalf of CleanSwim

OVERVIEW

Our feedback is that Auckland City’s 10-year budget and project proposals for the WQIP as a way to clean up Auckland’s coastal recreational waters are misleading and unrealistic, and require extensive revision and rescoping, because:

- 10-year budget is based on spending 80% of the proposed additional Healthy Waters funding ($361M) limiting waste water overflows in the Waitemata Harbour from part of the Western Isthmus
- Auckland Council’s SafeSwim water testing has shown severe sewage contamination on beaches from Cheltenham to Red Beach in both wet and dry conditions – where is the fix for this, let alone the other beaches in Auckland outside the Western Isthmus?
- Auckland Council’s 2016/17 Annual report, Volume 1, p161 under the objective ‘Facilitate Action to Restore the Quality of Auckland’s Waterways and Harbours’ states that the proportion of key catchments where sources of contaminants were identified and impact mitigation measures were in place was NOT MEASURED

Our contention is that the scale and breadth of human sewage contamination of Auckland’s beaches, being substantially unmeasured and unknown was not taken properly into account when the 10-year budget was compiled, and so has only become apparent with the introduction of the much more rigorous and extensive testing begun in 2017 under the revised SafeSwim programme. 10-year Budget Plans have been exclusively based on measures around waste water/sewage overflow events without testing of beach waters. Key points in support of this are set out below.

Commitment to Western Isthmus fully supported, what about the rest of Auckland?

The supporting information document ‘Auckland Council 10-year Budget 2018-2028 Supporting Information Section 7: Additional supporting information 7.9 Water quality improvements programme, Attachment A, options Table states that the 10-year Budget proposal will permit additional expenditure of $856m across the LTP period, $452m funded by a Water Quality Targeted Rate and committed to projects initiated and managed by Council Organization Healthy Waters. It is stated that 80% of this investment will be to projects located in the Western Isthmus.

It is further stated that 10 % of the WQIP budget will be spent in rural areas leaving only 10% for other areas (we quote)

“The remainder of the rate will be spent on contaminant containment and rehabilitation of streams in urban areas outside of the Western Isthmus”. So, at a rough calculation, around $85m additional funds over 10 years
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10-year Budget submission from #CleanSwim
to clean up beaches in the Eastern Suburbs, the North Shore from Cheltenham to Red Beach, not to mention the Manukau?

$8.5m per year to clean-up a storm water network of 6,000kms is inadequate.

To sum up, Auckland Council proposes cleaning up, as a priority, the Western Isthmus but allocates no visible additional budget and a mere 10% of the WQIP budget to clean up Auckland’s most popular beaches. We do not object to cleaning up the Western Isthmus.

We do object to (apparently) ignoring the serious pollution issues on other beaches now amply demonstrated by the Council’s water testing programme under SafeSwim (see below).

This is further pointed up by Auckland Council’s stated measure for the WQIP: “reducing wastewater overflows into the Waitemata Harbour from hundreds of events to six or less each year” (Section 7: Option papers 7.9: Water Quality Improvements Programme, our underlining.)

This does nothing for all or any of the popular Northern beaches stretching from Cheltenham in Devonport to Red Beach in Whangaparaoa. Where are the measures or goals for these? These beaches, most showing differing levels of unacceptable pollution, are on the Rangitoto Channel/Gulf, NOT on the Waitemata.

The Proven Pollution Problems on North Shore Beaches - SafeSwim

We commend the Council for the relaunched and revised SafeSwim programme. We have met with Nicholas Vigar and Martin Neale and received a presentation on actual beach seawater and storm water quality tests as well as the SafeSwim advisory notice system based on a newly developed modelling system. We understand from the presentation that water quality testing has increased significantly and the poor results at many beaches account for the shocking increase in ‘Red High Risk’ advisories.

Testing Data provided by the Council’s SafeSwim team from more than 5,000 water quality tests shows significant, regular contamination of multiple North Shore beaches by human sewage such that health guidelines are exceeded by a wide margin. In the case of Takapuna this year (2018) multiple storm water discharges have been found to be contaminated with fecal matter many times over recommended safe guidelines (refer MFE June 2003 Guidelines).

Of great concern, particularly in view of the Council and Watercare’s exclusive focus on managing wastewater overflows associated with rain events, was the number of ‘Red High Risk’ water tests during dry or low rain periods.

Conclusion

We submit that, given the proven pollution levels flowing from the storm water network and associated health risks indicating human sewage on multiple well-used beaches including on the North Shore from Cheltenham to Whangaparaoa, the Auckland Council approach to devote 90% of additional resources AWAY from these beaches is incomprehensible, and must be reviewed and a replacement programme designed to effectively address this pollution crisis.

When SafeSwim was launched by Auckland Council on 3 November 2017 the Press Release stated:
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10-year Budget submission from #CleanSwim

“Our beaches, harbours and islands are the jewel in the crown of Auckland. We enjoy a fantastic environment marked by its natural beauty, but we need to do more to lift the quality of water at our beaches.”

“We are embarking on an ambitious plan to significantly improve our water quality including billions of dollars of investment to stop wastewater overflows and to prioritise safety and cleanliness of our waters.”

The 10-year Budget proposal fails to provide the funding necessary to be able to deliver on these pledges. This failure to deliver is a concern following a number of acknowledgements by Mayor Goff that Auckland has under-invested in its wastewater networks for more than 25 years.

SafeSwim monitors 84 Auckland beaches and it has become clear that there is a higher than acceptable level of contaminants that is being discharged to the beaches by storm water runoff through the storm water drainage network and creeks after rain events. The problem is made more extreme by illegal discharges of contaminants through the storm water drainage network. The discharge of contaminants to the sea has resulted in way too many ‘Red High Risk’ advisories being issued by SafeSwim, that are effectively closing beaches. Surf Life Savers will not patrol a beach where a ‘Red High Risk’ advisory has been posted.

The 10-year Budget proposal fails to acknowledge the significant contamination problems flowing into the sea from the storm water network. More than 5,000 actual sea water quality tests carried out by SafeSwim have shown that in many cases there are unacceptably high levels of contamination being revealed in the test results. The ‘Red High Risk’ advisories being posted at many Auckland beaches by SafeSwim are resulting in more and more people choosing not to swim at the dirty beaches in Auckland.

So the historical belief that Auckland has a ‘fantastic environment’ is fast becoming questionable.

Clearly this will require significant additional funding being sourced to provide lasting solutions to the problems as the current ‘do nothing’ plan set out in the 10-year Budget fails to provide for the much needed upgrades to the 6,000km stormwater network, which in turn fails to clean up Auckland’s most used and popular beaches.

This is unacceptable when the total remedial costs have not been revealed by Council and could well run into the billions of dollars over the term of the budget.

Mayor Goff has been quoted on a number of occasions recently saying: “It will take at least a decade to tackle the issues causing dozens of health warnings and no swim notices around city beaches.”

A 10 year wait is unacceptable to the thousands of Auckland recreational and ocean swimmers to have to wait this length of time for Auckland Council to tackle the proven problems with the storm water network, that have arisen after more than 25 years of neglect by successive Councils.

We look forward to engaging with the Council to support an improved Budget to ensure that the storm water network will be upgraded through a programme which must include a significant increase in funding, more resources, clear targets and accountability and effective communication on a unified approach from Watercare and the Council which acknowledges the seriousness and extent of the pollution problems emanating from the storm water network on a regular basis.

“ENDS”
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The report

- Thanks Te Kawerau ā Maki and Auckland Council for their leadership
- Welcome ratification of Feb decision
- Concern that not consistent between report and list of tracks
- What about concessionaires doing high risk activities?
- Commercial use prioritised over everything else?
- Messaging must be simple and unequivocal
- Mixed messaging and confusion will continue
- Failure to comply & more expensive enforcement will result
- “Respect the rāhui and close forested areas” - must mean you actually do that
We recommend:

1. Council develops **specific strategies for the future use and management of the Waitakere and Hunua Ranges** that take account of tikanga, biosecurity and conservation priorities, that address future needs for recreation, are peer reviewed and robust - and agreed with mana whenua
We recommend:

2. All communications must stress the clear message in the decision, ie that the **forested area of the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park is closed**. Then a strategic plan is developed to do the upgrading work and open tracks in a controlled and sensible way as rolling openings. The only tracks that remain open are those outside the forest or that already achieve the standards of the CAN, ie in all conditions the track surface enables that there will be no soil on footwear - not just ones that have had a cleaning station added to the entrance. That will not guarantee compliance and will not prevent disease spread within the park, which is one of your stated objectives of the closure.
We recommend:

3. **Tracks highlighted in Attachment E (attached)** should remain closed until jointly agreed by TKAM and Biosecurity that they:
   
   a. Meet the standard of the CAN re the track surface and infrastructure.
   
   b. That other closed tracks leading off these open tracks are properly secured and the closure enforced, ie that they are not allowing access to other areas of risk.
We recommend:

4. That all open tracks will be regularly (monthly) audited by Te Kawaerau a Maki (TKAM) and Biosecurity to ensure they remain CAN compliant (conditions change, especially in winter) and if they don’t comply they will be closed until they do.

5. TKAM will be adequately resourced by Council to do this work with Council.
We recommend:

6. Council works with DOC and MPI to develop a **national track engineering standard** to ensure that tracks meeting this standard will be CAN compliant. This will ensure money is not wasted on inadequate short term engineering solutions which need to be redone multiple times.
We recommend:

7. Council urgently develops a region wide alternative recreation and comms strategy to direct people to other areas without kauri, while ensuring that those areas have adequate infrastructure to cope with increased demand.
We recommend:

8. Tracks in forested areas of Local Parks also need to be closed until they have been upgraded to meet the CAN standard and can be opened on a rolling programme with the same logic as for the Regional Park.
Environment & Community Committee, 10 April 2018
Kauri Dieback Management

The Tree Council thanks Te Kawerau ā Maki and Auckland Council for their leadership in taking this bold step to protect kauri in the Auckland Region and show the way forward for the rest of the country to follow.

The Tree Council largely welcomes the report, which recommends ratifying the decision you already made in February. However we have some serious concerns, most notably that the statements in the report relating to CAN compliance and closed vs open tracks do not match up with the list of tracks proposed to be open. Ie that the majority of tracks proposed to be open are not currently CAN compliant and are very unlikely to be so by 1 May. We believe this presents a significant communication issue for Council and will continue the confusion and mixed messaging to the public that has caused so many problems with compliance to date.

There is no mention of whether concessionaires will be stopped from operating in the park. Do we imply from this that their use will be allowed to continue while ordinary people will be shut out? If so that is a very dangerous precedent to set and one we challenge strongly. If for eg the canyoneers who go off track and travel down watercourses posing a massive and unacceptable risk of spreading kauri dieback are allowed to continue to do so then this tells us that the proposed open tracks bear no relation to a biosecurity strategy to prevent disease spread, but only to enable commercial use of the park to continue regardless of the implications for the health of the forest.

Council must present a clear and unequivocal message to the public that is simple, easy to understand, logical and easy to interpret if they want to get compliance with the closure and minimise the cost and complexity of enforcement measures. The current proposed list of open
**Proposed Open**
The opening of those tracks marked with an * are subject to track surface improvement works being completed prior to 1 May to ensure they will meet the required standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TWIN PEAKS TRACK</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPPER HUIA DAM TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER KAURI TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSHER TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAINAMU BUSH TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAITAKERE TRAMLINE WALK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAITORU RESERVE TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER RIDGE TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST TUNNEL MOUTH TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHATITIRI TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINSTONE TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZION HILL TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZION RIDGE TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| ANAWHATA BEACH TRACK      |   |
| ARATAKI NATURE TRAIL      |   |
| BEVERIDGE TRACK           |   |
| * SYERS TRACK             |   |
| CAVE ROCK TRACK           |   |
| CON BRYAN TRACK           |   |
| * DREAMLANDS TRACK        |   |
| EXHIBITION DRIVE WALK (Watercare) |   |
| HUIA DAM ROAD (Watercare) |   |
| JAN WELLS TRACK (Partial - Piha Road to Auxiliary Dam) |   |
| KAKAMATUA BEACH WALK      |   |
| KAKAMATUA INLET TRACK     |   |
| KARAMATURA LOOP WALK      |   |
| * KITEKITE TRACK          |   |
| * KNUZITEN TRACK          |   |
| LAIRD THOMPSON TRACK      |   |
| LAKE WAINAMU TRACK        |   |
| * LARGE KAURI WALK        |   |
| LION ROCK TRACK           |   |
| * LONG ROAD TRACK (Partial - from road end to where paddock meets the forest) |   |
| LOOKOUT TRACK (Arataki Visitor Centre) |   |
| MANUKAU BAR VIEW WALK     |   |
| MARAWHARA WALK            |   |
| MCELWAIN LOOKOUT TRACK    |   |
| MCCLACHLAN MONUMENT TRACK |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MERCER BAY LOOP TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT DONALD MC LEAN WALK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*OMANAWANUI TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*OPANUKU PIPELINE TRACK (Partial - from Mountain Road to the campground)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ORPHEUS GRAVES WALK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARARAH VALLEY TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKER TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPELINE ROAD and part of PIPELINE TRACK (Watercare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PURIRI RIDGE TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAL HOUSE TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIP TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRAGGS MONUMENT TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASMAN LOOKOUT TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE HENGA WALKWAY (DOC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER NIHOTUPU DAM ROAD (Watercare) AND UPPER NIHOTUPU WALK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAITAKERE DAM WALK (Watercare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIG-ZAG TRACK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should remain closed until agreed by TRAM & BIOSECURITY that they meet the standards of the CAN.
Proposal for Forest Hygiene Stations to protect against Kauri Dieback

Submission to the Environment & Community Committee

Auckland Council

Prepared by Forest and Bird Warkworth Area
and the Kauri and Native Bushman's Assn Warkworth
Practical steps required to reduce the risk of Kauri Dieback becoming established

- **Dry Tracks** – Metalled tracks and Boardwalks near kauri trees are required to reduce the risk of the transferring of contaminated soil.
- **Spray and Brush Stations** are probably used by less than 50% of visitors and even using sprays these are likely to be less than 50% effective. We need to aim at 100% coverage for all public tracks.
- **Full Forest Hygiene Stations** need to be installed at all high risk sites and at all sites where visitor numbers are high.
Hygiene Station constructed at Parry Park, Warkworth

Station built by Forest and Bird Warkworth Area together with the Kauri and Native Bushman's Assn Warkworth.

The structure was funded by Forest and Bird Warkworth Area

A second structure will be funded by the Kauri and Native Bushman's Assn Warkworth.
Item 5.5

First customers 21st March 2018
The Plan

- The material cost (excluding tray and brush sets) is approx $2000.
- Volunteer labour can build a complete station in less than 80 man hours.
Our Request

We are asking Auckland Council to:-

- Place urgency on installing Forest Hygiene Stations at Kauri Forest sites throughout Auckland City
- Adopt standard plans wherever practical.
- Fund and provide full kitsets for construction
- Allow volunteers to construct the stations with the minimum of bureaucracy

Contact Roger Williams 09 4259127 or ropeworth@gmail.com
Closure is directed at stopping transmission of kauri dieback.

Dieback is transmitted on pin head amounts of soil which can be moved by people; pigs; possum; rats; stoats, birds, water, erosion, wind and an endless number of other modes or vectors.

The results of the Consultation exercise show that there is widespread scepticism about the effectiveness of closures because of the limited understanding of the impact different vectors have on its spread.

That scepticism is reflected in the Report in the words “there is significant technical uncertainty around how best to control it”.

My reason for speaking to the Committee today is to emphasise:

1. There is no data on the how much of the disease is spread by the human vector; and
2. There is a whole lot of data about the negative recreational and commercial effects of closure.

In the absence of data on the human impact, the Committee should not close any tracks just yet. But once that data exists, it should be weighed it against the effects on recreation and commercial activities.

Until then it is essential that there is greater investment into R&D, education, cleaning stations and increasing knowledge about possible treatments.

It is clear from the recommendations on page 13, paragraph e of the Report, and statements throughout the report that there are “significant technical risks relating to the understanding of kauri dieback disease and the impact the proposed closure approaches may have”.

No one has any idea of the human vector effect or its impact on the spread and how that impact, if any, compares to any of the other vectors or how it will be measured.

The risks of closure are set out in paragraphs 136 to 141 of the Report. They include:

1. No data about the human vector.
2. The unknown lag time between disease spread and symptoms.
3. No way to measure effectiveness of closure because other vectors of transmission are not understood or addressed.

4. Restricting access increases the risk of the spread to other areas.

5. There is a significant enforcement risk, particularly given:
   a. the size of the area,
   b. lack of data to evidence closure;
   c. a high risk of non-compliance given significant scepticism about the benefits of closure.

To which I would add the following additional risks:

6. Consultation shows that the 43% opposed to closure are unlikely to accept that course of action because it is unknown what the human vector contributes; In that regard: paragraph 77 of the report states that the proposed closures are of a scale not previously tested in NZ and paragraph 19 states that in relation to the Dec 17 closures: there was a high level of non-compliance with cleaning stations, track closures and calls to respect the rahui.

7. Track closures without the evidence alluded to will do more to harm to efforts to limit spread if they fail than taking time to collect data now.

The Consultation process showed a “fervent” desire for balance. Balance is impossible without data and that is what is likely to cause closure to fail.

If those risks materialise we will be in a worse position because cleaning stations will have been abandoned, track maintenance will be non-existent, education processes will not have been focused on and yet people may be using the Park.

The Committee should see the recommended proposal as similar to full closure. The promise of sufficient and adequate track openings in a year or anytime in the future is not realistic given the definition of what is “acceptable” for a track in the Report.

Just because the human vector is the only vector that can be controlled does not mean we should control that vector without data and weighing the impact. Together, pigs; possum; rats; stoats, birds, water, erosion, and wind sound like they might play a pretty big role.
The key point is that there is a whole lot of data on effects and impacts of closure, which show significant recreational and commercial effects, but no data on the benefits of closure which is the risk that leads to the other identified risks.

In my view data the Committee should resolve to collect more data at the same time as investing in more:

1. research and science,
2. education; and
3. track improvement and cleaning stations

Closure should be revisited once that data exists.

Number of words: 735
Aim for: 700
Good morning, thank you for the opportunity to talk today. My name is Cam Bowen, I own and operate AWOL canyoning adventures. We are one of many businesses that have already been greatly affected by the announcement of the park closure. I am from the Waitakere’s and have spent my life working in the bush. I fully support track maintenance and cleaning station upgrades and further public education on dieback procedures as an important step towards slowing the spread of dieback. My entire business depends on finding working solutions to kauri dieback, we are completely behind council and would like to offer help wherever possible. My career of 30 years is in recreation and it is from that vantage point that I wish to talk today. I want to advocate for activities to remain in the park that meet the ‘low risk criteria’ under the controlled area notice conditions.

I first learnt about Kauri dieback seven or so years ago and have been on a site visit of the affected trees with Dr Waipara, I have attended council seminars, had visits from council to check our operation and have regular contact with park rangers. For all these years we have been educating clients on dieback and correct park protocol. This summer, because of the new report showing spread of dieback, I again checked that we are still following best practice and are minimal risk users in the park.

I want to ensure that there are no misconceptions about our canyoning operation, as it seems people’s perceptions of our activity and the scale of our business are often quite different from reality. For that reason, I have some photos from our trips and will give a quick overview of what we do.

Slides

The reason why our activity has been assessed as ‘low impact’ is because we enter and exit the park using council tracks and then step off them onto the solid rock face of the canyon. The areas of stream we are consented to canyon in, are fast flowing and subject to floods that regularly strip the rock face bare of vegetation. The ‘off track’ section of our trips is on rock - not on soil and not around kauri trees.

We have a reputation built on 20 years of operating in the park. It’s a proven track record of managing our clients and being an environmentally sound activity with a low social impact to other users. In most cases providing a point of interest. We have been approved through council bio security and Niwa for minimal impact. Our concession also caps the number of clients we can take through the canyons, making us a small operation.

Despite the size of our operation there has still been the label of ‘commercialisation’ in a ‘negative sense’ because we operate in the park. Putting this into perspective. We are permitted to take a total of 1700 people per annum to the two sites that we operate. Compare this to Waitomo adventures, who can turnover that amount of people in only two days of operating. The number of visitors we bring to the park is also insignificant compared to public use of the park. A busy day for us could mean 10 people, a busy day for a track could be 1500 people - again this is nearly the same as our yearly quota.

My wife and I run this business, out of our home. The business has been slow to build and is still similar in lots of ways to when we started 20 years ago, we are still operating out of our
home, I’m still guiding trips. We have managed to grow the business to provide enough work for two guides. It also meant we have been able to take on and train students studying Outdoor Recreation and Management from AUT and for me to re-focus on becoming a manager and ensure overall safety. In short, the business has reached a point where it can operate successfully, and safely even though on a small scale. At a smaller scale than we are now this business is not sustainable.

Rangers have often said we are the ideal park user’s because we have small, well managed groups, that are educated and observed the entire time they are in the park. For years we have been the eyes and ears for council in the areas we operate, notifying council staff of waste, risk taking behaviour, dangerous areas of tracks and we have assisted with medical emergencies of other park users. This has led on to me joining Landsar 7 years ago. Landsar is a volunteer group that assists police in search and rescue operations. We are tasked with finding lost, injured, despondent or dementia patients. I continue to volunteer with them assisting with high rope rescues and on searches all over the greater Auckland area. This has been my way to give back with the skills that I have.

What keeps us going for all these years is all the good people we have met and guided, their priceless reactions at what they’ve achieved and the sheer beauty of what they’ve seen. We offer an amazing recreational experience and we know that each person leaves the park that much more knowledgeable and in touch with nature. This kind of education is invaluable.

The situation that we now find ourselves in is completely out of our control. Everything I have worked for is now on the line. We are looking at losing our entire business, 20 years of hard work and excellent operation. Access to the two sites that we operate in and clear support for us as a concessionaire that is operating environmentally safely will be critical to the survival of this business.

The Waitakere’s are a key place of recreation for Auckland. People want to protect the park, but they also want to enjoy the park. I hope that businesses like ours that have proven track records, guide and monitor its groups and can meet the requirements of controlled area notice will be able to continue to provide an important recreational experience.

Thank you.
Local Board Feedback on Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2)

1. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (Resolution number MT/2018/37)
   24.1 The Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2)
   That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:
   a) endorse the draft of the Council submission as proposed.

2. Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board (Resolution number OP/2018/32)
   That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:
   a) note the report.
   b) agree to support the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill in a submission to Parliament.
   c) delegate to the Chair to develop and approve the wording of the submission in co-operation with the Governing Body and any other local boards involved.
   d) request the Regulatory Committee and officers to take all practicable steps to conclude legal proceedings on the Provisional Local Alcohol Policy, and bring the policy into force as soon as possible.

Additional submission attached.

3. Manurewa Local Board – additional submission attached.

4. Papakura Local Board – additional submission attached.

5. Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board - additional submission attached
5 April 2018

Auckland Council submission: to the Governance and Administration Committee
Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill No.2

Additional comments from Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board

1. Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board supports the intent of the Bill, and the Supplementary Order Paper of 21 February 2018.

2. The local board wishes to provide additional information to the Auckland Council submission, to illustrate the difference the Bill might make on renewal of off-licence. This is based on the board’s experience lodging objections to alcohol licences applications in unsuitable locations, and observing the outcome of those processes.

3. The Auckland Provisional Local Alcohol Policy provides that when renewing off-licences, the District Licensing Committee should include the following conditions unless there is a good reason not to do so:
   - Prohibited persons: (a) ensure that no intoxicated persons are allowed to enter or to remain on the premises; (b) ensure that signs are prominently displayed detailing the statutory restrictions on the sale of alcohol to minors and intoxicated persons adjacent to every point of sale.
   - Register of alcohol-related incidents: The licensee must maintain a register of material alcohol-related incidents, noting the date, time and details of each incident, and the steps taken by the licensee in response to the incident.

4. These conditions have not been imposed in cases the board has been involved in. As the board understands the Bill, when a licence without those conditions comes up for renewal in future, the Bill will ensure that the District Licensing Committee will be prompted to consider imposing conditions based on the policy: for example, conditions concerning a register of alcohol-related incidents, and requiring things such as CCTV or exterior lighting.

5. The board supports the Bill giving the District Licensing Committee the power to consider local alcohol policies on licence renewals. While conditions might not be imposed in every case, the board supports the consideration of such matters being enabled by the Bill.

Select committee hearings

6. The local board asks that the Select Committee schedule hearings in South Auckland. This would be appropriate due to the degree of alcohol harm in South Auckland and the high community interest in the subject.
7. Decisions requested

8. That the select committee endorse and recommend the Bill to the House, with the changes proposed in the Supplementary Order Paper dated 21 February 2018.

9. That the select committee hold hearings of submissions in South Auckland.

Nga mihi nui

[Signature]

Lotu Fuli
Chairperson
Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board
LLB(Hons), BA(English), MA(Hons), MALT(Hons), MLitt(Hons), GradDipTeaching(Sec)
Email: lotu.fuli@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz  Phone: 021 242 3713
22 March 2018

Manurewa Local Board Submission to the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No. 2)

Background

With a population of 82,242 (as per the 2013 census data) Manurewa has one of the youngest median ages of all local board areas. With more than a quarter of Manurewa’s usual residents children (aged 0 to 14 years).

The median personal adult incomes are lower than that for the whole of Auckland. The area, in general, is acknowledged as a low socio-economic area with the social issues that come with that.

The Manurewa Local Board has consistently advocated for a sinking lid approach to the number of off licences in Manurewa, particularly where these are located in neighbourhood shopping centres and in sensitive areas such as early childhood centres and schools.

The board has had extensive input from members of the community indicating that reducing alcohol-related harm is very important to them, and has supported communities to make submissions on applications in their area.

Submission

The Manurewa Local Board supports the intent to reduce alcohol related harm by the amendment of section 133 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No. 2) which is endeavoring to limit the number of off licence outlets in sensitive areas, but also wants to ensure the minimisation of unintended consequences.

The board agrees with the points made in the Auckland Council submission in relation to this bill in that:

1. The Local Alcohol Policy process is subject to legal challenges which delays implementation of the Policy and due to this the Auckland Council’s draft Alcohol Policy is still not in effect.

2. This bill presents an opportunity to address issues with the local alcohol policy process.

3. Having a local alcohol policy in force is vital to this bill having practical application.
4. The bill only applies to off licences. A club, tavern or on licence could be established in the sensitive areas with no consequence.

5. The bill needs to be balanced to minimize potential negative impacts on established business, employment and economic growth.

6. More central government guidance is needed to address what is a complex, lengthy and expensive process for councils to undertake.

Yours sincerely

Angela Dalton - Chair
Manurewa Local Board
Email: Angela.Dalton@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Ph: 0212833311
Papakura Local Board Submission to the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No. 2)

This submission relates to the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Background

The Papakura Local Board area has a population of 45,633 (as per the 2013 census data). 28.1% of the residents identify as Maori and 14.5% identify as Pacific peoples. 24.4% of the population is under 14 years or younger.

Median incomes are relatively low in Papakura and there are lower levels of residents with qualifications. The area, in general, is a low socio-economic area with the social issues that come with that.

The Papakura Local Board Plan ‘outcome 2: People in Papakura lead active, healthy and connected lives’ speaks to the Papakura Local Board’s aspiration for the community overall to be safe and healthy.

The Papakura Local Board has been an advocate in the past to reduce alcohol related harm on the community and has provided feedback and input during the development of the Auckland Council Local Alcohol Policy.

It is noted that the Auckland Council Local Alcohol Policy is currently provisional and is not yet in force.

Submission

1. The Papakura Local Board supports the Auckland Council submission on the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No. 2) and Supplementary Order Paper, which aims to limit the number of off-licence outlets in Priority Overlay Areas.

2. The board agrees with the points made in the Auckland Council submission in relation to this Bill in that:
   - The practical application of the Bill is limited to where a local alcohol policy exists containing elements relating to location and density on the renewal of licences.
   - The local alcohol policy process is subject to legal challenges which delays implementation of the Policy and due to this, the Auckland Council’s Alcohol Policy is still not in effect.

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson

Date: 04 April 2018

Felicity Auva'a
Deputy Chairperson
Auckland Council submission: to the Governance and Administration Committee

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

Additional comments from Mangere - Otahuhu Local Board

10 April 2016


2. The local board wishes to provide additional information to the Auckland Council submission, to illustrate the difference the Bill might make on renewal of off-licence. This is based on the board’s experience lodging objections to alcohol licences applications in unsuitable locations and observing the outcome of those processes.

3. The Auckland Provisional Local Alcohol Policy provides that when renewing off-licences, the District Licensing Committee should include the following conditions unless there is a good reason not to do so:
   - Prohibited persons: (a) ensure that no intoxicated persons are allowed to enter or to remain on the premises; (b) ensure that signs are prominently displayed detailing the statutory restrictions on the sale of alcohol to minors and intoxicated persons adjacent to every point of sale.
   - Register of alcohol-related incidents: The licensee must maintain a register of material alcohol related incidents, noting the date, time and details of each incident, and the steps taken by the licensee in response to the incident.

4. These conditions have not been imposed in cases the board has been involved in. As the board understands the Bill, when a licence without those conditions comes up for renewal in future, the Bill will ensure that the District Licensing Committee is able to consider imposing conditions concerning a register of alcohol-related incidents and requiring things such as CCTV or exterior lighting.

5. The board supports the Bill giving the District Licensing Committee the power to consider conditions like these. While conditions might not be imposed in every case, the board supports the consideration of such matters being enabled by the Bill.

Select committee hearings

6. The local board asks that the Select Committee schedule hearings in South Auckland. This would be appropriate due to the degree of alcohol harm in South Auckland and the high community interest in the subject.
Decisions requested

8. That the select committee endorse and recommend the Bill to the House, with the changes proposed in the Supplementary Order Paper dated 21 February 2018.

9. That the select committee hold hearings of submissions in South Auckland.

Lemauga Lydia Sosene
Chair
Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board