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1 Welcome

Chairperson IM Fordham will open the meeting and welcome everyone in attendance. Member J Cleave will lead a karakia.

2 Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

3 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 20 March 2018, as true and correct.

5 Leave of Absence

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

6 Acknowledgements

At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

7 Petitions

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

8 Deputations

Standing Order 3.20 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Great Barrier Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

At the close of the agenda no requests for deputations had been received.

9 Public Forum

A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public forum had been received.

10 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:
“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

11 Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
Environmental agency and community group reports

File No.: CP2018/03436

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for Great Barrier community groups and environmental agencies with interest or role in the environment or the work of the Great Barrier Local Board, to have items considered as part of the board’s business meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Environment Committee of the Great Barrier Local Board has been discontinued from the start of this electoral term 2016/2019. To continue with the tradition of open and more direct interaction between the board, local groups and others, the local board has extended an invitation to either speak at the board’s business meeting via Public Forum or put items forward and have reports included in the agenda.
3. Inclusion of items on the agenda is at the discretion of the Great Barrier Local Board Chairperson in discussion with the Great Barrier Local Board Relationship Manager to ensure the material is appropriate and will not create any issues. Any items submitted will be included under a cover report which will have the recommendation that “item xyz be noted or received”.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:
a) receive the following reports:
   i. Biodiversity/biosecurity report February – March 2018
   ii. Biosecurity report February – March 2018
   iii. Motu Kaikoura Trust Supporters’ Newsletter Issue 25, March 2018
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Okiwi pest co-coordinator

- A field team member from the Okiwi community has been employed to deploy 150 snap traps for rodent control.
- A five-minute bird count is to be completed within the community to engage residents and understand population changes of conspicuous species as the program develops.
- All traps will get GPS coordinates and be added to trapNZ.
- The traps will be laid out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property/resident/owner</th>
<th>Number of boxes</th>
<th>Locations/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okiwi Passion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Around outside, especially nthn side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okiwi Passion roadside</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Out of mowers way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River reserve/walkway</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Secured or/and above flood level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea roadside paddocks beside stream</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Secured or/and above flood level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland over road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Around back side, work with school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside from wetland to property of TL of Aotea road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>as appropriate, stream side but out of flood zone or secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and all of Okiwi Reserve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Work with school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural property</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>As appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okiwi residential properties</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1/property, not where mower will hit, eg boundary hedge, most have bait or devices round house already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Reserve up stream</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ecology conversations

- An ecology conversations meeting was held on the 25th of February.
- Resolutions include the establishment of a monthly meeting, community educational workshops and development of community led conservation initiatives including an Aotea trap network, riparian restoration and community led island wide bird surveys for outcome monitoring.
- 10 more traps were deployed in the Claris trapping area/Kaitoke Medlands BFA
- To date 51 rats have been caught over a three month period.
Biosecurity/biodiversity monthly report February- March 2018

Sanctuaries

Windy Hill

- The automatic lures and gas canisters were changed in the Big Windy Hill A24s between 22 and 23 March
- Biosecurity, Windy Hill and Good Nature staff helped with the change over
- No fresh rat kills were noted. Older rodent skeletons were observed under five A24s.
- Less ALPs were faulty during this check. However, problems were still observed with some lures not dispensing any bait.
- The A24 program will be looked at by the biosecurity team to determine possibilities for the use of the tools elsewhere and the efficacy of the trap from the Windy Hill data. Judy Gilbert will make suggestions for the program in her next A24 report; this should be available to the board in mid-May.
- A new changeover time of the ALPs from every six months to every four months with CO2 canisters being changed every eight rather than six months is suggested. The change is aimed at assessing whether better results are achieved with the bait being palatable to rats 100% of the time, as the trial at Windy Hill suggests the bait becomes less palatable over time with less rat kills observed in the last two months of the ALP life span.

Glenfern

- Rodent monitoring was completed across the Kotuku Peninsula between 5 and 9 March. Rat tracking results are up past the five 5 per cent threshold and management practices are to be reviewed.
- Lizard tracks were also observed in the coastal broadleaved forests indicating abundant herpetofauna in some ecotypes.
Biosecurity/biodiversity monthly report February- March 2018

Pest Plants

Royal fern

- A large royal fern infestation was identified while wetland monitoring near Whangapoua Estuary.
- The infestation has likely been present for more than two years with estimated 20 plants in a 100sqm area in Raupo reedland/tangle fern scrubland ecotone.
- Envirotkiwi contractors and biosecurity staff have delimited the infestation and begun removal of all sporangia and root material. This will be deep buried at landfill.

Houttuynia

- The Houttuynia infestation that was treated last month at Glen fern was checked.
- The treatment was effective and will continue to be monitored to ensure the weed does not re-sprout.
Biosecurity/biodiversity monthly report February- March 2018

Lantana

A request for service for possible lantana plant was recorded on the 28 February 2018. This was responded to and the plant was removed. No seedlings were observed on site.

All fruit and flowers were removed for deep bury at the land fill and vegetative material left on site.
Biosecurity/biodiversity monthly report February- March 2018

Madeira vine

- A large Madeira vine infestation was responded to on the 13th of March at Kawa Marae.
- This has been reported to contractors and a decision for its control will be made.

Roadside weed surveillance

- An audit has been completed in Claris, Okupu and Awana on the roadside weed control.
- This has been compared to a survey completed in 2014.
- To date there appears to be a lapse in control in some surveillance weeds that were contracted for control. However, all total control weeds appear to be absent, suggesting the contractors have completed effective control with these species.
- There has been some great team work and collaboration with the Community Facilities during this work.

Pest animals

Plague skinks

- 245 traps have been deployed at two by two metre spacing at the plague skink site in an area for a proposed trap only cell. This is to determine whether the skink densities in this area are high enough to test efficacy of IST traps for eradication in an area.
- Preliminary results suggest this cell will be a good trial area.
- The southwestern end of the fence is being completed and should be finished within the next two weeks.
- The chickens have been move to a new cell and post chicken trapping in chicken cell one will commence next month.
Biosecurity/biodiversity monthly report February- March 2018

Argentine ants

- Argentine ant surveillance by hand searching was completed on Michener’s Road by biosecurity staff on the 29th of February.
- A resident in Okupu reported Argentine ants while gardening. A follow up survey confirmed Argentine ant presence.
- Argentine ants were also picked up at the landfill just on the periphery of the Gray road site.

Community education

**Taonga of the month**

This is a monthly article in the Barrier Bulletin aimed at highlighting some of Aotea’s special and threatened species. This article is titled Taonga of the month and for March/Maehe the feature species is kakariki.

This is an initiative to educate residents on what we are trying to protect when we complete pest control and highlight the kaitiaki and conservation heroes that are working hard to protect the taonga of Aotea.

**Aotea plant swap**

An Aotea plant swap will be held on Easter weekend at the Claris market day. Some keen weeders have already done some fantastic work for the reward of a nikau donated by the Department of Conservation. This is been a great collaboration between DoC and Auckland Council biosecurity.

This is an example of work being completed for the swap:
Biosecurity/biodiversity monthly report February- March 2018

"Our ginger weed infestation-"before" photo:

"After" photo, YAY it's all gone. We used a pick-axe and steel bar to dig the roots out over several days.

“We hauled about 36 bags of roots to the dump for deep-burial.”

**Personal Development, meetings & training**

- CSL training – 20 February 2018
- Biosecurity team meeting – 21 February 2018
- Inspiring communities forum – 23 February 2018
- Great Barrier Local Board environment update – 06 March 2018
Biosecurity Local Board General Update

Month/Year: 14th February to 14th March 2018

Officer’s name: Jeremy Warden

Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area - Great Barrier Island

Plague Skink Shoal Bay Wharf

- The two hundred Chickens have been moved to a holding pen positioned at the top of the skink area running adjacent to the exterior fence. The chicken cell area will be allowed to settle over a period before presence/absence trapping is implemented to determine how effective the chickens have been.
- Pre commencement resource consent meeting was held prior to the start of fence construction that runs between Taylors Bay access track and Gibbs lagoon. Fence construction has progressed well and is now finished.
- Trapping to determine skink density happening within an area to determine if it is suitable for a trap only cell. This site has been confirmed to have high enough densities and runs parallel to the exterior fence.
- A wider delimitation line has been identified. The first section of these traps (Tryphena point) has been installed.

Argentine & Darwin’s ants

- **Mulberry Grove** – Monitoring of this site is complete. The only population of Argentine ants detected (via planned monitoring) has been found at the bottom of Rosalie Bay Road. Two separate sites were located on the Bell property where the Pines were removed. They are located close to or on the boundary where planned monitoring was carried out and are known to have had infestations from previous seasons. These sites have been grouped in with the treatment for the Rosalie Bay Rd site.

Argentine Ant Surveillance

Contracted surveillance monitoring has been carried out in the following areas:

- Medland Rd – below Mitchener Rd to The Lane
- Okupu – foreshore properties and sun beam
- Tip Shop
- Mulberry Grove development – large area where pines were felled. Argentine ants detected here. Two treatments have been carried out where Peter Speck has been stock piling firewood that is about to be removed from site. Communication has been very good between Enviromon and Aotea Family Support about the potential threat of spreading ants from this site via firewood and all the necessary precautions are and will be taken.
- Blackwells pig pens
- Aotea Contractors
- Thomas road – at end of road
- Kaitoke lane - end of road
- Awana campground
- Awana fire depot
- Sand pile at Awana (opposite new build on dunes)
- Landfill (new sample needed from here for ID)
- Claris Fill depot (behind old Daly homestead)
Item 12

- Okupu transfer station
  - Okupu wharf (skink surveillance done here also)
  - Whangaparapara wharf (skink surveillance done here also)
  - Whangaparapara Rd – turning bay opposite golf club
  - Medlands transfer station
  - Medlands community garden

**Weed Control**

**Total Control**
- Enviromiki treating Royal fern on Mabey Road
- Madeira Vine treatment – Mabey farm house
- Madeira Vine treatment – Whangaparapara lodge
- Quality Audit of Sanderson Royal Fern site-No plants found

**SWI**
- Treatment of Port Fitzroy moth plant and Lantana done consecutively
- Boneseed and Kahlill ginger- Parners
- Japanese Honeysuckle – Rosalie Bay

**Wharf and Airport Mustelid and Rodent Pest Surveillance (January)**
- Port Fitzroy 71.5% Bait take, 2x kioire caught in DOC200, 0x Wax tag=Rat
- Tryphena- 12% Bait take 2x Ship Rat caught in DOC200. 0x Wax tag=Rat
- Whangaparapara- 50% bait take 3x Ship Rat in DOC200’s. 2x Wax tag=Rat
- Okupu -0% bait take. 0x Rat caught in DOC200, 0x wax tag=Rat
- Claris airfield environment – 33% bait take
- Claris residential-30% bait take

**Bait Stations at Transfer Sites (January)**
- Southern Stations- Medlands 0%, Okupu 0%, Puriri bay 0%, Mulberry grove 0%
- Northern Stations- Motairehe 100%, Okiwi 90% & Kawa 75%

**Private Jetties & Boat Ramps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>DOC200</th>
<th>Bait Station</th>
<th>Wax tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yates</td>
<td>0x Rat</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty</td>
<td>1x Rat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickards</td>
<td>0x Kiore</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellins</td>
<td>0x Rat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangapara Jetty</td>
<td>1x Rat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okupu Boat Ramp</td>
<td>1x Rat</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Grove Boat Ramp</td>
<td>0x Rat</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puriri Boat Ramp</td>
<td>1x Rat</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** No new species of pest animals detected, bait consumption very high at Port Fitzroy with some of the stations empty. Minimal interceptions of rats in DoC200.
Good Nature A24 Traps
Assist with ALP and Co2 change at Windy Hill Sanctuary (22 February 2018) along with sanctuary staff and representatives from Good Nature.

Glen Fern
Assist sanctuary with bringing monitoring cards in from G block.

Dog Work
Hairy -conservation predator dog recertification for rodent detection and bird aversion completed.
KAKA COMMENTS

MOTU KAIKOURA TRUST SUPPORTERS’ NEWSLETTER ISSUE 25, March 2018

We have had a very successful summer with a variety of activities.

Firstly the new lodge is nearing completion. We are extremely appreciative of the hard work and sacrifices made by the Architect+Women who have given their time to carry out this project. Also the builders, electricians and plumbers who all worked enthusiastically. It was great to have such a dedicated team lead by Dave Strachan and Maria Hosking. In the newsletter you will read all about them.

There are reports on gannet and reptile surveys.

Also included is a precis of the 2017 Rat Monitoring report by Mike Lee. We are very pleased with the results thanks to Mike and Clint. The full report can be seen on the website.

The Stannard family have updated us on their activities.

CONGRATULATIONS to Xyra Stannard. Xyra received the Rural women NZ Golden Jubilee award for outstanding attitude and achievement in education for any aged student in a remote area. 25,000 students were enrolled for 2017.

Follow the link to see the amazing journey of our new Lodge. http://www.architectwomen.org.nz/news-events/motu-kaioura-final-push

The Warkworth Rotary group led by Jon Nicholson is continuing with their upgrades which are bringing our facilities back to life and looking great.
I have continued with my flights to the island now 404 plus 2 boat trips. A recent flight was transporting an electric bike which is proving invaluable.

Our thanks to: Foundation North for the balance for the new lodge.

Gl Barrier Local Board towards solar panels.

Lion foundation towards insurance.

DOC Community Fund towards ranger’s wages.

Rod Miller
Chairperson
Motu Kaikoura Trust

---

Motu Kaikoura Rat Control Programme – Progress Report 2017

The Motu Kaikoura Trust has been undertaking a manual rat control operation (baiting and trapping) on Motu Kaikoura (564 ha) since March 2014, with the objective of managing rat numbers on the island at or below 5% index level. Satisfactory progress is indicated by the index of rat abundance which in mid November 2017 was 2%. This data is supported by the continuing decline of bait consumption and in the number of rats trapped, bait-take (December) is presently below 1% (of bait blocks available) and rats trapped in 4% of traps.

This compares to relative rat abundance on nearby Great Barrier Island of 60% or higher - similar to levels recorded on Motu Kaikoura prior to the start of the manual operation in 2014.

www.motukaikoura.org.nz
The Motu Kaikoura Trust using manual methods has significantly reduced rat numbers on Motu kaikoura and has kept them at 5% or below especially during the ecologically important Spring season for the last four years. Despite rat numbers in the temperate coastal forests of Great Barrier Island being some of the highest in New Zealand, all year round, we have confirmed there is a distinct pattern of seasonal increases or ‘spikes’ in population levels, beginning in February and lasting up until June. Judging by control data this seasonal pattern is apparent both on Motu Kaikoura and on Great Barrier Island. However on Motu Kaikoura, as noted, it is encouraging that in response to ongoing management the spike in rat numbers was lower in 2017 than 2016 and has been progressively lower each year going back to 2014 when we began the control programme.

![Motu Kaikoura rat index monitoring results](image)

Also as a result of the programme, a reversal has occurred in the relative proportions of the remnant rat populations on the island with kiore present in greater proportion than ship rats. This is almost an exact reversal of what would normally be expected in unmanaged environments where these two species cohabit.

On Motu Kaikoura ‘habitat repair’ due to natural forest regeneration and reducing the environmental burden of rats is resulting in improving ecological health, evidenced by increased forest regeneration and diversity of understorey. While this remains to be measured objectively, monitoring indicates a greater presence of small forest birds in particular and noticeably more bird song – indicators of recovering ecological processes. The success and consistency of our rat management regime means Motu Kaikoura is now an attractive option for the release of bird species which would not be expected to establish on the island naturally.

Sustainable progress in managing rats on the island now enables the Trust to focus on achieving its wider conservation restoration goals as set in the Motu Kaikoura Trust Biodiversity Management Plan.

We would like to thank Motu Kaikoura Island ranger Clint Stannard for his hard work and dedication in making this operation a conservation success story. Assisted by his wife Jacinda, Clint has done a superb job. I would also like to thank former resident volunteer Robbie Smith for his contribution to the programme.

Thanks are also due for the ongoing support of Brett Butland of Auckland Council’s Predator-free Auckland and Jonathan Miles and the Biosecurity team at Auckland Council both in terms of providing advice and material support.

_Mike Lee_

[www.motukaikoura.org.nz](http://www.motukaikoura.org.nz)
New Lodge Construction – Architecture + Women

Volunteer Build Team

It was a beautiful evening on Motu Kaikoura, our first meal in the new lodge we had just built; the stars and the ruru were out, the workers were exhausted after a day of building in the scorching sun - but refreshed from a jump into the sea at the end of it - and satisfied to be re-fueling for the next day’s work in such beautiful surrounds - both natural and woman-made.

Rod took this opportunity to ask me if I’d write a short piece for the Trust newsletter describing what the experience of being a volunteer on the building project has been like. “Just something short” he said. But how to fit such a unique experience into something short?

Anyone who has been following the project from the beginning, on the Architecture + Women website (http://www.architecturewomen.org.nz/news-events/motu-kaikoura-final-push), will know that in July 2017, 16 women, all architectural graduates or registered architects (and one engineer!), all from diverse backgrounds, enrolled to be part of a building workshop offered by Strachan Group Architects and Architecture + Women. In return for the course fee we would “gain confidence and further knowledge on a construction site”, as well as “on the tools’ experience under the expert eyes of Dave Strachan, Architect, the builders from Crate Architectural Innovations and, during the build, JR Hosking Carpenters.

In the end what we gained from this course was so much more than just building skills and construction site knowledge. As women working in architecture we got to meet other women - recent graduates, sole practitioners, mothers - and bond over our experiences in the profession. As the weeks went on we formed strong ties, not only with each other, but also with the project, we experienced the joy of crafting a building and the thrill of mastering new skills and tools - we each have a special wall, a piece of joinery, or a particular tool that we feel a sense of ownership of.

We discovered our own strengths within the group – Krupa the human calculator, Nicky the aesthete, Ellie and George the patient, pristine deck layers, Katie the MVP (most valuable player, both for building and constant supply of home baking). As architects, we had the invaluable experience of having our roies reversed, from authors of documents to interpreters of drawings in to built forms. (Even with a very comprehensive set of plans we discovered a new found respect for the time and patience of builders.)

But there was more to come. The installation on the island itself. The course was originally going to run every Friday and Saturday until mid-October, but we were asked if anyone was able to stay on the build and help until installation in December. Lo and behold every single member of the team continued working, and travelled to the island to help install in December.

Needless to say the patience of workplace bosses and clients (who had allowed jobs to be left undone every Friday), and families (who had not seen their partners’ mothers on a Saturday for 4 consecutive months), was wearing thin. But we did whatever it took to make up the time, and I think that the passion and dedication we all feel for the Motu Kaikoura project is so strong that in the end it would have been difficult for anyone to deny us the opportunity to finish what we had started, and see the lodge erected on site.
We’d like to take this opportunity to thank Dave Strachan and Maria Hosking, the architects and our role models. Their dedication for this project has been unflagging. The unique parameters of the project, and logistics of building on the island, meant that the work they did, and extra hours they put in, far exceeded the usual call of duty. We have learnt so much from both of them, and their patience, professionalism, craftsmanship and determination has been inimitable.

And so now it is finished, and I’m not shy to say it is looking stunning. ‘If’. This building needs a name…she is one of us now! There are so many people who have contributed to the creation of this building. We would like to thank Rod and Rosalie for always being at hand on the island to help during the build. We’d also like to thank Clint, Jacinda and their girls for their help and hospitality, and for kindly making a start on the construction waste that we were unable to take away with us on the boat, and Piers for the wonderful boat rides! Lynda Simmons, and her team from Architecture + Women, who spent many hours of their own time organising, documenting and promoting the build, sourcing sponsors, supplying the build and the builders with support and resources, we are grateful. And to the many sponsors of building materials and course fees, and to the members of the Motu Kaikoura Trust, we thank you for your vision and for the opportunity to be part of such an exciting project, we have learnt so much. We hope that the experiences the new building offers will encourage others, who have a passion for New Zealand’s natural heritage, to visit Motu Kaikoura and become active participants in its restoration.

Ka mate te kāinga tahi, ka ora te kāinga rua

When one house dies, a second lives

Written on behalf of the Architecture + Women Volunteer Build Team: Nicola Herbst, Pip Newman, Gaynor Eade, Krupa Patel, Jane Waldegrave, Katie Comer, Katherine Hebben, Elspeth Gray, Georgina Gray, Yenegh Badimayalew, Aishwarya Basri, Terese Fitzgerald, Divya Purushotham, Lily Wong, Lauren van Tiel – by Anna Boow
Gannet Survey - January 2018

Using Motu Kaikoura as a base, a team of five researchers from Environmental and Animal Sciences, Unitec Institute of Technology spent 09 to 12 January sampling the gannets breeding at Mahuki Island. Mahuki Island, one of the Broken islands on the southern approaches to Port Fitzroy Harbour, is the home to few thousand gannets and a convenient 20 min boat ride to Motu Kaikoura. After a day in the hot sun wrangling gannets the return passage to Motu Kaikoura followed by a warm shower was a delight.

The main objective of the trip was to collect the gut contents of adults returning to feed chicks. If breeding adults are caught immediately on landing at the nest, before feeding the chick, they frequently regurgitate the contents of the upper digestive tract spontaneously. Catching the gannets involves carefully placing a hook, attached on the end of a long pole, around the neck and pulling the bird towards the catcher and then catching the regurgitation into a bucket (hopefully).

Once tanked up with food most gannets probably feed no more than an hour or two direct flying time from their breeding colony. Accordingly, the items recovered from the gut are frequently well preserved and can be easily identified. We are using these samples to identify the range of species upon which gannets and potentially other marine predators in the Hauraki Gulf depend for survival. Preliminary analysis indicated that the fish species Jack Mackerel, Saury and Red Bait were particularly important prey items this year. More uncommon prey included arrow squid and even flying fish.

A similar sampling programme conducted last year at a similar time revealed that diet of gannets returning to Mahuki Island was somewhat different being dominated by arrow squid, anchovy and pilchard. This change may reflect the consequences of the particularly warm waters being recorded around northern New Zealand this summer. It is now recognised that many seabirds including gannets are excellent, wide-ranging samplers of small fish and squid that may be otherwise difficult to sample. This type of data on seabird diets may therefore provide insights and information on the likely effects of ocean climate interactions on the structure of food webs in coastal marine ecosystems and upon which seabirds and other top predators depend. (Below; Gannets fluttering during a hot day similar to a dog panting.)

Nigel Adams
The Hidden Mokomoko of Motu Kaikoura

The land of birds is also the land of mokomoko/lizards (geckos and skinks). In the past decade, DNA has helped to paint a more accurate picture of our lizard diversity, revealing around 120 unique species (a third more than our endemic birds). 100% of our indigenous lizards are only found in Aotearoa and more than 75% of those are under threat, with 30% heading towards extinction.

16 species currently reside in the Auckland region with 13 of these known to live on Aotea/Great Barrier Island, which makes this Auckland’s lizard hotspot.

So far, searches on Motu Kaikoura have confirmed the presence of 3 known species – the copper skink (Not Threatened), shore skink (At Risk - Naturally Uncommon) and the moko skink (At Risk – Relict).

Copper skinks are distributed throughout the island and are particularly fond of damp areas with good cover of almost any material as long as it gives them ample cover at the ground level.

Shore skinks are, as their name suggests, a coastal species - rarely venturing beyond the vegetation bordering the coast and are often seen ducking in and out of rocks at Boulder Bay.

Moko skinks are under threat on the mainland and rely on pest free offshore islands for their continued survival. These are medium sized skinks with vivid racing stripes running down the length of their body and may be seen virtually anywhere on the island, with high densities in some pockets.

Despite several attempts to find geckos on Motu Kaikoura, to date none have been confirmed. This doesn’t mean they aren’t present, in fact this result is hardly surprising as the most effective time for detecting geckos is at night by torchlight and efforts to date have focused on suitable habitat within reasonable walking distance of the cabins. Much of the habitat surrounding the cabins may only be superficially suitable due to the presence of preferred tree species such as kānuka (and even pines), but can lack complex undergrowth for daytime retreats. Remnant pockets of mature forest are still present and would have acted as areas of escape from fire. The areas of regenerating scrub surrounding these pockets are probably our best bet for finding geckos and previously undetected skink species.

Motu Kaikoura may be home to virtually any of the lizards present on Aotea however some are considerably more likely than others. A trip by UNITEC in December 2017 included a reconnaissance mission to scope suitable lizard habitat and based on this the following species may potentially be present...

Ornate skinks (At Risk – Declining) may be in mature forested pockets in leaf litter or amongst rocks, while striped skinks (At Risk – Declining) may be tucked under logs or amongst epiphytes in mature trees, the former is more likely.
Pacific geckos (At Risk – relic) may be present in the crevices of trees, clay banks or rocks along with the Raukawa gecko (Not Threatened). The Raukawa gecko surprised everyone when their footprints were detected for the first time on Tiritiri Matangi Island in 2004, and are now known from multiple sites there.

The forest gecko and elegant gecko (At Risk – Declining) may be utilizing kānuka pockets with sufficient undergrowth and within proximity to refugia that would have assisted them in surviving the burning.

New Zealand’s largest gecko – the Duvaucel’s gecko (At Risk – Relict) and the country’s longest lizard, the Chevron skink/ Niho Taniwha (Threatened – Nationally Vulnerable) could also be present, although this is unlikely. Duvaucel’s gecko was until recently considered extinct from the New Zealand mainland until one was caught in a rodent trap inside the predator-proof fence surrounding Maungataputauri in the Waikato.

When it comes to our mokomoko and what we think we know, we should always expect the unexpected. If rat densities are kept low on Motu Kaikoura as they are currently, it will give these needles in the haystack an opportunity to build their numbers and change their predator-aversion behaviours making their presence a bit more obvious.

Mikey Watson

KAKA COMMENTS - SUMMER CATCH UP 2018

What a swell summer it’s been so far….combined with a surge in interest around the lodge being built things have seemed unprecedentedly busy!

About an hour ago the builders all left aboard the Norma Jean, with Piers and Skip, and although things are just about completed, some of them will have to return to finish off a little bit here and there…

The “Supermoon tides” and storm event that lashed NZ’s coastline didn’t leave things unscathed around here either, as it washed away one of the concrete pads for the washing lines at Smokehouse Bay, eroded the sea wall, and lots of flax which has tenaciously maintained its position for years along the beach as well as around the coast of Motu Kaikoura too.

We’ve been planting out this flax up the ‘old road gully’ along with seedlings that we relocated during track clearing from the pest control lines too, with lots of help from the kids, and volunteers as well.

Our first living beings in the new lodge to stay overnight were a fantail and morepork. How fitting.

Later, when some of the dolphin researchers entered to rest, the piwakawaka and ruru were gently evicted….after some time spent enjoying the evening’s serenading. During this time we also had a large group staying while they collected samples from the gannet colony at little Mahuki Island, as well as visitors and volunteers; so there was a ‘fair bit of ‘musical boats’ happening down at the wharf.

There were also some “not so musical” shrieks going on when the water flow was interrupted, which people returning here will appreciate when the water system is fixed…currently the water
level in the creek is too low to get flow in to top up the tank, and yesterday evening when
investigating a problem in the pipeline I pulled out an eel that was firmly wedged in a join….I will
not elaborate!!!!

Last year it was a real pleasure to have the ‘bird group’ return for their annual surveying. I was
very privileged to learn from Barbara some more about the calls to distinguish the trickier birds to
identify. We also discovered a fledgling morepork who was perfectly camouflaged on the forest
floor, except for it’s big yellow eyes and snappy beak, which ruined it’s attempt at cryptic. A few
hours later it had disappeared. Thankfully we have no feral cats to make a meal of it.

Recently Clint had some brilliant news. Early last year he sought permission from the trustees to
clear out one of the old ponds to encourage pateke to return here. After inspection and approval
from a representative of the Department of Conservation it finally happened. Clint was able to clear
out one side before the digger had to be used to build the new lodge. Recently we’ve had it free
again to get on with the western side.

Well, while Clint was actually dredging out the mud what should fly in to check it all out, was a
wonderful wee pateke!! It floated about watching him, perhaps excited about all those goodies
brought up to the bank with the longer reaching arm of the digger and (just hopefully) planning on
staying to start a family. We’ve never seen them in that vicinity up until then, only a few down at
Crawford’s Cove.

It’s been a while since we’ve seen any at Port Fitzroy reclamation and it seems the numbers have
been dwindling in this area, so we have our fingers and toes crossed that our efforts will actually
help make a substantial improvement here for them.

Our last monitoring results showed only two percent of the tracking tunnels indicating the presence
of rats. Although this is one of our best results ever we aren’t resting on our laurels, as there’s
plenty of food around for them and plenty of rats nearby that often swim over too. Perhaps we
could host a talent search for ‘Pied Pipers’ at Great Barrier Island?...

Visitors to Motu Kaikoura often comment on the proliferation of stick insects around here,
especially around the shower block, so of all the trees many of them could choose to mate on
lately, the only tree we noticed them on at the time was an apple sapling in the garden, with eight
pairs mating amongst it’s foliage. To Xyra’s discovery and delight! If you haven’t been out for a while
now is a good time to come and visit

Jacinda and the Stannard Family

OUTDOOR PURSUITS CENTRE (OPC)

20 students from Kaikpara College (Helensville) kayaked from OPC Gt Barrier Island to Bradshaw
Cove, Motu Kaikoura for an overnight camping trip bringing all their gear with them.
MOTU KAIKOURA TRUST SUPPORTERS

C/- Rosalie Miller
44 Martins Bay Road
R D 2
WARKWORTH 0982

roaliegmiller@hotmail.com
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Sir Peter Blake
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Skills workshops and potable water-testing proposal

File No.: CP2018/04363

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval from the Great Barrier Local Board for the allocation of $20,000 towards on-island skills workshops and a potable water-testing project for island residents.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. $20,000 is currently set aside under “Skills Development” in the Great Barrier Local Board 2017/18 work programme. On 17 October 2017, the board resolved (Resolution number GBI/2017/128, item 14 - Great Barrier Island Skills Survey and Directory) to allocate the funding to Aotearoa Community Trust to build and administer an online skills directory/ skills website. However, the website project has been delayed.
3. The board has expressed a preference for re-allocating the $20,000 to two projects:
   - a series of skills workshops ($10,000)
   - a potable water testing project ($10,000).
4. It is proposed that Aotea Education Ltd be the umbrella community organisation overseeing the skills workshops. To that end, the group will contract a workshop administrator to organise and manage the workshops.
5. It is proposed that Aotearoa Community Trust be the umbrella community organisation overseeing the potable water testing project. To that end, they will work with an on-island water quality specialist to organise public workshops and to purchase and issue individual household water testing kits.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) rescind resolution number GBI/2017/1 of 17 October 2017 ($20,000 from its Skills Development budget line to the Aotearoa Community Trust for the building and administration of a skills website).

b) approve $10,000 from the Skills Development budget line to Aotea Education Ltd to run a series of skills workshops. As part of this, the group will contract a workshop administrator to organise and manage the workshops.

c) approve $10,000 from the Skills Development budget line to Aotearoa Community Trust to run a potable water-testing project for island residents.

Horopaki / Context
6. At the October 2017 Great Barrier Local Board business meeting, $20,000 was allocated towards the development and management of an online skills database/directory for Great Barrier Island. It was proposed that the Aotearoa Community Trust oversee the project. However, the board has since chosen to postpone the development of the website.

7. The board has expressed a preference for re-allocating the budget two projects:
   - a series of skills workshops ($10,000)
   - a potable water testing project ($10,000).
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Skills workshops
8. The purpose of the skills workshops is to upskill Great Barrier Island residents across a range of sectors and topics, such as Xero accounting, social media, website development and health and safety.
9. Aotea Education Ltd will manage the skills workshops, which will involve contracting a workshop administrator to organise and manage them. This person will also be responsible for ensuring that there is no cross-over between the skills workshops and any other workshops already planned on the island (e.g.: winter workshops at the Arts Village).

Potable water-testing project
10. The purpose of the potable water-testing project is for Great Barrier Island residents to gain a greater understanding of the quality of their residential water supply, as well as a better understanding of how to address any water quality problems they might have.
11. Water quality was raised as a public health issue, including by the Aotea Health Trust, during consultation with the community over the Local Board Plan. “Investigating the supply of clean drinking water” is a specified initiative under the Local Board Plan.
12. The water project will involve public workshops at which people can learn how to clean up and keep their drinking water safe. Attendees at those workshops will each receive a free water testing kit.
13. The water-testing budget of $10,000 will go to the AoteaOra Community Trust, who will manage the project.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
14. The proposal to reallocate the $20,000 to skills workshops and water testing has been discussed by the local board over the course of several workshops. Local board feedback during those workshops, as well as feedback from Aotea Education Ltd and the AoteaOra Community Trust, has been incorporated into the final proposal.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
15. All skills workshops will be inclusive of mana whenua. The workshop administrator will be expected to engage with mana whenua when determining what workshops to run.
16. There is potential for testing of the island’s two marae as part of the potable water-testing project.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
17. The budget for the skills workshops is $10,000, a portion of which will go towards contracting an administrator.
18. The budget for the water testing project is $10,000, which will go towards public workshops, and the purchase of individual water quality testing kits for workshop participants.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
19. No risks have been identified.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
20. Once the money is allocated, Aotea Education Ltd will employ a workshop administrator and put together a calendar of workshops.
21. Once the money is allocated, AoteaOra Community Trust will arrange public water quality workshops and purchase test kits.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kathy Cumming – Strategic Broker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers  | Mary Dawson – Manager Strategic Brokers  
|              | Helgard Wagener – Relationship Manager Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards |
Local Transport Capital Fund: options for distribution and size of the fund

File No.: CP2018/04633

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. This report seeks formal feedback from the local board on options for the future size and underlying distribution methodology of the local transport capital fund (LTCF) and on the proposal to increase advisory support for the fund from Auckland Transport staff.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. In September 2017, the Governing Body agreed in principle to an increase to the local transport capital fund as an outcome of the governance framework review. Staff were directed to undertake further work with Auckland Transport and local boards on the size of the increase, and the distribution methodology.

3. The LTCF was established in 2012 and currently sits at $10.8 million. It is allocated on a pure population basis. Two options for the size of funding increase have been modelled, an increase of $6 million and an increase of $10 million.

4. Staff have also modelled three different distribution options: the current population model, a model applying the Local Boards Funding Policy, and a model that includes a fixed level of funding per board, along with a variable rate determined by the Local Boards Funding Policy.

5. Each of the options has been assessed against a set of criteria. The pure population model is not supported by staff, while each of the other two models has merits. On balance, staff recommend that the Local Boards Funding Policy be applied to the distribution of the LTCF, with an additional amount of $10 million being added to the fund. Feedback is sought from local boards on their preferences.

6. It is also recommended that Auckland Transport have funding allocated to provide an increased level of support to local boards in developing and assessing local transport projects.

7. Final decisions will be made by the Governing Body as part of the 10-year budget process in May.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations

That the Great Barrier Local Board endorse:

a) an increase to the local transport capital fund of $10 million per annum (inflation adjusted) from 1 July 2018.

b) the distribution of the entire local transport capital fund to be made according to Auckland Council’s Local Boards Funding Policy from 1 July 2018.

c) Auckland Transport receiving additional funding to provide an increased level of support to local boards in developing and assessing projects for the local transport capital fund.

Horopaki / Context

8. The local transport capital fund (LTCF) was established by resolution of the Strategy and Finance Committee [SF/2012/40] in April 2012, in order to provide local boards with access
Great Barrier Local Board
17 April 2018

Item 14

to funding for local transport projects that had strong local significance, but which were unlikely to be prioritised through the regional transport planning process.

9. The establishment of the fund is consistent with the government’s original policy intent that local boards would have a role in funding local transport projects out of a dedicated local budget [CAB Minute(09) 30/10] and that “local boards will have an advisory role with respect to transport services and a budget for the transport elements of ‘place shaping’”.

10. The objectives of the fund are to:
   - ensure locally important transport projects are given appropriate priority
   - provide local boards with more direct ability to influence local transport projects.

11. Projects must be deliverable, meet transport safety criteria and not compromise the network. Auckland Transport retains the responsibility for delivering projects delivered through this funding and the budget remains with Auckland Transport. Depreciation and consequential operating expenditure are also the responsibility of Auckland Transport, as is the core administration of the fund.

12. The fund was initially set at $10 million per annum (since adjusted for inflation, and now sitting at $10.8 million) and is currently split between the local boards on the basis of population, excepting Waiheke and Great Barrier Island local boards, which receive two per cent and one per cent of the fund respectively. The population figures that the distribution is based on have remained at 2012 levels.

13. At the Governing Body meeting of 28 September 2017, at which the recommendations of the Governance Framework Review Political Working Party were considered, it was agreed [GB/2017/117] that officers would report back to the governing body through the 10-year budget process on options for significantly increasing the LTCF, as well as providing an assessment of options for allocating the additional funding.

14. This report provides options for the quantum of the proposed increase, the method of allocating the proposed increase among the twenty one local boards and issues relating to the administration of the fund. Workshops have been held with each local board to discuss these proposals and now formal feedback is sought through business meetings. Final recommendations will be made to the Governing Body in May.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

15. Issues with the local transport capital fund identified through the governance framework review were grouped under three key themes:
   - the overall size, or quantum, of the local transport capital fund
   - the methodology underpinning its distribution among local boards
   - the administration and support provided by Auckland Transport to local boards in relation to developing options and projects for consideration.

Quantum of funding

16. When the LTCF was initially established at $10 million, the figure was not based on any specific assessment of need, but more on the recognition that smaller, local projects that had a strong place shaping component were unlikely to be funded according to Auckland Transport and NZTA’s prioritisation formulas.

17. While the fund took some time to get established, it is now delivering valuable transport related outcomes for communities across Auckland. The LTCF spend forecast in 2016-17 financial year was $17 million, as boards have been able to accumulate funding across

---

1 Cabinet paper: Auckland Governance: Regional Transport Authority Steven Joyce, Minister of Transport 2009
2 Based on Statistics NZ 2011 population estimates
years to put towards more significant projects. It has delivered 286 projects over the five year period.

18. The LTCF contribution to these many local projects has also been complemented through the input of additional funds from Auckland Transport (as well as NZTA subsidy) with the value of the work they have delivered to their communities being substantially leveraged through this additional funding.

19. Staff have modelled the impact of the proposed increase on individual local boards according to a range of distribution models. In doing so, two different levels of increase have been used – the $10 million figure, initially proposed by Auckland Transport, and a lower figure of $6 million.

20. Neither figure is based on specific needs assessment, but Auckland Transport is of the view that a baseline of approximately $650,000 a year is desirable to give individual boards the resources to support significant local projects. This would require an increase of at least $6 million per annum.

21. Boards that have had access to higher levels of funding have generally found it easier to leverage that to attract NZTA subsidies and additional Auckland Transport funding, for example for projects that are being brought forward as a result of LTCF investment. Successful examples include the Half Moon Bay ferry terminal, the Mt Albert Station Bridge and the Māngere Future Streets project.

Distribution methodology

22. This section provides modelling of three distribution options applied to two levels of overall increase (sub-option A being an increase of $6 million, and sub-option B being an increase of $10 million). The options are:

- Option 1: status quo – simple population based distribution of both the existing fund and any additional funding
- Option 2: applying the current Local Boards Funding Policy to the distribution of the fund
- Option 3: a model that provides for a fixed level of baseline funding for all boards, as well as a variable component based on the Local Boards Funding Policy.

Population based distribution

23. In 2012, the governing body elected to distribute the first iteration of the LTCF purely on a population basis, following consultation with local boards\(^3\). The distribution has not been adjusted to account for population distribution changes since the fund was established.

24. We have modelled (Appendix A) the option of applying the population based distribution methodology, based on Statistics NZ 2017 population estimates. As you will see from the modelling, the impact on boards with higher populations is the most significant, in terms of an increase in funding, especially if the additional amount is $10 million.

25. Under this model, however, if the additional amount is $6 million, six boards would still fall short of the $650,000 baseline figure identified by Auckland Transport as being desirable to enable the delivery of viable local transport proposals.

Applying the Local Boards Funding Policy to the LTCF

26. Following the establishment of the LTCF, work was undertaken to develop the current Local Boards Funding Policy, as required under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009. This policy was adopted in 2014 and uses an allocation methodology incorporating three factors: population (90 per cent), deprivation (five per cent) and land area (five per cent). This funding policy is currently applied to locally driven initiatives funding, including the local capital fund, but was not retrospectively applied to the LTCF.

\(^3\) There was no formal local board funding policy in place at this time
27. The development of the funding policy involved significant consultation and engagement with local boards prior to final adoption. There are no current plans to review the policy.

28. We have modelled (Appendix B) the option of applying the Local Boards Funding Policy to the distribution of the LTCF. The modelling has been applied to the existing fund and the additional amounts of $6 million and $10 million. The modelling is also based on 2017 population estimates.

**Fixed and variable costs distribution**

29. As previously noted, Auckland Transport has the view that in order to deliver transport infrastructure of any significance, a certain level of baseline funding is desirable – around $650,000 per annum, based on practical experience.

30. Many local boards have achieved significant results with their local transport projects, but transport infrastructure is inherently costly and costs tend not to vary according to location. For example, a footbridge and walking path in Pukekohe will tend to cost the same as a comparable one in Glenfield.

31. In considering the distribution methodology for the extended fund, Auckland Transport has put forward the following factors as being relevant:
   - the cost of building transport infrastructure is not directly related to the size of the population it serves
   - mature areas with high populations tend to already have higher quality and better developed transport infrastructure
   - the existing Auckland Transport/NZTA criteria for regional transport spending tend to favour, as would be expected, areas of high density and growth
   - the physical size of an area tends to have a correlation with the need for transport infrastructure e.g. the number of settlements, town centres.

32. A distribution model based on a split of fixed and variable costs has also been modelled as an option. The methodology involves fifty per cent of the entire quantum of funding being distributed by an even split (with the exception of Great Barrier and Waiheke Island Boards which receive 1/3 and 2/3 of a single share respectively), thus giving all other local boards the same level of core funding. The other fifty per cent of the funding would be distributed according to the Local Boards Funding Policy.

33. We have modelled (Appendix C) the option of applying this fixed/variable costs model to the distribution of the LTCF.

**Assessing the options**

34. Each of the three distribution models has elements to recommend it and others that detract from it. In assessing the models, staff applied the following assessment criteria:
   - transparency and ease of understanding for communities and stakeholders
   - equity and fairness of outcomes across the region
   - ensuring delivery of good local transport outcomes
   - recognising the role of local boards as leaders of place shaping with their communities.

35. Staff assessment of the options against these criteria is set out below.

*Options 1a and 1b – population based distribution*

36. These options have been modelled on 2017 Statistics New Zealand population estimates.

37. A pure population based approach has the benefits of being objective, transparent and straightforward and means that funding received is proportionate to the number of ratepayers. It was, however, recognised at the time that this approach applied to areas of
extremely low population (Waiheke and Great Barrier Islands) would result in those boards receiving insufficient funding to achieve anything practical, hence the application of the one and two per cent formula for the island boards. A similar approach is also used in the Local Boards Funding Policy.

38. The limitations of this approach are that it does not address either the level of need in a given local board area, or the underlying cost drivers of transport infrastructure. Hence, large areas of low population density with significant roading networks and multiple population centres are funded at the same, or lower, level as smaller urban communities of interest with already well-developed transport infrastructure, but higher population density.

39. The distribution methodology is simple and transparent and easy for communities and stakeholders to understand. In terms of delivering equity and fairness, this model delivers the widest differential of funding levels across boards, with the highest funded board receiving 2.78 times the amount of the lowest funded board (excluding the island boards).

40. Option 1a also results in six boards receiving less than Auckland Transport’s benchmark identified as desirable for supporting good local transport outcomes in communities. The model limits the potential for those boards to actively implement their role as local place shapers and to leverage additional investment into their projects. This model, and therefore Options 1a and 1b, is not supported by either Auckland Council or Auckland Transport staff.

Options 2a and 2b – Local Boards Funding Policy based distribution

41. This distribution method involves application of the current Local Boards Funding Policy. The policy is currently applied to distribution of funding for local activities (including local capex) to local boards and is based on the following factors: ninety per cent population\(^4\), five percent deprivation\(^5\) and five per cent land area\(^6\).

42. Applying the Local Boards Funding Policy is a simple methodology that has a clear rationale, is easily described to the community and is consistent with council’s wider approach to funding local boards. It takes account of multiple factors, delivering a more equitable distribution of funding, especially to boards with lower populations but very large land areas and roading networks.

43. Reviewing the projects that have been funded from the LTCF to date, it is clear that much of the local boards’ focus has been on “people centred” transport projects, for example pedestrian safety improvements, walkways and cycleways, footpaths and streetscape improvements. This is consistent with the principles underpinning the Local Boards Funding Policy i.e. that population is the key driver of need for the funding, but that geography and deprivation also need to be taken into account.

44. This distribution methodology evens out the increase in funding across the twenty one boards. The boards with a larger land area receive more funding than under the pure population model, and all boards receive the proposed level of baseline funding, but only under the $10 million quantum increase.

45. Under this model, however, the level of funding that accrues to the more populous boards becomes very substantial in relationship to that for the smaller boards, due to the compounding impact of the distribution model. For example, the Howick Local Board would receive over $1.7 million and Henderson-Massey over $1.4 million. Despite these extremes, this option provides an arguably more equitable and nuanced distribution of funding, as well as being consistent with current funding policy.

46. Its variation between the lowest and highest level of funding is still high with the highest funded board receiving 2.57 times the amount of the lowest funded board. Under Option 2a, five boards still receive less than Auckland Transport’s desirable benchmark for delivering

---

\(^4\) Based on annually revised estimates from Statistics NZ  
\(^5\) Based on Index of Deprivation provided by the Ministry of Health  
\(^6\) Excluding Great Barrier and Waiheke
good local transport outcomes in communities and it limits the potential for those boards to actively implement their role as local place shapers.

47. This is the preferred option on the basis of consistency with the existing funding policy, assessment against the criteria and recognition of the population focus of projects delivered using this fund. The preferred option is for the $10 million quantum as better providing for good local transport outcomes and delivering local place shaping.

Options 3a and 3b – fixed and variable cost distribution

48. This model is more complex and less transparent to communities and stakeholders than the other models. The identification of the benchmark figure is based on Auckland Transport’s experience of administering the fund over the past five years and the learning that has been gained from this, rather than in-depth financial analysis of infrastructure costs.

49. The results of this distribution are similar to those of applying the Local Boards Funding Policy, in that a similar number of local boards benefit under each model. However, it is different local boards that benefit from each model. In terms of equity and fairness, this model reduces the difference between the highest funded and lowest funded boards and also brings all boards above the $650,000 benchmark, even under Option 3a ($6m increase).

50. The model reduces the impact of population on the distribution of funding, however, which is a core component of current funding policy and the focus of the projects delivered using the LTCF. The model performs well against the criteria of enabling the delivery of good local transport outcomes and supporting the role of local boards as place shapers.

Summary of assessment of options

51. Of the three distribution models assessed, the current model of pure population distribution performed the poorest and is not recommended by either Auckland Council or Auckland Transport staff.

52. The other two models deliver mixed results against the criteria. On balance, staff recommend that the Local Boards Funding Policy distribution best meets the criteria and is consistent with current funding policy. The final recommendation to the governing body will also be informed by feedback from local boards through this process.

Administration of the LTCF

53. When the LTCF was established in 2012, it was recognised that there would be an impact on Auckland Transport as the fund administrator. While design costs are capitalised within the cost of a specific project, there are also additional costs in developing options, undertaking feasibility studies, assessing proposals and general administration.

54. It was noted at the time that if each local board proposed 3-4 projects a year that this could place a considerable burden on Auckland Transport and it was recommended that this be reviewed at the time the fund was reviewed. Given the proposed increase to the size of the fund, this issue needs to be revisited.

55. Auckland Transport’s advice on LTCF investment focusses on whether a project put forward by a local board is technically feasible, and whether it is realistic in light of the available funding from the LTCF. During the governance framework review some local board members raised concerns about the nature and quality of advice received from Auckland Transport in relation to LTCF proposals. Boards felt that advice was limited to assessing their proposal against criteria, rather than helping them identify and develop high quality proposals.

56. It is recommended that Auckland Transport be allocated additional opex funding in support of the LTCF to be used to develop a more systematic and responsive work programme with local boards around the application of the LTCF. This will include supporting boards to investigate and develop options for projects for consideration. A sum of $500,000 per annum is recommended to support this deliverable.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

57. Workshops have been held with every local board and a range of initial feedback has been received. Discussion on collective views has also taken place at the Local Board Chairs’ Forum. While some local boards have given early indication of their preferred options, others have reserved the right to engage in further consideration ahead of providing formal feedback.

58. There was general support for an increase to the fund and for additional funding to be provided to Auckland Transport to provide advice on projects and mixed views on options for allocating the fund. As noted in the assessment of options, each of the options for the amount of increase and the distribution methodology affects individual boards differently.

59. Growth was raised by some boards as a factor that should be considered. Staff’s view is that the population element of each of the models addresses this as current population is the only reliable indicator of growth. Population estimates are updated and will be applied to the fund annually.

60. As noted in the assessment of options, each of the options for the amount of increase and the distribution methodology affects individual boards differently. A recent presentation to the Local Board Chairs’ Forum noted that it would be helpful for the Governing Body to have a clear preference signalled by the majority of local boards, in order to facilitate its decision making.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

61. A move away from a pure population based distribution model would take into account other factors, being deprivation and land area. Both options 2 and 3 include a deprivation component, although this is greater in option 2. This would have some positive impact on local board areas where there is a higher Māori population.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

62. The source of the additional funding is not addressed in this report, as it is being considered through the overall budget setting process in the 10-year budget. Essentially, however, there are two options that the governing body will need to consider – that additional funding comes from rates and/or borrowing, or Auckland Transport reprioritises within its existing funding envelope.

63. The proposed size of the increase to the fund (both options) is not significant enough within the overall transport budget to be able to enable transparent trade-offs at a detailed level e.g. which specific transport projects might not be funded in the Regional Land Transport Plan in a given year if the LTCF is increased.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

64. No significant risks have been identified.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

65. Final decisions will be made by the Governing Body as part of the 10-year budget process in May. Any new funding and change to the distribution methodology will be applied from 1 July 2018.
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## Attachment A: Population based distribution modelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 1a</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 1b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,259</td>
<td>$1,080,585</td>
<td>$1,337,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,087</td>
<td>$621,441</td>
<td>$780,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,158</td>
<td>$736,198</td>
<td>$915,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$105,570</td>
<td>$168,090</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$810,647</td>
<td>$1,210,227</td>
<td>$1,498,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$849,708</td>
<td>$1,034,096</td>
<td>$1,280,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$944,450</td>
<td>$1,486,313</td>
<td>$1,840,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>$827,735</td>
<td>$936,182</td>
<td>$1,151,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$560,634</td>
<td>$802,530</td>
<td>$993,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$842,681</td>
<td>$935,130</td>
<td>$1,157,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakeke-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$333,924</td>
<td>$788,676</td>
<td>$976,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Črakei</td>
<td>$595,708</td>
<td>$805,444</td>
<td>$1,121,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čtara-Papatepeoe</td>
<td>$394,996</td>
<td>$666,829</td>
<td>$1,075,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,660</td>
<td>$536,308</td>
<td>$687,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>$410,682</td>
<td>$623,420</td>
<td>$771,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,986</td>
<td>$636,284</td>
<td>$787,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$365,112</td>
<td>$646,179</td>
<td>$820,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>$216,641</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>$216,641</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitāmatā</td>
<td>$508,878</td>
<td>$1,073,668</td>
<td>$1,329,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$960,634</td>
<td>$836,154</td>
<td>$1,037,714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B: Local Board Funding Policy distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 2a</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 2b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,259</td>
<td>$1,013,841</td>
<td>$1,255,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,087</td>
<td>$587,209</td>
<td>$727,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,158</td>
<td>$696,840</td>
<td>$1,110,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$105,370</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$813,647</td>
<td>$1,146,311</td>
<td>$1,419,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$849,799</td>
<td>$673,716</td>
<td>$1,205,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$944,450</td>
<td>$1,375,550</td>
<td>$1,703,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>$827,735</td>
<td>$876,680</td>
<td>$1,085,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$560,834</td>
<td>$794,642</td>
<td>$983,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$842,681</td>
<td>$601,483</td>
<td>$1,116,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$535,524</td>
<td>$767,842</td>
<td>$950,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>$595,708</td>
<td>$840,058</td>
<td>$1,040,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Paparawhere</td>
<td>$594,996</td>
<td>$649,392</td>
<td>$1,051,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,660</td>
<td>$540,785</td>
<td>$689,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>$410,662</td>
<td>$606,154</td>
<td>$730,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,986</td>
<td>$687,983</td>
<td>$1,223,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$365,112</td>
<td>$615,035</td>
<td>$761,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>$216,641</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$355,706</td>
<td>$565,003</td>
<td>$699,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>$508,878</td>
<td>$1,008,133</td>
<td>$1,248,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$560,834</td>
<td>$805,670</td>
<td>$997,496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment C: Fixed and variable costs distribution 50/50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 3e</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,250</td>
<td>$932,821</td>
<td>$1,147,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,087</td>
<td>$717,591</td>
<td>$833,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,158</td>
<td>$901,500</td>
<td>$1,075,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$105,370</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$277,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$819,647</td>
<td>$1,001,313</td>
<td>$1,229,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$499,700</td>
<td>$913,007</td>
<td>$1,122,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$944,450</td>
<td>$1,113,164</td>
<td>$1,371,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapōtiki</td>
<td>$627,735</td>
<td>$863,985</td>
<td>$1,062,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$560,634</td>
<td>$827,659</td>
<td>$1,011,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$642,681</td>
<td>$875,294</td>
<td>$1,078,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$535,924</td>
<td>$812,212</td>
<td>$995,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrakei</td>
<td>$595,706</td>
<td>$843,623</td>
<td>$1,040,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatowiro</td>
<td>$594,996</td>
<td>$854,332</td>
<td>$1,045,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,660</td>
<td>$698,308</td>
<td>$854,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>$410,062</td>
<td>$726,517</td>
<td>$895,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,586</td>
<td>$973,311</td>
<td>$1,131,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$365,112</td>
<td>$732,300</td>
<td>$900,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>$218,641</td>
<td>$448,000</td>
<td>$554,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$359,706</td>
<td>$714,259</td>
<td>$899,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitāmatā</td>
<td>$508,678</td>
<td>$930,042</td>
<td>$1,144,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$560,634</td>
<td>$830,168</td>
<td>$1,018,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delegation for formal local board views on notified resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement

File No.: CP2018/04632

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To seek that the Great Barrier Local Board delegate the responsibility of providing formal views on resource consents, notified plan changes and notices of requirement to a local board member.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Local board feedback can be provided on notified resource consents, plan changes and designations. Written feedback needs to be provided prior to the submission closing date (usually 20 working days after public notification). This feedback is included in the planner’s report verbatim and local boards are also able to speak to their written feedback at the public hearing. Views should be received by the processing planner or reporting consultant by submission closing date to ensure the content can be considered in planning reports.

3. This report explores options to enable local boards to provide their views in a timely way. Local boards normally provide their formal views at business meetings. Because local board reporting timeframes do not usually align with statutory timeframes, in most instances formal reporting at a business meeting will not allow local feedback to be provided by submission closing date.

4. Providing formal local board views by way of a delegation to a local board member is considered the most efficient way of providing formal local board views. This is because the delegate can provide views within the regulatory timeframes and because no additional reporting is required when new applications of interest are notified.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) delegate the authority to Local Board Member XXX, to prepare and submit local board views and speak those local board views at any hearings on:
   - notified resource consents
   - notified plan changes
   - notices of requirement.

Horopaki / Context

Notified Resource Consents

5. Local boards are able to provide input into the determination of applications that may be notified. Local boards, via their appointed Resource Consents Leads, input into a wide range of resource consents that are received by the council and that trigger the matters of particular interest to local boards.

6. Local views and preferences are also able to be provided, once a decision of notification is made, and local boards can then submit further feedback to any notified resource consent application within their local board area. This feedback is then included in the planner’s
report verbatim for the hearing and for the consideration of the commissioners who determine the outcome of the resource consent application.

7. Local boards are also able to speak to their written feedback at any notified resource consent hearing. Local boards are taking this opportunity up more often and it is considered important to ensure any feedback is authorised by the local board and a delegation is in place for the Resource Consent Lead to authorise them to speak on behalf of the local board at hearings.

**Notified Plan Changes and Notices of Requirement**

8. The Auckland Unitary Plan was made “Operative in Part” in November 2016. As plan changes and notices of requirement can now be received and processed by the council, there are opportunities for local boards to provide their views and give feedback on notified applications.

9. For council-initiated plan changes and notices of requirement, staff will seek local board views prior to notification for proposals where there are issues of local significance. For private plan changes and notices of requirement submitted by non-council requiring authorities, local boards may not have any prior knowledge of the application until notification.

10. Local boards can provide written feedback on notified applications. Written feedback needs to be provided prior to the submission closing date (usually 20 working days after public notification). Local boards can subsequently present their feedback to support their views at any hearing.

11. It is important that options are explored to enable local boards to provide their views in a timely way and a delegation to ensure timely feedback is desirable. At present the local board views must be confirmed formally and statutory timeframes are short and do not always align with local board reporting timeframes.

12. Local boards may want to add the responsibility for plan changes and notices of requirement feedback to the resource consent lead role. This will broaden the responsibilities of the role to enable feedback on notified plan changes and notices of requirement to be provided. Alternatively, local boards may want to develop a separate planning lead role and each local board has the flexibility to make appointments that best suit their needs.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

**Options considered**

13. Options available for local boards to provide their views into the hearings process have been summarised in Table 1.

14. Local boards normally provide their formal views at business meetings (option 2). Because local board reporting timeframes do not usually align with statutory timeframes, in most instances formal reporting at a business meeting will not allow local feedback to be provided by submission closing date. Views must be received by the processing planner or reporting consultant by the submission closing date to ensure the content can be considered in planning reports.

15. Providing formal local board views by way of a delegation to one local board member (option 5) is considered the most efficient way of providing formal views. This is because no additional reporting is required when new applications of interest are notified.
### Table 1: Options for local boards to provide their formal views on notified applications (resource consents, plan changes, notices of requirement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No formal local board views are provided</td>
<td>- All local board members contribute to the local board view</td>
<td>- Local board views will not be considered by the hearings commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides transparent decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Formal local board views are provided at a business meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines are unlikely to align with statutory deadlines imposed by the planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formal local board views are provided as urgent decisions</td>
<td>- Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that meets statutory deadlines</td>
<td>- Decisions are not made by the full local board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Urgent decisions may not be accompanied by full information and the discussion may be rushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not transparent decision-making because the decisions do not become public until after they have been made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formal local board views are provided by separate and specific delegation for each application which the local board wishes to provide their views</td>
<td>- Delegations can be chosen to align with area of interest and/or local board member capacity</td>
<td>- Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines required to make each separate delegation are unlikely to align with statutory deadlines imposed by the planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decisions are not made by the full local board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Formal local board views are provided by way of delegation to one local board member (preferred option) for all applications</td>
<td>- Delegate will become subject matter expert for local board on topic they are delegated to</td>
<td>- Decisions are not made by the full local board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that meets statutory deadlines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Any feedback can be regularly reported back to the local board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

16. This report seeks a delegation to a local board member for resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement, to allow local boards to provide feedback in accordance with agreed timeframes on notified resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement.
17. Any local board member who is delegated responsibilities should ensure that they represent the wider local board views and preferences on each matter before them.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

18. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have a positive or negative impact for Māori.

19. The Resource Management Act 1991 requires that the council consults with Mana Whenua of the area who may be affected, through iwi authorities, on draft plan changes prior to their notification. The council must also consider iwi authority advice in evaluations of plan changes.

20. For private plan changes, the council seeks that the applicant undertakes suitable engagement with relevant iwi authorities, and where necessary will undertake consultation before deciding whether to accept, reject or adopt a private plan change.

21. For notices of requirement, the council serves notice on Mana Whenua of the area who may be affected, through iwi authorities. Requiring authorities must also consult with the relevant iwi as part of the designating process.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

22. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have financial implications on Auckland Council.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

23. If local boards choose not to delegate to provide views on notified applications, there is a risk that they will not be able to provide formal views prior to the submission closing date and may miss the opportunity to have their feedback presented and heard at a hearing.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

24. The appointed member of the Great Barrier Local Board will operate under the delegations of the Great Barrier Local Board once they have been adopted.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Carol Stewart – Senior Policy Advisor, Local Board Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Anna Bray – Policy and Planning Manager - Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mason – General Manager Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helgard Wagener – Relationship Manager Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy was implemented on 1 July 2015. The policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.
3. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year.
4. This report presents the Great Barrier Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019 for adoption (see attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:
a) adopt the Great Barrier Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019.

Horopaki / Context
5. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy was implemented on 1 July 2015. The policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.
6. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year. The local board grants programme guides community groups and individuals when making applications to the local board.
7. The local board community grants programme includes:
   - outcomes as identified in the local board plan
   - specific local board grant priorities
   - which grant types will operate, the number of grant rounds and opening and closing dates
   - any additional criteria or exclusions that will apply
   - other factors the local board consider to be significant to their decision-making.
8. Once the local board community grants programme for the 2018/2019 financial year has been adopted, the types of grants, grant rounds, criteria and eligibility with be advertised through an integrated communication and marketing approach which includes utilising the local board channels.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
9. The new Great Barrier Community Grants Programme has been workshopped with the local board and feedback incorporated into the grants programme for 2018/2019.
10. The new grant programme includes:
   - new outcomes and priorities from the Great Barrier Local Board Plan 2017
   - the same number of grant rounds for 2018/2019, as are available in 2017/2018.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

11. The Community Grants Programme has been developed by the local board to set the direction of their grants programme. This programme is reviewed on an annual basis.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

12. All grant programmes respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to organisations delivering positive outcomes for Māori. Applicants are asked how their project aims to increase Māori outcomes in the application process.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

13. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long term Plan 2015 - 2025 and local board agreements.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

14. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board grants programme. Therefore, there is minimal risk associated with the adoption of the grants programme.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

15. An implementation plan is underway and the local board grants programme will be locally advertised through the local board and council channels. Targeted advertising and promotion will be developed for target populations, including migrant and refugee groups, disability groups, Māori and iwi organisations.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Great Barrier Community Grants Programme 2018/2018</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Marion Davies – Community Grants Operations Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Shane King – Operations Support Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helgard Wagener – Relationship Manager Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Great Barrier Local Board

Local Grants Programme 2018/19

Our Local Grants Programme aims to provide contestable and discretionary community grants to local communities.

Great Barrier Island is unique in the Auckland region and its needs are different to elsewhere. Almost all of the on-island community facilities and services that would on the mainland be operated by Auckland Council are, on Great Barrier, privately provided by local groups. The result of this is that the local board, through its discretionary grant budgets, is a key funder of many community facilities and services on Great Barrier Island.

Outcomes and our priorities for grants

Our grants programme will be targeted towards supporting the outcomes outlined in our 2017 local board plan. The Great Barrier Local Board welcomes grant applications that align with the following local board plan priorities:

- **Our people thrive and life is good**
  - We support our community groups to do their good work
  - We celebrate and look after our island’s culture and heritage
  - We recognise and celebrate the uniqueness of our local communities
  - We support life-long learning

- **Our environment is protected and enhanced**
  - We lead our region in ecological heath
  - We will continue to support the island to achieve off the grid self-sufficiency and invest in infrastructure that safeguards us
  - We continue to reduce, reuse and recycle on our pathway to zero waste
  - We will work towards marine protection around our coastline
  - All our freshwater streams will be healthy

- **Our infrastructure is future-proofed**
  - We can get around our island in a safe and enjoyable way
  - We will work to improve freight and transport affordability and efficiency
  - Our communities will have cellphone and internet coverage
  - Smarter housing opportunities will be explored

- **Our economy is sustainable and prosperous**
  - We will continue to work for local jobs for local people
  - Our beautiful island is a desired destination
  - More goods and services are promoted and supplied locally
  - Local employment and business opportunities will be increased
Lower priorities

We will also consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities which may be considered a lower priority on a case by case basis.

The Great Barrier Local Board has identified the following activities as lower priorities:

- activities which are inconsistent with the direction signaled in the Aotearoa Great Barrier Local Board Plan.
- applications from groups not based on Great Barrier unless the proposal has a significant and/or direct benefit to the island community.

The Great Barrier Local Board will take into account if a group has a substantial cash surplus (relative to the amount applied for), unless the surplus has a specific purpose, which means it can't be used as a contribution to the project.

Exclusions

In addition to the eligibility criteria outlined the Community Grants Policy, the Great Barrier Local Board will not fund:

- Retrospective costs. It is important groups plan for funding needs wherever possible.
- GST will not be funded, if the community group or individual is GST registered.
- Insurance costs.

Note: The Great Barrier Local Board may on a case by case basis, support community organisations providing primary health care or core educational services, where these services are delivered on the island by community organisations.

Capital grants specific

Continuing to provide capital grants to community and marae groups operating facilities which meet a need in our community and which are open to and regularly used by the community.

Investment approach

The Great Barrier Local Board has allocated budgets to support the local grants programme as follows:

- Local Grants
- Capital Grants (Capital Grants Guidelines follow below)

Application dates

Grant rounds for 2018/19 will be as follows:

*Capital grants and local grants (arts and culture, community, events, environment, heritage and sports and recreation. Accommodation support e.g. rates, rental and leases falls under the community focus in local grants.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/19 Grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital and Local Grant Round One</td>
<td>16 July 2018</td>
<td>24 August 2018</td>
<td>16 October 2018</td>
<td>1 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital and Local Grant Round Two</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
<td>22 March 2019</td>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>1 June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accountability measures

The Great Barrier Local Board encourages all successful applicants to report back to the local board in a meeting (once the accountability form has been completed). A local board representative will be allocated to liaise with the applicant and ensure the project has been completed, as per their application.

Assessment and prioritisation

The Great Barrier Local Board expects all groups applying for a grant to submit a copy of the most recent Annual General Meeting (AGM) financial statements and resolutions unless a good reason for not supplying these is provided.

The local board also expects the group’s grant applicant(s) to attend the business meeting where the application is being considered to speak in a public forum and answer questions unless a good reason for not attending is provided.
Capital Grants Guidelines

Great Barrier Local Board recognises the vital role that local community facilities play in developing a strong, vibrant and engaged community and has established a capital grants fund to support capital projects associated with community facilities on Great Barrier Island.

Applicants will need to read the Aotearoa Great Barrier Local Board Plan before submitting an application. This can be viewed online at www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/localboardplans, picked up from the Auckland Council service centre, or ordered from the call centre on 09 301 0101.

Criteria for Great Barrier Local Board Capital Grants

The Great Barrier Local Board will allocate grants based on, but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Applications will only be accepted for projects which result in the creation or improvement of a capital asset at or associated with a community facility on Great Barrier Island that is available for community use. Examples of eligible projects include but are not limited to the following:
  - Buildings, structures, plant, services, infrastructure or equipment
  - Upgrades or refurbishments to existing facilities
  - New or upgraded alternative power systems, low energy appliances and equipment, rainwater collection systems etc.

- Applications must provide evidence that the facility for which a grant is sought is available for use by the community and a record of such use over the preceding 12 months unless the facility hasn’t been operating during that period.

- Applicants must demonstrate alignment with the outcomes in the Aotearoa Great Barrier Local Board Plan 2017 and the amount granted may reflect the extent to which the project aligns with the local board plan.

- Applicants must hold (or be able to obtain) insurance for the asset being applied for.

- Where a building or resource consent is needed this must also be obtained prior to the grant being released although advance funding to enable this can be provided if specified in the application.

- Where paid project management assistance is required the amount of this must be included in the application.

- Applicants must contribute a percentage of the project cost in cash, labour or materials, with the percentage increasing as the cost of the project increases as follows:
  - Up to $5000 = 5 percent
  - $5001-$10,000 = 7.5 percent
  - Over $10,001 = 10 percent

- Grants of up to $50,000 only may be approved. More than one application per group can be made.

- Where a grant over $10,000 is approved this may be paid in stages with later payment amounts based on the project meeting agreed milestones.

Application deadlines: Please refer to the application dates table above in the Local Grants Programme, or Auckland Council’s website www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/funding.
Additions to the 2016-2019 Great Barrier Local Board meeting schedule

File No.: CP2018/03442

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for two meeting dates to be added to the 2016-2019 Great Barrier Local Board meeting schedule in order to accommodate the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Great Barrier Local Board adopted the 2016-2019 meeting schedule on Tuesday 15 November 2016.
3. At that time the specific times and dates for meetings for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement as part of the 10-year Budget 2018-28 were unknown.
4. The board is being asked to approve two meeting dates as additions to the Great Barrier Local Board meeting schedule so that the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes can be met.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) approve two meeting dates to be added to the 2016-2019 Great Barrier Local Board meeting schedule to accommodate the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes as follows:
   • Tuesday, 8 May 2018, 1.00pm
   • Tuesday, 5 June 2018, 1.00pm

b) note the venue for both meetings will be the Claris Conference Centre, 19 Whangaparapara Rd, Claris, Great Barrier Island.

Horopaki / Context
5. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) have requirements regarding local board meeting schedules.
6. In summary, adopting a meeting schedule helps meet the requirements of:
   • clause 19, Schedule 7 of the LGA on general provisions for meetings, which requires the chief executive to give notice in writing to each local board member of the time and place of meetings. Such notification may be provided by the adoption of a schedule of business meetings.
   • sections 46, 46(A) and 47 in Part 7 of the LGOIMA, which requires that meetings are publicly notified, agendas and reports are available at least two working days before a meeting and that local board meetings are open to the public.
7. The Great Barrier Local Board adopted its business meeting schedule at its 15 November 2016 business meeting.
8. The timeframes for local board decision making in relation to the local board agreement which is part of the 10-year Budget 2018-28 were unavailable when the meeting schedule was originally adopted.

9. The board is being asked to make decisions in early May and early June to feed into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 process. These timeframes are outside the board's normal meeting cycle.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

10. The board has two choices:
   i) Add the two meetings as additions to the meeting schedule.
   or
   ii) Add the two meetings as extraordinary meetings.

11. For option one, statutory requirements allow enough time for these meetings to be scheduled as additions to the meeting schedule and other topics may be considered as per any other ordinary meeting. However, there is a risk that if the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 timeframes change or the information is not ready for the meeting there would need to be an additional extraordinary meeting scheduled anyway.

12. For option two, only the specific topic 10-year Budget 2018-2028 may be considered for which the meeting is being held. There is a risk that no other policies or plans with similar timeframes or running in relation to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 process could be considered at this meeting.

13. Since there is enough time to meet statutory requirements, staff recommend approving these meetings as additions to the meeting schedule as it allows more flexibility for the board to consider a range of issues.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

14. This report requests the board’s decision to schedule two additional meetings and consider whether to approve them as extraordinary meetings or additions to the meeting schedule.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

15. There is no specific impact for Māori arising from this report. Local boards work with Māori on projects and initiatives of shared interest.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

16. There are no financial implications in relation to this report apart from the standard costs associated with servicing a business meeting.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

17. There are no significant risks associated with this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

18. Implement the processes associated with preparing for business meetings.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Guia Nonoy – Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers     | Louise Mason – General Manager Local Board Services  
|                 | Helgard Wagener – Relationship Manager Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards |
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To update the Great Barrier Local Board on Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) activities within the local board area for the six months from 1 September 2017 to 28 February 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Panuku was established in September 2015 due to the merger of two Council Controlled Organisations, Waterfront Auckland and Auckland Council Property Limited (ACPL).
3. Panuku helps to rejuvenate parts of Auckland, from small projects that refresh a site or building, to major transformations of town centres or neighbourhoods.
4. Panuku manages around $2 billion of the council's property portfolio, which we continuously review to find smart ways to generate income for the region, grow the portfolio, or release land or property that can be better used by others.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) receive the Panuku Development Auckland Local Board update for 1 September 2017 to 28 February 2018.

Horopaki / Context
Local Activities

Portfolio management
5. Panuku manages ‘non-service’ properties owned by the council and Auckland Transport (AT). Non-service properties are those that are not currently needed for service or infrastructure purposes. These properties are generally being held for planned future projects, such as road construction, park expansion or development of future town centres.

6. As at 28 February 2018, the property portfolio comprises 1437 properties, containing 1119 leases. The current portfolio includes vacant land, industrial buildings, warehouses, retail shops, cafes, offices, medical centres, and a large portfolio of residential rental homes.

7. The average monthly tenantable occupancy rate, for the six-month period is more than 98 per cent, which is above the Statement of Intent target of 95 per cent.

Properties managed in the Great Barrier Local Board Area
8. Panuku currently manages the following commercial leases within the Great Barrier Local Board area.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Helicopters Ltd</td>
<td>70 Hector Sanderson Road, (Claris Airport)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Airlines</td>
<td>70 Hector Sanderson Road, (Claris Airport)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greasr Clearing House</td>
<td>70 Hector Sanderson Road (Claris Airport)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwells Quarry</td>
<td>25 Hector Sanderson Road</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Ongoing management of the airport leases would be most effectively managed by Auckland Transport. Council staff have been working with Auckland Transport to achieve this outcome and transfer of Claris Airport leases.

Business Interests

10. Panuku optimises the commercial return from business interests it manages on the council’s behalf. This comprises forestry enterprises, landfills and quarries.

11. There is currently one managed business interest in the Great Barrier Local Board area:

12. Blackwell’s Quarry – Blackwell’s quarry is located on Hector Sanderson Road, Great Barrier Island, and is leased from the Blackwells. Panuku manages the lease from the Blackwells on the council’s behalf. Fulton Hogan operates this quarry on behalf of Auckland Council by way of an Operating Agreement for five years to December 2020.

Portfolio strategy

Optimisation

13. The Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2015-2025 reflects a desire of the council to materially reduce or slow down expenditure, and unlock value from assets no longer required, or which are sub-optimal for service purposes. In response to this, prior to the establishment of Panuku, ACPL developed a new method of dealing with service property, called optimisation.

14. Asset optimisation deals with ‘service property’. It is self-funding, maximises efficiencies from service assets, and maintains levels of service while releasing property for sale or development. A key element of optimisation is that the sale proceeds are locally reinvested to advance approved projects and activities on a cost-neutral basis. It does not include the Auckland Transport portfolio. Panuku continues to advance this programme of work, which includes the development of a cross-council project to coordinate and execute asset sales and optimisation.

Portfolio review and rationalisation

Overview

15. Panuku is required to undertake ongoing rationalisation of council’s non-service assets. This includes identifying properties from within the council’s portfolio that may be suitable for potential sale and development if appropriate. Panuku has a focus on achieving housing and urban regeneration outcomes. Identifying potential sale properties contributes to the Auckland Plan focus of accommodating the significant growth projected for the region over the coming decades, by providing council with an efficient use of capital and prioritisation of funds to achieve its activities and projects.
Performance

16. Panuku works closely with the council and Auckland Transport to identify potential surplus properties to help achieve disposal targets.

17. Target for July 2017 to June 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review</td>
<td>$60m disposal recommendations</td>
<td>$30.25m as at 28 February 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process

18. Once identified as a potential sale candidate, a property is taken through a multi-stage ‘rationalisation’ process. The agreed process includes engagement with council, council-controlled organisations (CCOs), the local board and mana whenua. This is followed by Panuku board approval, engagement with local ward councillors and the Independent Māori Statutory Board, and finally, a Governing Body decision.

Under review

19. There are no properties currently under review in the Great Barrier Local Board area.

Acquisitions and Disposals

20. Panuku manages the acquisition and disposal of property on behalf of Auckland Council. Panuku purchases property for development, roads, infrastructure projects and other service needs, and manages the sale of properties surplus to council requirements. These properties may be sold with or without contractual requirements for development.

Acquisitions

21. Panuku does not decide which properties to buy in a local board area. Instead, it is asked to negotiate the terms and conditions of a purchase on behalf of council.

22. Panuku purchased eight properties for open space across Auckland in this financial year (ending 30 June 2018) at a cost of $19.7m, and also bought six properties for storm water use at a value of $4.2m.

23. No properties were purchased in the Great Barrier Local Board area during the reporting period.

Disposals

24. The disposal team sold eight properties for a total of $10.7m this financial year. The team’s 2017/2018 target is $8.0m for the year. The target is agreed with the council and is reviewed on an annual basis.

25. No properties were sold in the Great Barrier Local Board area.

Regional activities

Highlights

26. Over the year, Panuku achieved key project milestones and performance results in our priority development locations. Panuku categorises three types of priority locations:

27. Transform locations – Panuku ‘transforms’ locations by creating change through urban regeneration. Panuku leads the transformation of select parts of the Auckland region; working alongside others and using the custodianship of land and planning expertise. The catalytic work Waterfront Auckland led at Wynyard Quarter is a great example of the transformation of urban locations.
28. Unlock locations – Panuku also ‘unlocks’ development potential for others. By acting as a facilitator; using relationships to break down barriers and influence others, including the council family, to create development opportunities.

29. Support locations – Panuku plays a ‘support’ role to ensure council is making the most of what it already has. Intensification is a key driver in the Auckland Plan. Panuku will support housing demands by enabling development of council-owned land.

Transform locations

30. The Wynyard Quarter is undergoing rapid change both commercially and residentially, with thousands of Aucklanders using this space every week.

- The first three phases of structural steel have been installed at the Park Hyatt Hotel. All up, approximately 2000 tonnes of primary structural steel will be used to construct the luxury five-star hotel, which will span a total area of 37,000sqm.
- In April 2017, Mayor Phil Goff officially opened the Mason Bros. building, a former industrial warehouse that has been redeveloped into a three-level office space, bringing together a community of entrepreneurs and businesses. It is the centrepiece of Wynyard Quarter’s innovation precinct.
- The innovation precinct in Wynyard Quarter has expanded with the newly opened five-floor building at 12 Madden Street. The purpose-built home for entrepreneurs offers the latest in flexible co-working spaces. This milestone marks two years since the GridAKL initiative was launched by Auckland Tourism, Events, and Economic Development (ATEED), partnering with Panuku and Precinct Properties to develop the commercial space to house ambitious companies and connecting technologists, designers, digital content makers, product designers and start-ups.
- Developer Willis Bond is constructing 500-600 apartments of various types and sizes that are set to house around 1100 people. There are two developments currently under construction; Wynyard Central and 132 Halsey. The first residents moved in during September 2017.

31. ‘Transform Manukau’ was the first location to have a Framework Plan completed, outlining the five key moves for the project and the vision for Manukau in 2040. Over the past six months, the emphasis has been on confirming the delivery of an affordable housing development on 5ha of land at 20 Barrowcliffe Place. This project will be Panuku’s largest development of affordable housing and involves the first partnership arrangement with mana whenua in a property development role. Earthworks on the development of over 200 homes will commence soon. Work is also about to commence on the street-scape upgrade of Putney Way, in conjunction with the bus station process led by AT.

32. The high-level plan to ‘Transform Onehunga’, on a similar scale to Wynyard Quarter and Manukau, was approved in March 2017. The plan was completed involving significant consultation with the community. Panuku is leading the redevelopment of strategic council-owned land, and works in partnership with government and others, to deliver positive outcomes for the local community. The East-West link, which affects the wharf and southern parts of the area, is currently being reassessed by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA). The final board of inquiry decision approving the East-West link was given in January 2018. Panuku is however, expecting amended plans later this year. Working with the local board and key stakeholders, Panuku has advanced plans on the town centre and the Onehunga wharf precinct where possible. The Framework Plan that will guide the transformation is due for completion in April 2018.

Unlock locations

33. In Takapuna, Auckland Council owns nearly four hectares of land focused around the Anzac Street carpark and the Gasometer site, and consultation on redevelopment of these sites has started.

34. Hobsonville 20ha Airfields site - stage one of construction of 102 standalone and terrace homes is underway. Avanda Group have been announced as the developers that will deliver
more than 500 homes in stage two, of which a minimum of 10 per cent will be affordable housing.

35. In Northcote, a masterplan and design guide for the new Awataha Greenway project has been completed, and work is well advanced on the masterplanning and reference design for the town centre regeneration. Works are also progressing well on the redevelopment of the Housing New Zealand stock by Homes Land Community (HLC).

36. The Council’s Planning Committee approved the over-arching plans to redevelop Old Papatoetoe in June 2017. Panuku is leading the redevelopment of the mall, a 2.5ha block of land, which will see the area opened up with a new plaza space, reconfigured shops, upgraded carpark and a revamped New World supermarket. In addition to the upgrade of the mall, which is expected to be completed early next year, approximately 110 new homes are planned to be developed in the surrounding area.

37. With the overall plan for Henderson being approved in May 2017, the vision is for it to grow into an urban eco-centre. This vision will guide planning and development with an outcome towards ‘liveable growth’ by creating a safe, attractive and vibrant mixed-use environment with a uniquely west Auckland identity.

38. The opportunity to revitalise Avondale has been given the green light in November 2017, with the approval of the over-arching plan for its regeneration by the Planning Committee. The vision for Avondale will be enabled through a number of key moves. Panuku will work closely with the local board and community to implement a retail strategy that attracts new businesses, increasing diversity of products and services. The train station, upgraded bus network, and new cycleways, offer great transport options and Panuku will continue to strengthen connections between these activity hubs and the town. A focus for the regeneration of Avondale is to work with developers to build quality residential neighbourhoods that offer a mix of housing types, including terraces and apartments. A number of significant developments are already underway in the area.

39. A development agreement was signed with Todd Property for the delivery of more than 350 homes in Flat Bush, Ormiston.

Support locations

40. The Mariner Rise subdivision at 20 Link Crescent, Whangaparaoa, has been completed by Panuku’s development partner, McConnell Property, along with the delivery of a 2700sqm park and playground. Sixty new homes will be built on this new subdivision.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

41. A workshop with the Great Barrier Local Board was held on 6 March 2018.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

42. Tāmaki Makaurau has the highest Māori population in the world with one in four Māori in Aotearoa living here.

43. Māori make up 12 per cent of the region’s total population who mainly live in Manurewa, Henderson-Massey, Papakura, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Māngere-Otahuhu and Franklin. Māori have a youthful demographic with 50 per cent of Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau under the age of 25 years. Five per cent of the Māori population in the region are currently 65 years and over.

44. There are 19 Mana Whenua groups in the region, with seven having indicated an interest in Panuku lead activities within the Great Barrier Local Board area.

45. Māori make up 18 per cent of the Great Barrier Local Board population, and there are two marae located within the local board area.

46. Panuku work collaboratively with Mana Whenua on a range projects including potential property disposals, development sites in the area and commercial opportunities.
Engagement can be on specific individual properties and projects at an operational level with kaitiaki representatives, or with the Panuku Mana Whenua Governance Forum who have a broader mandate.

Panuku will continue to partner with Māori on opportunities which enhance Māori social and economic wellbeing.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Authoriser</td>
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Correspondence

File No.: CP2018/03434

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To inform the Great Barrier Local Board of the correspondence sent and received for the month of March 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The attached correspondence have been received and sent for the Great Barrier Local Board’s information.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) note the correspondence received and sent for the month of March 2018:
   i. Letter from the Department of Conservation regarding Rakitu Island eradication project consultation
   ii. Correspondence from Spark, Chorus and Hon Nikki Kaye regarding telecommunication services on Great Barrier Island
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14 March 2018

Izzy Fordham
Chairperson
Great Barrier Local Board

Dear Izzy

Thank you for your letter of 7 March 2018. We have provided a detailed table of consultation for the Rakitū Island Eradication Project for your information below.

The consultation has been quite focused, and our intention is to continue consulting with interested and affected parties as requested. In addition, there have been numerous requests for information under the Official Information Act and letters seeking response from the Minister of Conservation. All available information has been provided to those who have requested it.

Regarding further community consultation, in January we held an information day at our Okiwi office with the purpose to provide the local community with information about the planned rodent eradication on Rakitū. This was touted to be possibly repeated further south on the island. We are open to ideas on how further community consultation could be best achieved.

If you wish to discuss this further with the department, please contact George Taylor (Operations Manager, Great Barrier Island) on 027 533 3954 or by email gttaylor@doc.govt.nz.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Baucke
Director Operations, Auckland
### Consultation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Consultation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/5/13</td>
<td>Land occupier</td>
<td>Dane Foster</td>
<td>Face to face meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/2013</td>
<td>Consent approver (land owner)</td>
<td>Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea Trust Board</td>
<td>Meeting with Nicola MacDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/2014</td>
<td>Interested Party</td>
<td>Great Barrier Island Local Board</td>
<td>Face to face meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/05/2014</td>
<td>Consent approver (Isd building occupier)</td>
<td>Foster family: Charmaine, Dane, Shannon and Kyle</td>
<td>Face to face meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/05/2014</td>
<td>Consent approver (Isd building occupier)</td>
<td>Derek Rope</td>
<td>Face to face meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2014</td>
<td>Treaty Partner</td>
<td>Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea Trust Board</td>
<td>Face to face meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2015</td>
<td>Consent approver (Isd building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster and Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Face to face meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2015</td>
<td>Consent approver (land owner)</td>
<td>Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea Trust Board</td>
<td>Meeting with Nicola MacDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/04/2017</td>
<td>Consent approver (Isd building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster, Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Face to face meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/06/2017</td>
<td>Consent approver (Isd building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster, Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/07/2017</td>
<td>Treaty Partner</td>
<td>Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea Trust Board</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consultation on Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Consultation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26/05/2014</td>
<td>Consent approver (Ird building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine, Dane and Kyle Foster. Apology from Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2015</td>
<td>Consent approver (Ird building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster and Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2015</td>
<td>Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea Trust Board</td>
<td>Nicola MacDonald</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/06/2017</td>
<td>Consent to access houses (Ird building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster, Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/06/2017</td>
<td>Consent approver (Ird building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster, Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/07/2017</td>
<td>Consent approver (land owner)</td>
<td>Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea Trust Board</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/06/2017</td>
<td>Consent approver (Ird building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster, Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>Affected Party - Crayfisher</td>
<td>Des Ashton</td>
<td>Email/phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2017</td>
<td>Consent approver (Ird building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster, Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23 Oct</td>
<td>Consent approver (Ird building occupier)</td>
<td>Charmaine Foster, Sheridan Rope</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.11.17</td>
<td>Affected Party - Crayfisher</td>
<td>Des Ashton</td>
<td>email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/11/2017</td>
<td>Consent approver (land owner)</td>
<td>Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea Trust Board Chair</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/11/2017</td>
<td>Interested Party</td>
<td>Tony Storey</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2017</td>
<td>Interested Party</td>
<td>Tony Storey</td>
<td>Radio/Aotea FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2017</td>
<td>Pest Free Aotea</td>
<td>Izzy Fordham</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>Poison Free Aotea</td>
<td>Tony Storey/Elise Bishop</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/2017</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board</td>
<td>Izzy Fordham</td>
<td>Local board meeting/forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2017</td>
<td>Poison Free Aotea</td>
<td>Tony Storey/Elise Bishop</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/01/2018</td>
<td>Nearby Landowners</td>
<td>Kevin and Gwen Burke</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/2018</td>
<td>Poison Free Aotea</td>
<td>Tony Storey/Elise Bishop</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/1/2018</td>
<td>Poison Free Aotea</td>
<td>Tony Storey</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/2018</td>
<td>Great Barrier Island local community</td>
<td>Aotea Community</td>
<td>Face to face/information day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 to 9/2/2018</td>
<td>Great Barrier Island local community</td>
<td>Aotea Community</td>
<td>Face to face/information day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/2018</td>
<td>Kaumatua -Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea</td>
<td>Hine Wii &amp; John Wii</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/01/2018</td>
<td>Iwi/hapu</td>
<td>Paula Williams</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/2018</td>
<td>Iwi/hapu</td>
<td>Lorna Cleave</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/2018</td>
<td>Barrier Bulletin</td>
<td>Kevin Burke</td>
<td>Face to face/information day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 March 2018

Hon Nikki Kaye
MP for Auckland Central

Dear Nikki,

Thank you for your letter sent last week in relation to telecommunication issues on Great Barrier Island.

I’ve reached out to our operations team for a full investigation and have been informed that there have been multiple issues with Chorus equipment that links Great Barrier to the mainland, some of which are ongoing. I understand Chorus are sending you a full report outlining all these issues in detail.

Please be assured that I share your frustration, on behalf of our customers, and agree that it’s totally unacceptable. We have been asking Chorus to address these issues for some weeks. The dates for fault restorations have been repeatedly pushed back which drives more calls from frustrated customers into Spark service channels. And in some cases, we’ve been informed that repairs have been made, when the work has been unsuccessful.

Unfortunately, Chorus doesn’t have an enforceable Service Level Agreement (SLA) with service providers that specifies individual customer faults should be fixed in a certain time frame. We simply notify them of a fault and hope for the best for our customers (the SLAs are set by the Regulator as overall averages, not customer-specific measures).

I appreciate that it may seem a little insincere to be told that the root problem is in the hands of Chorus. But the reality is that the way the broadband industry has been structured in New Zealand means service providers, including Spark, do not have control over the Chorus lines network. This is not just a Spark vs Chorus issue; it is the same for every service provider, including Fenns, who also have many customers on the island.

For our part, we’re doing everything we can to communicate updates to customers and to help keep them connected where possible. In most circumstances, the widespread usage of mobiles and call diversion technology means we can divert a customer’s landline to their mobile phone when there’s a fault. However, in this case, as you’ve highlighted, many of the elderly residents on Barrier Island do not own a mobile phone which has prevented us keeping these residents connected.

We have suggested to Chorus that we should go with them to the island to personally apologise to our impacted customers once the issues are resolved. You can be assured we will continue to push hard to achieve this resolution on our customers behalf.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Moutter
Managing Director

Cc: Izzy Fordham, Great Barrier Island Local Board Chair

Spark New Zealand Limited
167 Victoria Street West
Auckland, New Zealand

spark.co.nz
15 March, 2018

Dear Nikki

Thank you for raising and highlighting the concerns of the local community on Great Barrier Island regarding the reliability of their telecommunications services.

Chorus takes its responsibility to provide a reliable service for all its customers very seriously, whether they are within Auckland central or in more remote areas such as Great Barrier Island.

There has been a higher than usual number of faults on the island in January and February this year which has adversely impacted some customers and the timeframes for which we have been able to restore service. This has resulted in the commentary you have received from your constituents.

While Chorus has had a technician based on the island until just recently, the faults were not issues that having a technician locally could have resolved. We do however accept that the timeframes and impacts are not what Chorus would expect people to have to experience. We already have work under way to resolve the issues you raise and to ensure our network is more reliable in the future.

The issues we are working to resolve are:

- Our equipment at Okupu runs on solar power and suffers from shading of the solar panels. This has resulted in intermittent service on the island. As soon as the issue was identified we have been topping up the backup batteries on a weekly basis to ensure continuity of service. A temporary power supply has been agreed to with our Rural Broadband Initiative partner, Vodafone, which is planned to be implemented next week. A permanent power source to our site requires appropriate resource consents and permits which is being worked through at the moment.

- Trees are impacting a line of sight communications antenna at Tryphena. This has caused intermittent faults due to signal interference on the radio link. We have been liaising with the landowner to arrange to have the trees trimmed, and this work was completed yesterday.

- There has been a fault with one of the antennas that requires replacement. This required part is scheduled to arrive next week. There is diversity on this link with two antennas to avoid any loss of service.
In the longer term, to ensure the resilience of our network on the island, Chorus completed an audit of our network infrastructure on the island last year, as well as a structural engineers report for all of our main sites to ensure we are providing a robust network for the residents. This audit is in addition to the annual maintenance that Chorus does on the local network on the island.

This audit identified the works highlighted above as risks requiring attention. Unfortunately some of these risks have been realised while we were in the process of working to mitigate them. The audit has also identified the need for a technological upgrade for the phones on the island. This upgrade means the phone service will be provided by our existing fixed line copper network, rather than via radio links at Tryphena. This work will allow greater network diversity and reliability. This work is currently in the design phase, and will be implemented later this year.

Faults unfortunately can and do happen, irrespective of the measures that we put in place to mitigate network outages. While we do not have a technician permanently located on the island now, technicians are on the island for significant periods to ensure the network maintenance is done regularly.

We will also send technicians as and when required for any faults if there is not a technician on the island at that time. The transport infrastructure to the island is consistent enough for us to be able to maintain our network and respond to faults quickly enough without the requirement of a permanent presence.

I hope my assurances and the information about the work we are doing to improve telecommunications services on the island gives you the confidence that we will keep residents connected, particularly for those that may have a medical dependency or other essential requirements, and that we have a through on-going maintenance programme.

Regards

Kate McKenzie
Chief Executive
Chorus New Zealand Ltd
--------- Original message ---------
From: Hon Nikki Kaye <Nikki.Kaye@parliament.govt.nz>
Date: 15/03/2018 9:23 pm (GMT+12:00)
To: leonie@aoteahealth.co.nz, "Izzy Fordham (Great Barrier Local Board)"
<Izzy.Fordham@aucklandscouncil.govt.nz>, "BRIGHT, Roger"
<Roger.Bright@police.govt.nz>
Cc: Shelley Addison-Bell <Shelley.Addison-Bell@parliament.govt.nz>, Charlotte Guy
<Charlotte.Guy@parliament.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Letter from Chorus CEO

Ok thanks I will send this follow up letter tomorrow copying it to Simon Moutter

Dear Kate,

Thank you for your letter. Unfortunately while I appreciate the work that you may be doing in the long term to build a more resilient infrastructure I do not feel confident that the organisation appreciates the serious nature of the situation that your company let occur. Great Barrier Island is an isolated island for which the lack of faults being fixed in a timely manner left vulnerable people isolated with no communication access for weeks.

I note Mr Moutter offered an apology (even though he is clear the faults were the responsibility of Chorus). Given the length of time taken to respond and the potential risks to vulnerable people I would have expected a similar statement from the company. Many on the island have lost confidence in Chorus and that would help repair the relationship.

A number of key support services including the local police officers and the Aotea Health trust have also asked for much greater assurances that faults will be responded to in a timely manner in the short term not just the long term. I recognise that faults do happen but the issue is whether chorus can provide an adequate response time for these faults given emergency responses that may be needed.

I would appreciate a more detailed timeline of when the technological upgrade will be complete later this year. I would be happy to attend a briefing on island with residents where this could be presented. In the short term I would like a stronger commitment to timeliness of resolving faults given the serious nature and huge delay of what occurred.

If you are unable to provide greater assurances on the responsibility of the company to do a lot better and clear time commitments in terms of a response for faults to be on island then I would be happy to take up this matter with your responsible minister.

I realise this may feel like a pretty strongly worded letter but it reflects my sense of disappointment and real concern that the company is putting lives at risk with the situation that occurred and the lack of longer term commitments. As the local Member of Parliament I feel it is my responsibility to advocate on these issues given the serious nature of them.

Best regards

Nikki

Hon Nikki Kaye
Opposition Spokesperson for: Education
Member of Parliament for Auckland Central
Parliament Buildings, PO Box 18341, Wellington 6160, New Zealand
E: nikki.kaye@parliament.govt.nz
www.nikkikaye.co.nz

Authorised by Nikki Kaye MP, 48C. College Hill, Auckland
From: Nathan Beaumont <Nathan.Beaumont@chorus.co.nz>
Date: Friday, 16 Mar 2018, 12:04 PM
To: Hon Nikki Kaye <Nikki.Kaye@parliament.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Hon Nikki Kaye letter response GBI services

Hi Nikki,

You have Chorus’ assurance that faults on the island will be responded to in a very timely matter. And of course, we do apologise to the residents for what has happened. We’re certainly not happy with what’s happened, and will be working hard to make sure there’s not a repeat.

As Kate said in her original letter, we have a wide plan of work underway to make the network on the island more resilient that ever. We had identified that this work was needed and had it underway when the faults happened.

Please be assured we absolutely appreciate the seriousness of the situation. I’ve looked at the fault history for the island going back to the beginning of last year. Apart from January and February of this year when we struck the issues we are now resolving, the overall fault rate has been on par with other parts of the country.

No matter how resilient our network is, unfortunately there are always going to be occasions when faults happen. For example, the recent ex-cyclone Gita caused significant issues throughout the country, including on Great Barrier. When severe weather issues strike our network, we work as quickly as we can to get the network back up and running, but as you can appreciate it can be challenging, and we take the health and safety of our workforce working in the dangerous conditions very seriously.

In an ideal world, it would be great if we could guarantee faults will be fixed within a certain time, but sometimes there are things outside out control. Generally we aim to fix faults within 24 hours of being notified. On many occasions faults are fixed much quicker than that.

We are still working on the timeline for the technology upgrade but as soon as we have more details finalised, I will share this with you.

Thanks

Nathan
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present the Great Barrier Local Board with its updated governance forward work calendar.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The governance forward work calendar for the Great Barrier Local Board is in Attachment A. The calendar is updated monthly, reported to business meetings and distributed to council staff.
3. The governance forward work calendars were introduced in 2016 as part of Auckland Council’s quality advice programme and aim to support local boards’ governance role by:
   - ensuring advice on meeting agendas is driven by local board priorities
   - clarifying what advice is expected and when
   - clarifying the rationale for reports.
4. The calendar also aims to provide guidance for staff supporting local boards and greater transparency for the public.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:
a) note the governance forward work calendar as at April 2018.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board Governance Forward Work Calendar - April 2018</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Guia Nonoy – Local Board Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Helgard Wagener – Relationship Manager Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 3 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 10 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 17 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>(PLACEHOLDER) Monday, 23 April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 24 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 1 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 8 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Tuesday, 8 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Venue: Claris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>13 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Tuesday, 15 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Venue: Claris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>GB Health Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Auckland Council's Quarterly Performance Report: Great Barrier Local Board for Quarter Three report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 22 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>25 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Please do not change this item. NZA to present the Great Barrier Island Visitor Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>29 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Please do not change this item. LBA WP workshop 8: finalise local board agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Resilient Recovery Strategy/Disaster Recovery Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Draft open space management policies for local boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Review of the Code of Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Please do not change this item. Cross-sectoral homelessness strategy for Auckland - BY MME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 5 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Venue: Claris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Please do not change this item. Additional business meeting to adopt LBA 18/19, Work programmes by activity, fees and charges schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 12 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Auckland Transport update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Discussion document: Indoor Sport Facility Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday 19 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday 19 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Venue: Clarks Conference Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Venue: Clarks Conference Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Venue: Clarks Conference Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Venue: Clarks Conference Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 26 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 26 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 26 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 26 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 26 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 26 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 26 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 3 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 3 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 10 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 10 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 10 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 17 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 17 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 17 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 17 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 17 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 17 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 24 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 31 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 7 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 7 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 21 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 21 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 21 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 21 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 21 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 23 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 4 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 11 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 11 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 11 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 18 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 16 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 23 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 30 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 6 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 11 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 20 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 27 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 4 December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To note the Great Barrier Local Board proceedings taken at the workshop held on 6, 13, and 27 March 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Under the current Standing Orders of the Great Barrier Local Board 12.1, workshops convened by the local board shall be closed to the public. However, the proceedings of every workshop shall record the names of members attending and a statement summarising the nature of the information received and nature of matters discussed. No resolutions are passed or decisions reached but are solely for the provision of information and discussion. This report attaches the workshop record for the period stated above.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:
a) note the record of proceedings for the workshop held on 6, 13, and 27 March 2018.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record - 6 March 2018</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record - 13 March 2018</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record - 27 March 2018</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guia Nonoy – Local Board Democracy Advisor</td>
<td>Louise Mason – General Manager Local Board Services Helgard Wagener – Relationship Manager Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Great Barrier Local Board held in Great Barrier Local Board office, 31 Hector Sanderson Road, Claris, Great Barrier Island on Tuesday 6 March 2018 commencing at 8.30am

PRESENT
Chairperson: Izzy Fordham
Members: Luke Coles, Sue Daly, Shirley Johnson
Apologies: Jeff Cleave
Also present: Helgard Wagener, Jacqui Fyers, Emma Joyce, Jeremy Warden, Shanti Morgan, Jacqui Wairepo, Terry Coe, Hazel Durkin, Sven Mol, Kathy Cumming, Patrick Thorp (by teleconference), Margie Daly, Ben Assado and Sam Grimshaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff in attendance gave the board an update on waste projects on the island, talked through the bioscary and biodiversity reports and also discussed the plaque skink eradication trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff gave the board an update on Panuku’s activities on Great Barrier Island and also discussed the quarry lease and America’s cup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Joyce</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Discussion was held on the skills website and Claris cemetery projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Warden</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>The committee gave the board an update on the progress of current projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanti Morgan</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Wairepo</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Coe</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Durkin</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku Development Auckland update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sven Mol</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Services update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Fyers</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Cumming</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Thorp (by teleconference)</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Learning Hub Steering Committee representative and coordinator update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Cumming</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Daly</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Assado</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Grimshaw</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4.00pm.
Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Great Barrier Local Board held in Great Barrier Local Board office, 81 Hector Sanderson Road, Claris, Great Barrier Island on Tuesday 13 March 2018 commencing at 8.30am

PRESENT
Chairperson: Izzy Fordham
Members: Luke Coles, Sue Daly, Jeff Cleave (left at 2.30pm), Shirley Johnson (attended the Marine terrestrial research centre item via teleconference only)
Also present: Helgad Wagener, Jacqui Fyers, Marcel Morgan, Rodney Klaassen, Cushia Buchanan, Jonathan Anyon (by teleconference), Richard La Ville, Rebecca Barclay, Nigel Bradly, Fraser Stobie, and Richard Somerville-Ryan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff gave the board an update on current projects and the services delivered on the island managed by community facilities department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Morgan</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Klaassen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushia Buchanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Discussion was held on the following items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Anyon (by teleconference)</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>a. quarry and core samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard La Ville</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Sandhills Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. pontoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. wharves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e. bus shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f. seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine terrestrial research centre</td>
<td>Local initiative</td>
<td>Staff and representatives from Envirostrat Ltd talked through their feasibility study presentation. Discussion was on the board’s scope for the feasibility study of the marine terrestrial research centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Barclay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Bradly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Stobie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotea/Great Barrier International Dark Sky</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Mr Somerville-Ryan updated the board with the current and future activities of DAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary Advisory Group (DAG) update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Somerville-Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 4.00pm.
Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Great Barrier Local Board held at Claris Conference Centre, 19 Whangaparapara Road, Claris, Great Barrier Island on Tuesday 27 March 2018 commencing at 9.00am

PRESENT
Chairperson: Izzy Fordham
Members: Luke Coles, Jeff Cleave, Sue Daly, Shirley Johnson
Also present: Helgard Wagener, Jacqui Fyers, Mark Purdie (by teleconference), Pippa Sommerville, Marcel Morgan, Emma Joyce, Kathy Cumming and Luo Lei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Agreement (LBA); workshop #5:</td>
<td>Direction setting</td>
<td>Staff talked through their department's draft work programmes for financial year 2018/2019. Work programmes are to be finalised in May 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Purdie (by teleconference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pippa Sommerville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Cumming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Joyce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo Lei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Empowerment Unit update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Discussion was held on the skills development project, and an update on technology and the Life-long Learning projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Cumming</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded at 3.30pm.