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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, 19 June 2018 as true and correct.

5 Leave of Absence

Member S Johnson is on leave for the period 18 June 2018 to 30 July 2018 inclusive.

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 7.7 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."
Annual reporting of the Great Barrier community funding agreements

File No.: CP2018/12980

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To note the annual accountability reports from the four Great Barrier Local Board funding agreement recipients, as stated in the terms of their contracts.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. A list of the funding agreement recipients are listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Purpose of funding</th>
<th>Amount of funding</th>
<th>Key contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotea Family Support Group</td>
<td>Support the Aotea Family Support Group to develop a range of services that meet the needs of the community.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Rendt Gorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust – Community Worker</td>
<td>Support the community worker to achieve successful community development outcomes, with a focus on community health and social services, safety, and marae capacity building.</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>Gael Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Great Barrier Island</td>
<td>Support Destination Great Barrier Island to manage the Claris visitor site, advance Great Barrier Island as a destination, and provide marketing promotion and economic development outcomes.</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>Sue Whaanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Island Community Heritage &amp; Arts Village Trust</td>
<td>Support the art gallery to provide programmes and opportunities for the Great Barrier Island community.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Nell Husband</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In all cases funding is also provided to support the delivery of initiatives outlined in the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board Plan and the Great Barrier Local Board Agreement.

4. It is stated in the terms of the funding agreements that recipients will report six-monthly and annually to Auckland Council and to the Great Barrier Local Board’s February 2018 and June 2018 meetings. Local board reports should be formal reports on the business meeting agenda, as well as verbal reports at the business meeting.

5. Copies of the Aotea Family Support Group, Great Barrier Community Health Trust, Destination Great Barrier Island and Great Barrier Island Community Heritage & Arts Village Trust June 2018 reports are attached.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:
a) note the annual reports from the Aotea Family Support Group, Great Barrier Community Health Trust, Destination Great Barrier Island and Great Barrier Island Community Heritage & Arts Village Trust.
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Dear Guia

CEUaccountability@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Re: Accountability Funding Report on Funding Agreement 1 July 2017 – 30 June 2018

Please find enclosed the annual report covering the relevant period detailed above.

Any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Leonie House
Supervisor

Gael Johnson
Community Worker

Anne

Attachment A
Accountability Funding Report

July 1 – June 30
2018

Report to
Great Barrier Local Board
Hector Sanderson Road
Claris, GBI

Report prepared by
Gael Johnson
Date: 25.06.18

Report to: Great Barrier Local Board
Hector Sanderson Road
Claris, Great Barrier Island

Accountability Funding Report for the period of: 1 July 2017 – 30 June 2018

1) **Summary/snapshot**
   
   - The Community Worker Project (CWP) embraces 4 specific social service sectors:
     - Referral / informative / advisory e.g. to Law Centre, to Women's Refuge, to gay support line
     - Logistical support to access professional service providers e.g. First Aid training, Victim Support, Educational access / issues
     - Navigation / advocacy with government services (e.g. Ministry of Health, Ministry of Social Development)
     - Emergency / crisis support, including targeted crisis funding
   
   - The CWP focus is firmly with on-island community development and support for capacity building in partnership with mana whenua

**Outputs / Snapshot**

- **Off the Grid**
  
  - **HIGHLIGHT:** Winter Energy Payment. At $20.45 pw for singles / couples and $31.81 for families with dependent children. This payment for 3 months will be really making a difference in the community. This funding is not specifically tied to paying electricity bill, means it can be used towards the most necessary cost: gas and / or firewood.
  
  - **Challenge:** Access to firewood. Water heating with firewood is used by 60% local homes surveyed. [Sustainability Stocktake, 2015]
    Firewood supplies may be dwindling in the long term. No information available for overall pattern. Many locals ask about how to get firewood, who is in the business, and whether one can get help with payment or physical support with stacking / chopping.
## 2) Progress to Date / specific projects and outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Objective</th>
<th>Progress so far / key performance indicators (figures/stats)</th>
<th>Summary of outcomes - what difference has your organisation made?</th>
<th>Highlights and challenges</th>
<th>Looking forward - how you will improve on what you're doing over the next 6 months?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental Project: To create a Community Owned Dental Clinic. Serviced by a quality visiting dental team</td>
<td>Create Community Owned Dental Clinic</td>
<td>Engagement of a dental team - with enthusiastic / community minded dentist. Proposal for first mobile clinic visit underway for July - using an Auckland Council room and QBI Community Health Trust equipment. In process of applying for lease of suitable building. Organising dental equipment donated by previous dentist. Placing advertising into Barrier Bulletin, by mail drop and on public notice boards</td>
<td>People are supported to make healthier choices. People are connected to essential and relevant on Island services. People able to access services without undue travelling expenses. Community is empowered: ownership and commitment to a local service</td>
<td>Highlight: Finding a willing dentist: one with an understanding of the geographic isolation, and socio-economic situation on Great Barrier Island. Challenge: Coordinating hosting a temporary service, arranging temporary storage for essential equipment, Navigating required application process for the lease of suitable rooms.</td>
<td>Establishing a regular reliable dental service. Ensuring the space leased is properly equipped serviced and well used. Ensuring that residents understand some financial assistance may be available for dental treatment depending on their circumstances Continue to liaise with the dental service and individuals as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Support Scheme</td>
<td>Amelioration of hardship for people traveling to tertiary health services.</td>
<td>CW administers a travel program largely funded by Ministry of Health. The arrangements for travel and the paperwork involved is provided under</td>
<td>Residents are supported to access appropriate tertiary care. Arrangements are streamlined, and the service tries to ensure</td>
<td>Highlight: Residents become familiar with taxi drivers and motelier. Stories are told about planes nearly missed or helpful hands offered.</td>
<td>The service is means tested by way of Community Service Card: residents need to understand that this service is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic isolation creates additional barriers for medical specialist visits: particularly financial, but also physical: weather changes and difficulties of small plane travel.</td>
<td>the commitment to the health and well-being provision of the CW budget. CW liaises with medical staff / patient / airline /whanau as needed</td>
<td>that residents feel cared for and assisted.</td>
<td>Challenges: Timing, ensuring that the correct dates are booked that people understand “check in times” (not Barrier style check in times! That taxi chits are updated correctly. And patients provide documentation of appointments in a timely way.</td>
<td>Limited and is for their benefit. Communicating clearly about responsibility is paramount for such a scheme to continue over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ka piki te ora ka hua te pai ki tatou iwi. Our people thrive, and life is good | On-going support. CW provides the best support for all our people. | Trust Confidentiality Longevity Delivery | Outcomes are such that people thrive, that life is as good as we can possibly manage with the resources at the table | Life is challenging – in a small, rural and very isolated community with no reticulated services, there are times it is overwhelming. Crisis care, and on-going support is essential for wellbeing. |

| Reassure that the service has no religious, political or ethnic partiality and it is a confidential and independent service. |  |  |  |  |
MOH Statistics July 2017 – June 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of contacts: per Monthly numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stats 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stats 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total MOH contacts: **MOH: 745**

Ministry of Health Stats: Travel to Hospital Services

Residents holding a Community Service Card (or under special circumstances) are eligible for assistance to travel to tertiary care at Auckland DHB base hospitals.

1. CW arranges registration of person with MOH travel scheme (NTA)
2. CW arranges for patient travel
3. CW scans letter relating to travel for verification to MOH
4. CW books online with air provider and ticket is issued to resident
5. CW provides taxi voucher (as appropriate)
6. CW arranges accommodation (as appropriate)

The numbers are only a representation of ‘a contact’ – the actual air ticketing but in fact include all the arrangements above.

This interaction could involve several phone calls and changes of arrangements, face to face interaction with a patient in need, the potential for referral for the person to other helplines or assistance, both on and off island. Phone calls, text, scanning and on-line booking.

At very basic figuring this is 15 tickets per week.
WINZ (MSD) Statistics July 2017 – June 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of contacts: per Monthly numbers &amp; Specific SNG FOOD request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of St John’s Community Church food boxes arranged through CW office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stats 2017</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINZ:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAILS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNG FOOD</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH FOOD</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stats 2018</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINZ:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAILS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNG FOOD</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH FOOD</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total WINZ contacts: 393
SNG FOOD Contacts: 31
St John’s Community Church Food Box: 52

**NB:** CW P has a contract with MSD for provision of WINZ service on Island. This contract specifies CW as a “remote reception desk” to verify documents and scan relevant details to WINZ (Waiheke Island Office at present).

**However:** the CW regularly interacts with people seeking financial assistance from WINZ beyond ‘the verification of documentation’. The CW is advocate, advice bureau and crisis referral. The CW provides explanation of process, MSD policy, and support with the notion of entitlement as opposed to ‘charity’: CW is navigator / kaiwhakatere of the systems and the tautoko for individuals in need of assistance.

**Trends:** Significant trend down in recorded WINZ interactions. Possibly due to inaccurate recording: WINZ contacts are recorded by paperwork i.e. a person has a paperwork interaction with WINZ through CW, then it is recorded (counted to be exact):

1. More people are being assisted to use online services
2. WINZ are offering less services: people are aware that WINZ is less likely to help with alternative energy equipment (solar panels, batteries, generators) requests than in past years (complex issue) for example.
3. WINZ routinely over past years requested more contact / paperwork per annum per client than their case management could properly process: requests for such repetitive information gathering have reduced.

4. More people are rolling over to NZS. Once on pension there tends to be significantly less need of interaction with WINZ – possibly many in this community are significantly better off once on pension. (Already very low income overall in population).

5. Requests for special needs grant food: non-recoverable (last 52 weeks): food assistance obtained directly from local shops by payment from WINZ to local shops have remained constant. People are required to prove hardship, they have a limited amount to draw on depending on family circumstance: about $400 per year. The food grant is specific to FOOD it is prohibited to buy alcohol, tobacco, or even magazines. Applications approx. same as last year.

Requests for Church food higher in the past 52 weeks. There has been an average of one food box per week. Requesting food is often felt to be particularly whakama - one can only praise the non-judgmental benevolence of our local church in their willingness to provide such emergency assistance. The C/W has criteria concerning the provision of assistance for food. Individuals / families cannot readily access such assistance unless as a last resort. Increase in Food boxes indicate 2 trends: they are less stressful to get than going to a shop with a WINZ food grant (embarrassing?), people are using up their food allowance at WINZ then relying on a food box when the next crisis happens: e.g. Car WOF, need for large gas bottle.
Telephone Statistics

2017 – 2018

Calls to Auckland are billed as included in MOB/Tolls & all Local Calls are charged.

The number of calls recorded for each billed month include: outgoing toll call, & MOB, incoming answered calls & local calls & txt messages.

Each call is recorded as ‘1’ contact, some calls are short others lengthy.

Trends:
- less telephone calls due to scan and email
- more txt messaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month of Bill</th>
<th>2016 - 2017 TOTAL</th>
<th>2017 - 2018 TOTAL</th>
<th>Toll Mcb</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>TXT</th>
<th>Working Days</th>
<th>Average Calls per day 2016-17</th>
<th>Average Calls per day 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Destination Great Barrier
P.O. Box 30 Claris
Great Barrier Island

Gt Barrier Local Board
Hector Sanderson Road
Great Barrier Island.

Dear Mr Fordham and Board

Please find attached the 5 monthly report – December 2017 to June 2018. Any queries please ring me on 0273222032.

Warm regards

Sue Whaanga, Chair DGBI 08/07/18
1. Snapshot

2018 is the fifth year of operation for the Destination Great Barrier Island Trust which is going from strength to strength in our mission of enhancing the economy and sustainability of our Island through tourism, events and encouraging visitors to buy local. The trust itself has changing membership from time to time but continues to have a strong presence from the North, the South and middle of the Island. New members have greatly added to the already strong skill sets of the core group.

Once again the extended summer season saw full planes and boats with very little availability for last minute bookings, demand for all services was high with Visitor Info Centre staff ringing operators on a daily basis to ascertain availability for casual “walk in” types of visitors. This was the first season that we really had any impact from Air B n B users - who were here in droves, the Visitor Info Centre compiled a list totalling in the 60s, of homes registered as Air B n B's which was extremely helpful to transport operators.

2. Progress to date

Decisions made in 2017 to apply for funding to- recognize GBI as a dark sky sanctuary, develop a new website, bring a social media trainer (Wanita Fourie) to the island over the course of 2018 to provide free media and business mentoring, and fund the manning of the Visitors Centre have all proven to be extremely successful.

- The Dark Sky launch was an extremely successful event since which the Dark Sky Advisory group has moved forward, currently in the middle of month long Matariki celebrations which began fabulously at Kawa marae with a dawn service - filmed for Te Karere , and will culminate in a “Stars in your Eyes” ball. An ongoing huge success and hopefully an annual event. DGBI continues to administer the funds allocated by Local Board on behalf of the Dark Sky Advisory Group.

- The new website is proving to be an invaluable tool and is constantly being improved and added too, currently we are endeavouring to include suppliers of local products to further encourage visitors to buy local, and after a year of free advertisements businesses are being asked to pay a nominal annual fee of $50.00 to have their services on the site.

- Wanita's visits are extremely popular. She has worked on general public social media training, processes for businesses to advertise on the Great barrier Facebook page, specific one on one business training with different on island businesses – all extremely beneficial to business growth. Wanita has also been working with the Visitor Info staff on events and promotion.

- The Visitor Info Centre has had a busy summer, Norm and Fleur Winger have taken over the contract and are settling into their work, preparing for another busy summer season. Personal development has been recognised as a key need and Wanita has been very helpful with her online training. Looking forward the trust has realised that hours need to be extended, particularly over the busy season so funding applications are being worked on to have long term fiscal security. Also, to extend the services to our visitors and tourism industry, funding is needed for a Tourism Co-Ordinator to focus on development of on- island events and local business.
capability requirements as needed. A stand-alone Visitor Info Centre is also in the pipeline. We also acknowledge the need for more collateral to be available for visitors and more bookings being made to generate some income for the operation. There are no real challenges to staffing the Visitor Centre apart from the physical aspect of it being in a corner of the airport building, however signage is currently being developed to ensure all visitors can find the information they need.

Visitor Strategy

This has been completed in and is with the Board for consultation, the staff at the Visitor Centre worked actively to ensure as many people as possible participated, Destination GBI Trust members look forward to working with the Board on this document.

Looking forward.

Exciting times ahead for our Island, managing the infrastructure to ensure our visitors experience the very best we have to offer and there is work to be done. A presence at Tryphena Wharf and Port Fitzroy Wharf on peak boat days would be helpful as would the implementation of Ambassador training (as developed by ATEED) for those of us who interact with our visitors.

All of these things depend on funding and we are fortunate to have Gondie Somerville-Ryan spearheading researching funders and applying for ongoing funding, a huge job which she manages extremely well. While most of the volunteers on the Trust are directly involved in tourism services it is great to have members from outside the sector to keep it real.

The final Visitor Strategy Document will be the template for the future of our tourism industry and as such will provide a valuable tool for all to use.

Yours sincerely,

Sue Whaanga

Chair, Destination Great Barrier Island.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Objective</th>
<th>Progress Achievements KPI’s</th>
<th>Highlights and Challenges</th>
<th>Looking Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DGRI website</td>
<td>Increase the Profile of GBI as a tourist destination</td>
<td>Web site is working well and receiving many enquiries daily</td>
<td>Web page is clear and informative. After a year's free Advertisements businesses no being asked to pay $50.00 per year.</td>
<td>Expanding the page to include local suppliers, updating all info and collecting more photos etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of Visitors Centre</td>
<td>Ensure all visitors have a positive experience and encourage them to buy local</td>
<td>New contract in place, visitor centre hours have been extended in the busier months. Additional funding was also received to achieve this</td>
<td>Training in online marketing has begun and is proving successful, the centre is tucked in a corner of the airport so signage is being sourced</td>
<td>Encouraging new tourism ventures to advertise on our webpage, increase the amount of commissionable bookings through the centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor strategy</td>
<td>Engage visitors in an online survey.</td>
<td>Board and Visitor centre staff worked hard on encouraging participation</td>
<td>The survey has been completed and is with Local Board</td>
<td>Workshop with local Board and community to ensure the best outcomes from the information received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, and 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Empower local business on line capabilities</td>
<td>We have had the On line Academy’s Wanita Foure over twice with public social media training and individual business mentoring</td>
<td>Wanitas workshops have proven very popular and effective, one on one mentoring has been extremely well received.</td>
<td>Continue and expand these workshops with On line Academy encourage more business owners to take advantage of mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign maintenance</td>
<td>Maintain signs</td>
<td>Oil application monthly</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Carry on with quarterly applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Balance Sheet

Destination Great Barrier Island Inc  
As at 30 June 2018

#### Add Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 Jun 2018</th>
<th>30 Jun 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Saver</td>
<td>49,964.78</td>
<td>81,832.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Sales</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheque ac</td>
<td>39,846.91</td>
<td>2,684.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bank</strong></td>
<td>89,543.69</td>
<td>84,815.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>11,393.50</td>
<td>3,105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory Assets</td>
<td>5,538.05</td>
<td>469.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>16,931.56</td>
<td>3,574.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Equipment</td>
<td>449.00</td>
<td>449.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td>449.00</td>
<td>449.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>106,924.25</td>
<td>88,840.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 Jun 2018</th>
<th>30 Jun 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>889.78</td>
<td>(1,319.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookings</td>
<td>4,948.84</td>
<td>4,293.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Adjustment</td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>68.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax</td>
<td>(1,860.65)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounding</td>
<td>(404.20)</td>
<td>(404.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>3,342.68</td>
<td>2,639.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://go.xero.com/f/report2.aspx?reportId=217fbf-1506-46ce-8f14-df6026e2a2f8&report&&statement=3ca7232b-5a33-4e4e-ac36-cae34562320498... 1/2
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7/2/2016</th>
<th>Xero</th>
<th>Balance Sheet</th>
<th>Destination Great Barrier Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dark Sky Branding</td>
<td>(220.75)</td>
<td>$9,123.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Sky Committee</td>
<td>12,075.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Sky Launch</td>
<td>2,576.20</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mataiki Festival</td>
<td>9,559.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site design</td>
<td>(6,977.53)</td>
<td>6,822.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>(778.30)</td>
<td>(103.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,231.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,842.18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,774.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,481.22</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,150.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,359.10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Year Earnings</th>
<th>Retained Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36,760.97</td>
<td>(10,993.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,359.10</td>
<td>61,352.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,150.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,359.10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Report to the Great Barrier Local Board from the GBI Community Heritage and Arts Village Trust, for the 2017/2018 funding year

As can be seen from the figures below, the Gallery is continuing to grow. The Trust purchase of a Point of Sale system in June 2017 has made life a whole lot more straightforward for busy times of the year, and although the investment of $7000 was a lot, we feel it was an extremely worthwhile purchase.

Paid to artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>14946.81</td>
<td>15610.53</td>
<td>23382.68</td>
<td>19140.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>8779.29</td>
<td>9684.15</td>
<td>9152.83</td>
<td>10656.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>7439.32</td>
<td>13106.88</td>
<td>7760.41</td>
<td>8803.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>8559.7</td>
<td>6274</td>
<td>6519.03</td>
<td>8216.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>4364.9</td>
<td>2846.13</td>
<td>4305.91</td>
<td>7115.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>3379.03</td>
<td>3001.38</td>
<td>2690.08</td>
<td>4169.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>3942.2</td>
<td>1960.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1720.23</td>
<td>2270.61</td>
<td>3312.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>3147.09</td>
<td>4149.42</td>
<td>4574.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>6711.32</td>
<td>9046.95</td>
<td>11443.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>7984.73</td>
<td>8799.09</td>
<td>8852.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>12777.35</td>
<td>13562.02</td>
<td>16185.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>82151.77</td>
<td>92253.36</td>
<td>100360.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>24089.6</td>
<td>26009.2</td>
<td>35836.3</td>
<td>28399.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>14757.3</td>
<td>15295.7</td>
<td>15302.6</td>
<td>17693.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>11526</td>
<td>20140.63</td>
<td>12715.5</td>
<td>14075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>14886.1</td>
<td>11479.5</td>
<td>11886.8</td>
<td>12910.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>6597.5</td>
<td>5221.1</td>
<td>7615.7</td>
<td>10501.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4915.5</td>
<td>4754.1</td>
<td>4927.25</td>
<td>6220.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>510.7</td>
<td>6820.7</td>
<td>3370.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>2898.3</td>
<td>3933.8</td>
<td>5768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>5794.4</td>
<td>8454.1</td>
<td>6601.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>10655.2</td>
<td>15089.15</td>
<td>18559.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>13586.3</td>
<td>13411.35</td>
<td>14858.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>23679.23</td>
<td>23794.1</td>
<td>25486.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>139286.1</td>
<td>154403.4</td>
<td>162999.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have been continuing our annual programme, with workshops, exhibitions and Kids Art Club sessions – now two a week in Terms Two and Three thanks to additional funding, meaning we are now catering for two age groups, covering 5-12 year olds.

The basic plan/layout for the year, designed by Helen Knaggs and Nell Williams a number of years ago, is continuing to provide a solid base to work from, with events such as Matariki celebrations, and Winter workshops now a fixture in island life. This makes day to day operations much more straightforward as everyone knows what is coming up when.

We consistently have exhibitions booked by solo artists and groups, and new members joining.

**Coming up/ future aspirations and strategic planning**

**Fundraising**

Metal Tree Sculpture - We are working on plans to fundraise to clear the mortgage/ loan to Bob and Di for the costs for relocation of buildings. Currently this is down to $34,000 outstanding, on an original loan of $125,000, due to a monthly ‘percentage of profits’ paid.

The idea is a metal tree with individual leaves and birds that people can buy, and get their name stamped onto. At the moment we are working on costings for materials, and planning the overall design. Selling leaves gives us the flexibility to make the tree sculpture, and then leaves and birds can be added as and when they are sold. Other ideas investigated, required ALL items to be sold initially, such as bricks for a seat.

**Site Work**

The Trust is in the process of overhauling the windows in the School Masters building and improving the inside with gibstopping and a new coat of paint. The decision to prioritise here was made based on the continued increase in the number of organisations using this as a meeting space.

We also hope to purchase some new solar panels, to increase our power capacity.
Thanks to Local Board funding we will be able to complete the concrete paths round the site this winter and smarten up the shed.

We will also be taking clay footprints to celebrate all those who have been involved with the Gallery over the years. This is based on the hands in the path, but feet on a wall means we can add new volunteers/ Trust members over time, and it’s not reliant on us laying a new section of path.

Additionally, we are investigating the possibility of creating some studio spaces for artists in residence. Great opportunity for visitors to see artists in action.

Website/ Social Media

We are going to be working on developing the website further, and updating/ expanding the artist profiles, to help encourage sales off island.

Community Engagement

The Trust is looking at ways to engage as many island residents as possible. And trying to work out the best format/ methods for doing that.

Highlights and challenges of the year

The main challenge has been trying to find a suitable Gallery Coordinator. I stepped back from the role in October 2017, for personal reasons. However, neither appointed Coordinator worked out, and the Trust and I have been filling in as best we can. We hope to find someone suitable later in the year.

This has unfortunately limited our plans with the Museum development, which has had to be put on the back burner.

Ongoing challenge of trying to find volunteers is continuing, and the Trust is aware that our most consistent volunteers are getting rather elderly which may cause issue in the future, and may require a different approach to how the Gallery is run.

Despite the hiccups this year, we still are getting fabulous feedback from visitors, and plenty of exhibitions being booked. New members, with new artwork are joining the Gallery, which is great, as it’s always so exciting to have totally new styles and makers involved.
### SCHEDULE 1 - OBJECTIVES & MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Auckland Plan Directive</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Actual (to be completed at end of contract for reference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people have opportunities to participate in the activities and programmes of the centre</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Target participation by at least two school groups per year</td>
<td>Matariki Celebrations attended by Playcentre and all three schools, Kids Art Club – weekly Terms 2 and 3, two age groups 5-8, and 8-12yrs 2 Kids Exhibitions a year Kids memberships – opportunity to create and sell their own work Creepies and Crawlies kids drop in sessions New Year’s Picnic – free art activities for children Skateboard design workshops for kids aged up to 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activities and programmes offered by the centre are ‘family-friendly’</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>At least two programmes/activities per year that are suitable for and participated in by all age groups</td>
<td>Matariki celebrations Members art exhibitions – participation is open to all ages New Year’s Picnic – free art activities for children Gallery – families can visit and see a range of artworks on display.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people have opportunities to participate in the activities and programmes of the centre</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>At least one programme/activity per year aimed at older people; evidence of older people taking part in mainstream programmes</td>
<td>Winter workshop programme Members exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity/programme allows participants to experience Māori traditions and world views, and/or Māori participate in the activity/programme; and/or there are direct outcomes of the activity/programme for Māori people</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>At least one programme/activity per year aimed at Māori or involving Māori-generated content; evidence of Māori taking part in mainstream programmes</td>
<td>Matariki celebrations, children’s Matariki art works Performances by island children – approximately 100. Attended by parents and friends and family members Artwork by the children on display for a month Winter Workshop Programme participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity/programme reflects the diversity of culture in Auckland, including the use of languages and/or other forms of cultural expression</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Evidence that the programme reflects the cultural diversity of the local Great Barrier Island community.</td>
<td>Matariki Celebrations Winter Workshop Programme is based as much as possible on island residents interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to a balanced network of cultural facilities and programmes across Auckland</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Evidence of increased use of facility by members of the public; and increased use of the gallery as a venue for activities and events for the local community groups</td>
<td>Visitor numbers – increased again this year to 10862 for 2017 year, or 11155 from July 2017 – end of June 2018 School Masters room bookings. Regularly used space now. Booked by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHEDULE 2 - LOCAL BOARD OBJECTIVES & MEASURES

| Objectives | Auckland Plan Directive | Key Performance Indicators | Actual  
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------|
| To develop the Museum project to create a facility to showcase Barrier history | 4.2, 4.3 | Collaboration with GBI History Research Group, iwi, Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai K/ Aotea and other organisations who have relevant input  
Open part of the building to showcase items  
Cataloguing of donated items  
Development of a planned layout/display/preservation of items | The opening of the building is in progress. Training has been undertaken towards cataloguing of items with workshop run by Te Papa. Display cabinets purchased through funding from Te Papa have been assembled. More items are being donated. |
| To develop a vision for a Sculpture Park and Trail, in collaboration with the Local Board, subject to confirmation of land being available | 3.3, 3.4 | The development of a plan to suit all parties, through to final approval  
The lease of the site.  
Realization of the Sculpture Park and Trail. | Still ongoing  
A new site needs to be found due to boundary relocations.  
Public art pieces commissioned at the Gallery, and one to be temporarily here, then moved to a public space after consultation by LB regarding reserves on island. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Narration</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-0920</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council Arts Funding Agreement</td>
<td>($10,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08/17</td>
<td>5106944016</td>
<td>Auckland Council Grant 5106944016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1345</td>
<td></td>
<td>Administration Wages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/17</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307681</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307682</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/17</td>
<td>30 Sep 2017</td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307683</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307684</td>
<td>755.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/10/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307685</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/17</td>
<td>31 Oct 2017</td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307686</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/11/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307687</td>
<td>770.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307688</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/17</td>
<td>30 Nov 2017</td>
<td>E Williams wages, Invoice # 307689</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/18</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>E Williams wages - overtime, Invoice # 307690</td>
<td>515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>IRD Payment 80-956-322 30 Nov 2017 A/C no. 0360490003100027</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRD Payment</td>
<td>308.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Account Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/08/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>FMS Insurance - part payment</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Account Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cash Flow - Monthly (Excl GST) MAR 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1000 Donations Received</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3000 Gallery Sales</td>
<td>11,912</td>
<td>9,071</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>3,282</td>
<td>5,559</td>
<td>6,195</td>
<td>17,022</td>
<td>14,557</td>
<td>23,083</td>
<td>23,851</td>
<td>24,473</td>
<td>11,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4030 Membership Income</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5110 ASBI FOUNDATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5200 NZ Lotteries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5215 Workshop Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5250 Auckland Council Art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5275 Auckland Council Pub</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5400 ACC Creative Comm</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5420 ACC Community Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5500 COGS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5600 Rent Received</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5701 Te Puna Helping Hand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8010 Workshop Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9000 Kids Art Club income</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>17,121</td>
<td>12,111</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>11,060</td>
<td>24,329</td>
<td>8,563</td>
<td>37,607</td>
<td>21,770</td>
<td>23,624</td>
<td>23,976</td>
<td>24,703</td>
<td>37,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Less: Direct Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1000 Consignment Stock</td>
<td>7,584</td>
<td>6,712</td>
<td>4,483</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>11,285</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>15,546</td>
<td>16,167</td>
<td>9,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1010 Consignment Stock</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1030 Contractors - GST</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2000 Gallery Stock Purchases</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2080 Packaging Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8010 Workshop Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8025 Tutor Fees- Kids Art C</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1050 Advertising</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Expenses</td>
<td>8,702</td>
<td>9,308</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>6,743</td>
<td>17,877</td>
<td>15,505</td>
<td>15,633</td>
<td>24,911</td>
<td>11,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gross Profit (Loss)

| Profit (Loss)                               | 8,328    | 2,862    | 1,169    | (16,667) | 17,020   | 1,919    | 39,794   | 3,693    | 8,136    | 8,043    | 92       | 26,282   |

### Less: Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1045 Administration Wage</td>
<td>3,491</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>3,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>Cash Flow - Monthly (Excl GST) MAR 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1020 Petty Cash</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1040 Accounting Fees</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1100 Bank fees</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1200 Computer Expenses</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1300 Dues &amp; Subscriptions</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1310 Estates Fees</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1550 General Expenses</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1600 Insurance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1600 Maintenance</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2006 Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2011 Supplies Expenses</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2012 Volunteers expenses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2101 Freight paid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2130 Project supplies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2250 Small Tools &amp; Equip</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2300 Rent Paid</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2310 Stationery &amp; Postage</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2400 Telephone</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2500 Travel &amp; Accomodati</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2600 Gas</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit (Loss)</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Other Deposits</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1000 Interest Income</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Other Withdrawals</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td>21,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All figures are in thousands of dollars.
### Cash Flow - Monthly (Excl GST) MAR 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-2300 D Hayes &amp; F Lawson</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital and Development</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>15,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cash Movement In (Out)</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>(14,186)</td>
<td>(5,055)</td>
<td>(22,505)</td>
<td>11,320</td>
<td>(4,514)</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>(3,936)</td>
<td>(1,160)</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>(4,624)</td>
<td>2,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cash Book Balances Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opening Balance</th>
<th>Plus: Movement</th>
<th>Closing Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81,581</td>
<td>(14,186)</td>
<td>67,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3,058)</td>
<td>(22,505)</td>
<td>44,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34,639</td>
<td>(1,160)</td>
<td>33,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**GBI Community Heritage & Arts Village Trust**

**Cash Flow - Monthly (Excl GST) MAR 2018**

---

**CCDE 1-GBICH**

---
Aotea Family Support Group End of funding period report FY 2018

Summary
As outlined below, thanks to our funders support the Aotea Family Support Group is able to offer a well-established support programme in our community, especially for younger and older residents and those finding themselves unexpectedly in need of support. We do this with a number of part time staff, a group of volunteer trustees and close collaboration with other individuals and groups in the community. Through our work, our volunteers and our partners, we have good feedback systems in place that substantiate the performance statistics we collect. The trust meets twice a year to review our performance in the context of our knowledge of the community and adopts planned outcomes accordingly. We can therefore feel confident that with the available resources we are providing effective social support services to our targeted clientele while at the same time being responsive to developing issues. Provided we receive continued financial support from our major donors, the Ministry of Children, the Lotteries fund, the Foundation North and Auckland Council Great Barrier Local Board we have the resources in place to continue in that role, as we have in the past 30 years.

Project outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>LB priority</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Highlights and challenges</th>
<th>Looking forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children and youth support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All planned outputs were delivered: school holiday programmes in term breaks, separate kids activity programmes for Y/8 and correspondence students, annual camp (at Orana/Hilary outdoors).</td>
<td>Children and youth have been able to take part in “safe and healthy activities, to grow in a positive environment with positive role models”, through these programmes.</td>
<td>While the school holiday programmes have enjoyed mostly near full attendance, engagement with older youth has been challenging. This has been addressed through recruiting a young outdoors oriented coordinator, running a very successful separate year 7/8 group and exploring alternative activities, eg weekend overnight, the collaboration with AE trust for leadership week, CAYAD events.</td>
<td>Continue holiday programme, Year 7/8 programme, off island trip to prepare transition to Auckland, collaborate on more activities with Learning Hub and AE, police and schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2x well attended parenting workshops were organized in spring and autumn. Welfare support/assistance was provided every month to an average of 3 families in difficulty.</td>
<td>Parents feedback stated improved skills and more confidence ‘to face challenges of parenting’. The families in crisis were supported.</td>
<td>There is good collaboration between the services, i.e. community worker and police. Noticeable is the lack of savings and resources among residents to face even smaller crises.</td>
<td>Apart from being available for crises and counselling support, our workers are also proactively reaching out through CAYAD and other networking efforts to be available for those in genuine need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regular programmes well attended of over 60s meals (32-48) along with monthly outings (9-12). Weekly physical exercise programme continued with typically 5 pp. Home maintenance assistance provided to 3 clients per month on average.</td>
<td>Older people tell us they are aging positively on the island and benefit from having access to support and peer networks as well as continuing to participate in the community.</td>
<td>Preparedness for old age and the inevitable dependence on assistance and living support is easily underestimated by aging Great Barrier residents.</td>
<td>Our services for aging persons are well established but the need to better prepare for aging needs more work. We generally reach out to older people to assist them with the process and we use NPY funds for assisting with home maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Two workshops benefitting community groups were held in late 2017, both attended by 17pp. This year we worked with Auckland Council’s CAYAD team to focus on Drug and Alcohol issue with 2 events. Crisis support was provided to 26 individual cases, incl referrals. The community vans were in use.</td>
<td>The intended outcomes were achieved, with the development of community organisation's capacity, residents in crisis supported, and the van. Tents and other resources being available for use of other groups, eg arts and crafts, kids soccer and surfing, etc.</td>
<td>We are limited in staff time to administer and maintain resources. We therefore have to rely on honesty and goodwill when we work with volunteers and officers for other groups. Limited staff time also affects capacity for community organization so we focus other planned outcomes and services.</td>
<td>We will continue providing resources but take a less active role in the organisation of community group huis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Services 2018/19

The current Schedule of Delivery represents well the work of the AFSG that Local Board financial support is required for. However, there is a disconnect between the Objectives and Measures (p3) and the Schedule of Delivery. Also, the most recent planning meetings refined some targeted outcomes. Our proposed amendments are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives (p3)</th>
<th>Schedule of delivery 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The general objective of the funding is to support the “Recipient” to provide for:</td>
<td>Children and Youth Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Youth support &amp; development programming</td>
<td>Remove:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Youth Self-development &amp; learning programming</td>
<td>2x Kids Activity Programmes for year 7/8s &amp; Learning Hub students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Family Support programmes for parents and families</td>
<td>Replace with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Support programmes for the older community</td>
<td>Out of school activities for students year 7 and up. (Group activities after school, weekends and/or during term break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Community Support</td>
<td>Justification:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove:</td>
<td>To allow for alternative youth engagement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Youth support &amp; development programming</td>
<td><strong>Older People Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Youth Self-development &amp; learning programming</td>
<td>Remove:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace with:</td>
<td>Firewood - Safe and Warm Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Children and youth support</td>
<td>Replace with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>- Senior’s home maintenance services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(to provide labour only for non-consentable repairs and maintenance to improve safety for senior residents, max 8h labour only.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aging advice (so that Residents over 60 have the opportunity to reflect on, be informed about and make decisions for changing needs with aging. Older people can remain in their homes.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To note the accountability report of Aotea Education Ltd, as stated in the terms of its funding contract.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. On Friday 19 December 2017, the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board agreed that “the Aotea Great Barrier Island Life-long Learning Strategy and Action Plan be governed by Aotea Education Ltd” and approved “a funding agreement of $30,000 towards implementation of the Aotea Great Barrier Island Life-long Learning Strategy and Action Plan to Aotea Education Ltd and noting that $5,000 will be allocated towards funding the Aotea Learning Hub for term 1 until 30 April 2018.”
3. Funding was provided to support the delivery of initiatives outlined in the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board Plan and the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board Agreement.
4. It is stated in the terms of the funding agreement that Aotea Education Ltd submits an end-of-year accountability report by 30 June 2018 and verbally presents that report at the July 2018 business meeting.
5. A copy of the Aotea Education Ltd end-of-year accountability report is attached.
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Aotea Education Ltd

7th July 2018

Great Barrier Island Local Board
Hector Sanderson Road
Claris, Great Barrier Island

Dear Izzy and Local Board members

Re: Accountability Funding Report on Funding Agreement 12th December 2018 – 30th June 2018

Please find enclosed the annual report covering the relevant period detailed above. Any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Aotea Education Director
Fleur Winger

Date 12 July 2018
Actea Education Ltd
76 Medland Rd, Tryphena
Great Barrier Island

Accountability Funding Report

12th December 2017 – 30th June 2018

Report to;

Great Barrier Local Board
Hector Sanderson Road
Claris, GBI

Report prepared by;

Fleur Winger
7th July 2018

Report to:       Great Barrier Local Board
                 Hector Sanderson Road
                 Claro, Great Barrier Island

Accountability Funding Report for the period of; 12th Dec – 30th June 2018

Summary
This hasn’t been easy! There have been times of great struggle to get things moving along when all involved are such busy people. However, I think we have done exceptionally well with having so many projects under one banner so to speak. We have just become a charitable trust so the work can be carried on and funding will be easier to attain. Not all age groups have been covered in this round but we have certainly covered a lot. It was interesting to see the outcome of Libby’s discussions with parents of preschool children for the Early Childhood Education initiative and that is covered in her report. Some of the projects are still running and some have just started which makes it difficult to see outcomes yet. There has been great turnouts at the Business Winter Workshop classes so far and the feedback from the first months participants will determine next month’s classes. Another fabulous turn out for the Leadership Training Week. It was interesting to be at the forum with Nikki Kaye and to hear the issues that face our young students on the island. Things ranging from telecommunications to QR codes on the tracks instead of large signs that need to be carried into the bush not to mention the upkeep that is required to keep them looking nice, getting their learner licenses. A big one for them is the cost of returning home from school and how they would love to be able to come home more often if the cost wasn’t such an issue.

We are still waiting for the results of the Gap analysis that has been gathered from the older island residents and are looking forward to hearing from their perspective what can be done to keep them engaged and active members of our community. It has been a terrific six months and all members of the trust are excited to be implementing the Life Long Learning and being part of making this island a better place for all ages. Thank you for your support.

1) Our people thrive and life is good
2) Our environment is protected and enhanced
3) Our infrastructure is future-proofed for our next generations
4) Our economy is sustainable and prosperous
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project objective</th>
<th>Corresponding Local Board Plan priority</th>
<th>Progress so far/key performance indicators (figures/stats)</th>
<th>Summary of outcomes – what difference has your organisation made?</th>
<th>Highlights and challenges</th>
<th>Looking forward - how you will improve on what you’re doing over the next 6 months?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter workshop</td>
<td>Deliver a weekly series of business based workshops over a four month period to support residents upskill and assist local businesses build capability. Provide workshop facilitation opportunities for locals with particular business based skills.</td>
<td>1, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Workshops start on the 14th July. We have been able to use local expertise for some of them which is good. PLEASE SEE APPENDIX A FOR MORE INFO ON THIS.</td>
<td>As these have not started yet it is difficult to judge what difference this will make. By the time of the meeting 28th August we should have a better picture of how the workshops have made a difference.</td>
<td>It has been interesting having our contractor away leading up to the start of these workshops. Communication hasn’t been great, we have had to trust everything is on track.</td>
<td>Until we get some feedback from the business community it is hard to say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE Scope and implementation plan</td>
<td>Have an accurate picture of gaps in ECE provision on island. Be informed on the range of options available for provision.</td>
<td>1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>We employed the services of a prominent consultant Libby Cunliff from 4e’s consulting. (See attached report) Libby has contacts in both the ministry and in the ECE. Something she is bringing into her contract with us. We have found her reliable and helpful and feel she is very much “on our side.” PLEASE FIND ATTACHED LIBBY’S ANALYSIS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (in pdf format, separate from this document).</td>
<td>Libby came to the Island and met with parents. It became very clear the necessity of an ECE on the island. Being able to free up mothers to re-enter the workforce will have a beneficial impact for this community.</td>
<td>The greatest challenge with this project was getting it up and running. We are just volunteers with full time work. It was a slow start but once Libby got the go ahead she was fantastic.</td>
<td>We will have a lot of work ahead of us getting the ECE set up. We will need some extra funding to pay an administrator for this project. There are some options presented to us and we may need to acquire some land. There is some other possibilities that will have to be looked into.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth leadership programme</td>
<td>Deliver in collaboration with AFSG a youth leadership programme for young people on island and at boarding school. Build young people’s confidence, social self-efficacy planning and problem solving abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attendance was better than expected with some days reaching over 30. The students were engaged and really enjoyed being together with North and South joining in a fun and supporting environment. PLEASE SEE APPENDIX B FOR MORE INFORMATION ON THE LEADERSHIP WEEK.</td>
<td>PLEASE SEE REPORT AS ATTACHED, APPENDIX B</td>
<td>This is a very popular initiative that has far exceeded expectations. The young adults on and off island have engaged well and really benefited from the time spent with each other. As many of the youth go to separate schools on the mainland it has been a chance for them to connect with each other and learn some wonderful life skills along the way.</td>
<td>We will have to add this to the yearly calendar for the youth on island. It was great to hear that Great Barrier Airlines came to the party with reduced airfares for our boarding students to attend. A big thank you to them. The prizes are a good draw card so we would be looking at finding some sponsorship for next year’s event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>Analysis of adult community learning (ACE) gaps and opportunities</td>
<td>Learning Hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish a clear understanding of gaps in ACE provision (e.g. adult literacy)</td>
<td>To help with operation of the learning hub, rent, phone, transport etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish an understanding of areas of interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish best approaches for delivery, e.g. how/when/where/with whom?</td>
<td>We haven’t used the funding yet as it was earmarked for the 3rd term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         | Members of the community have been approached and asked what they would like to learn if they had the opportunity. Not enough people have been interviewed so far so we are waiting on the final figures to come in. We have discovered that some of our apprentice providers have inquired to literacy classes for their apprentices, so they can do block courses. We have been in contact with an adult educator who has shown interest in providing these classes. | We have had some great progress with the learning hub students this year. Parents and coordinators alike have commented how more engaged the students are and the unit standards they are accomplishing. This is a vast improvement on previous years before the hub was established. 
PLEASE SEE ATTACHED FULL TERM ONE REPORT (PDF format and separate from this document) | |
|         | This is an ongoing project so the analysis hasn’t been done yet. | See report to MOE |
|         | The biggest challenge to this project was finding someone who would carry it out. Dr Ann Sprague has stepped in for us and has been taking and phoning people. Dr Sprague has been away a bit this winter, so it has been challenging for her to find the time. | We do need extra funding for the rest of the year and into the first term of next year. As the Learning Hub makes such a difference for these students it is important that it continues to be available to the students who for either financial or emotional reasons cannot go to boarding school. |
APPENDIX A – WINTER WORKSHOP SERIES

1) Update as at July 12 from workshop coordinator Rendt Gorton
2) workshop flyer, as distributed to all households and business owners
3) article printed in the Barrier Bulletin advertising the workshops

1) UPDATE FROM RENDT GORTER: Winter Business workshops series
Outcomes: Giving islanders the chance to up-skill and interact with other like-minded people.
Key indicators: Successful enterprises
Outputs:
By the end of the reporting period, planning and preparation for the 2018 winter workshop series was in place, with the recruitment of the programme coordinators, agreed learning objectives and an approved programme outline.
The programme will run from July to September with dates scheduled as monthly blocks of 3 weekly after work session followed by a Saturday workshop to deepen and consolidate learning. The monthly themes are administrative basics, sales and marketing, and business development.
The target audience includes both established businesses and freelancers as well as those intending to start a new business.
Marketing of the course included fortnightly Barrier Bulletin advertisements beginning a month ahead, a monthly feature article on the keynote speaker for the first session of each block, a maildrop around the island in the month preceding, an advertised Facebook page, occasional postings on Barrier Chitchat and word of mouth and direct emails to interested contacts.
Initial responses on Facebook and to a dedicated email address had 25 persons expressing interest to attend.

2) WORKSHOP FLYER:

Want to start your own business?
Are you self-employed?
Ready to diversify?
Aotea Education Ltd presents 3 block courses for small businesses, with funding from the Great Barrier Local Board.

July: Block 1 Getting the Basics Right: Financial literacy, employment, and your legal responsibilities.

August: Block 2 Sales and Marketing Fundamentals: Getting customers
to find you and having them come back.

**September: Block 3 Business Strategy:** Making your business succeed, year after year.

To find out dates and to enrol in any of these courses, visit www.facebook.com/aoteasbe or email aoteasbe@gmail.org.

3) **Barrier Bulletin article:**

**Getting down to business**

Running a successful business on Great Barrier Island, and enjoying the lifestyle you came for, may not be straightforward but is possible. The essential skills to help with that, range from basic financial literacy to strategic marketing, as well as being able to navigate the inevitable ups and downs with a robust business plan.

Following on from - and intended to complement - previous initiatives led by Destination Great Barrier, a new winter programme “Small Business Essentials” consists of three complementary block courses. The three-week-long courses make no assumptions about your prior knowledge but focus on providing you with the essential tools and competencies for growing your business. Even if you have been in business for years, you will learn something useful.

With guest speakers from off and on island, each course involves three after-work seminars, Tuesdays 5pm at the Art and Heritage Village in Claris, followed by a Saturday workshop to pull it all together in a personalised manual or strategy to take home. The first course, Getting the Basics Right, starts July 10.

The courses are aimed at present and future small business owners, especially sole traders and independent contractors, and are free thanks to funding by the Great Barrier Local Board. All you need to do is to enrol ahead of time and come along with your questions.

Rendt and Marea Gorster have been contracted by Aotea Education Limited to design and organise the course. Marea in the past used her training as secondary school teacher and diploma in small business studies to launch herself into business in Nelson with a tutoring service. She later sold the business before heading overseas to teach marine studies in Florida. Most recently, before she came to the island and worked with Aotea Education and the Learning Hub, she was the business manager of the Goat Island Marine Discovery Centre while also serving as chair of the Leigh Business Association. Rendt for this project draws on his past experience as project manager and workshop organiser, and also as adult education tutor in IT in the UK and Auckland.

Aotea Education expects that as part of the lifelong learning strategy, these courses will serve as a pilot for future winter programmes as well as providing the opportunity to gain feedback about other adult education needs to help residents sustain themselves economically and personally.

Everyone is invited to contribute ideas, recommendations and their experience to help our community thrive with this initiative.
APPENDIX B- YOUTH LEADERSHIP PROGRAMME

Evaluation Report

Aotea Exploration & Discovery Week 6th - 11th July 2018

A joint initiative of the Aotea Education Trust & the Aotea Family Support Group Charitable Trust

Concept

The idea behind this initiative was to provide a series of activities that would help our island rangatahi develop non-tangible skills such as leadership, team-participation, self-awareness, resilience and communication in a fun environment.

It was held during the July school holidays in order to bring together those who attend the Aotea Learning Hub with those who board off-island.

The week was loosely framed as a role-play, in which each participant represented one of five wakas that were landing on Aotea/Great Barrier Island. By completing various tasks over the week, the teams gained points which won them minor prizes (chocolates) at the end.

Major prizes (Macbook, iPad Mini, two GoPro cameras, UE Boom speaker) were awarded on the final day for those participants who had shown the greatest improvements in teamwork and leadership skills, and certificates were awarded to all those who had participated.

Activities took place from 10:00am-2:00pm at various venues around the island.

The organizers provided free transport and free catered lunches for participants and assistants.

The idea of a leadership week was presented by Shirley Johnson and the events were organized and coordinated by Sam Grimshaw and Kellie Cleave, with great assistance from Keri Lyon. Workshops and activities were facilitated by Sam Grimshaw, Kellie Cleave, Keri Lyon, Soul O’Reilly. Juliane Masina and Rendt Gorton, all of whom also helped with transporting participants to and from events. Various parents and other members of the community also contributed support.
Description of events

Day 1 – Marae Day (6/7/18)

We were called onto Kawa Marae by Eiaine Ngawaka and the staff and students of Okiwi School; Karakia, waiata, mihiwhi, korero and an explanation of the carvings were followed by outdoor cooperative and competitive adventure-based learning (ABL) games (the Human Knot, the Mute Line-Up, Drunken Sailor and Grab the Finger). After sharing lunch, the boys learned a haka while the girls learned a waiata and then performed them for each other.

Everybody enjoyed themselves, and from an organizational point of view it all went off very smoothly, with great cooperation from Ngati Rehua Ngatiwai ki Aotea and the staff and students of Okiwi School.

Day 2 – Waka Day (7/7/18)

We met up at Mulberry Grove beach and after a brief introduction and explanation we divided up into five teams and had a lesson on waka ama paddling technique with competitive paddler/racer Charles Nepia. The teams each raced a set course against the stopwatch with Charles helming for each team.

After the races were over we simulated a man-overboard situation in which one of the younger participants volunteered to jump in the sea (extra bravery points went to Magnus Kendall-Laven!). The team signalled to the onlookers onshore what had happened and one of the other participants used a VHF radio to call the coastguard.

The three coastguard volunteers Roger Bright, Skinny __?__ and Wayne Sanderson came and gave the teams a talk and quiz on marine safety and what is involved in coastguard volunteering.

We had lit a fire in a steel drum on the beach and shortly afterwards the rural fire service (same volunteers as above, wearing different uniforms) arrived with sirens blaring and lights flashing. One of the participants helped to aim the hose to put it out.

A talk and quiz was given on fire safety as well as an explanation of how the rural fire service operates.

Finally we simulated a situation in which one of the participants was suffering from smoke inhalation. The St. John’s Ambulance arrived, again with lights and sirens and filled Hayden with tubes and stretched him out. The whole exercise was done as a practical quiz/game for the teams to take part in. Adam Johnston led the activity and gave a short talk on ambulance volunteering and first aid for burns and was assisted by volunteers Michelle Harris and Jonathon __?__.

This was by far the most difficult day to coordinate, in terms of timing of the events and liaison with the three services. Weather, tide, extra Health & Safety considerations were all factors in organizing this day. Nevertheless we cooperated very well and it all went off well. Many participants even came up afterwards to say how much they had enjoyed themselves (and we’re talking about 15-year-olds here).

Numbers were much larger than the previous day as many boarders had been unable to attend the previous day’s events.
Day 3 – Leadership Day (9/7/18)

We met at Barleyman’s Cottage in Okupu and kicked off with a review of the points won by each team from Saturday’s events. We then played an energizer game, discussed the concept of leadership and played various other ABL games, both indoors and outdoors.

The teams then prepared various short workshops which they would lead. The younger island students (aged 8-12) who were taking part in the AFSG School Holiday Programme came in to participate and learn in these workshops led by their older peers. Activities taught by the older students to the younger ones included flax-weaving, Te Reo Maori and group percussion games. Gradually the groups merged and mingled and the skills and games were enjoyed by all.

Some of the younger children were timid to join in at first, but were soon reassured by the participants of the leadership workshops. It was fun to observe how the older students took the younger ones under their wings during these activities, and also how they demonstrated many of the leadership qualities that we had discussed at the start of the day.

Games and activities were coordinated by Soul O’Reilly and I.

Day 4 – Citizenship Day

We met at Barleyman’s Cottage in Okupu again. We had a review of the previous day’s activities, played a 20-minute game of “Psychiatrist,” a fun ice-breaker then moved on to a practice session of the haka and waiata that the participants had learned on Day 1. Participants organized themselves into groups and tutored each other.

After a snack, we held a short discussion about the concepts of agency and citizenship, then each group prepared a proposal on their ideas of how they might ‘improve’ the island. A panel of representatives (Nikki Kaye MP, Luke Coles, Lisa Eves and Fleur Winger) arrived and groups presented and discussed their proposals.

Positive feedback was given on the proposals and some ideas may be followed up on (QR codes on local signage, flight subsidies for students, a recreation centre).

Day 5 – Careers Day

Speakers arrived and set up stalls. One of the students led a karakia. Throughout the morning we heard presentations by the following:

Tama Toki (Aotea Tonics)
Joanne and Brett O’Reilly (Envirokwi)
Caity Endt (Okiwi Passion)
Sarah Harrison (local potter)
Pete Thomasen (BCITO)
Kristy Reichl (Taratahi)
Julia Bryant (Spirit of Adventure Trust)
Sarah Caves (Northland Polytechnic)
Barry Watkins (paramedic on Auckland Rescue Helicopter)
Guy Mac (Surf film-maker)
Nikki Kaye MP

A catered and shared lunch was provided.
The event was visited by parents, other students, siblings and many other interested members of the public.

Several of the participants volunteered to stand up and give presentations on their experiences during the AED week.

We held a prize-giving ceremony, in which certificates were handed to all participants. Chocolates were given to the winning team and the grand prizes were awarded to five individuals who had shown the greatest improvement in the various qualities of leadership, self-confidence, teamwork, etc.

We finished off the events with the waiata and haka that the participants had learned at Kawa Marae on Day 1 and had practised throughout the week.

This was one of the more complicated days to organize. Most of the logistics (flight bookings for speakers, venue booking, catering, programme for the day) were taken care of almost entirely by Kellie Cleave.
Great Barrier Island
Area Feasibility and Implementation Plan
July 2018
Introduction

The services of 4E’s Consulting were engaged by Aotea Education Ltd to carry out area feasibility on Great Barrier Island. The purpose of this area feasibility is to research and provide recommendations on what Early Childhood Education (ECE) service option is the most suited to Great Barrier Island.

Research Undertaken

Face to Face Meetings

Libby Cunniffe, from 4E’s Consulting, visited Great Barrier Island on Friday 15 June 2018 and held three meetings.

The first an open public meeting (held at Playcentre) in which there were 8 attendees, the second at Playcentre in which there were 4 additional attendees to the public meeting and the final at Playgroup in which there were 3 attendees.

Survey

In addition to these meetings a survey was given to each person in attendance and this was also posted on the Aotea Mums Page which has 43 members and the Barrier Chitchat page which has 2138 members. These surveys were posted to social media to ensure those who were interested had the opportunity to participate if they could not access one of the face to face meetings.

Due to the request of one of the attendees at the Playgroup meeting, the survey was also emailed to her for any interested parties to complete and return.

Through the four different avenues of distribution 32 surveys were completed.

The details of this survey are detailed below:

1) Question: Do you currently attend Playcentre or Playgroup?
   Answer: 52.5% answered yes.
   47.5% answered no.

2) Question: If a “drop off” Early Childhood Service was available to you would you use this?
   Answer: 91% answered yes.
   9% answered no.

3) Question: What area of Great Barrier Island would be the most ideal location for a “drop off” ECE Service for you? (more than one option can be selected)
   Answer: Claris: 49%
   Tryphena: 35%
4) **Questions**: What age are your children? (more than one option can be selected)
   
   **Answer**: Under 2: 34%
   
   2-3 Years: 33%
   
   3-5 years: 33%

5) **Question**: What days would you use a “drop off” ECE Service? (more than one option can be selected)
   
   **Answer**: Monday: 25%
   
   Tuesday: 14%
   
   Wednesday: 23%
   
   Thursday: 17%
   
   Friday: 21%

6) **Question**: What hours would you use a “drop off” ECE Service? (more than one option can be selected)
   
   **Answer**: Morning: 33%
   
   Afternoon: 9%
   
   School Day (9am – 3pm): 47%
   
   Full Day: 3%
   
   Casual: 8%

7) **Question**: How much would you expect to pay per hour? (more than one option can be selected)
   
   **Answer**: Less than $5: 16%
   
   $5-$6: 48%
   
   $6-$7: 24%
   
   More than $7: 12%
8) Question: Do you currently have an ECE qualification?
   Answer: 100% answered no

9) Question: Would you be interested in gaining an ECE qualification?
   Answer: 86% answered no.
   11% answered yes.
   3% answered maybe.

10) Question: Would you be open to becoming a home based educator?
    Answer: 93% answered no.
    7% answered yes.

**Facebook Poll for Teachers**

Where: NZ ECE Managers Page (3800 teachers and managers as members)

Question asked: “If an ECE Centre was to open on Great Barrier Island would you, as a teacher, want to move there to work?”

The response was:

- 67% responded no.
- 25% responded yes.
- 8% responded maybe.

**Communication with Local Midwife**

“The births on Great Barrier seem to run fairly consistently at 10-12 per year. Last year there were 14 but this year only 8. A preschool would be awesome as the children coming through are amazing. One of the problems with the feasibility in the past has been the population spread over considerable distance – ie 5 of the 8 pregnancies this year are in the North of the island and in reality I doubt that any of these mothers would be in a financial position to travel for preschool (quality of vehicles & cost of fuel & culture).”

Midwife: Adele Sauer
Contact: adele@aoteahealth.co.nz
Communication with Local Medical Centre

Due to confidentiality we were unable to see any official statistics of current population on Great Barrier Island, however through our calculations and communication with local residents we estimate that there are currently between 70-75 children under the age of 6.

Information Specific to Great Barrier Island

- Great Barrier Island has population of approximately 939 (communication with local residents suggest this is nearer to 1200).
- There are 510 occupied dwellings and 453 unoccupied dwellings in Great Barrier Local Board Area.
- 16.3 percent of people are aged under 15 years in Great Barrier Local Board Area.
- Couples with children make up 26.9 percent of all families in Great Barrier Local Board Area.
- 17.9 percent of families in Great Barrier Local Board Area are one parent with children families.
- Great Barrier is the largest island off New Zealand’s North Island. Nearly 60% of the island is public land managed by the Department of Conservation or Auckland Council with only 42% of the island in private ownership. Almost half of all dwellings are used only as holiday homes.

Information gathered from 2013 Census and Statistics New Zealand.

Surrounding Education Facilities

Early Childhood Services

Map indicating sites of two local services.

Playcentre – 29 children attending.
Playgroup – 13 children attending.
Primary Education

Map indicating sites of three local schools.

Okiwi School - Roll 31 - Full Primary (Years 1 – 8)
Kaitoke School - Roll 32 - Full Primary (Years 1-8)
Mulberry Grove School - Roll 25 - Full Primary (Years 1 – 8)
(However, local residents informed 4E’s Consulting that the roll of Mulberry Grove is now 12 pupils and the roll of Kaitoke School has increased due to this significant change).

Information gathered from the latest ERO Report for each primary school.

Intermediate Education

Although there is no specific Intermediate School on Great Barrier Island all of the Primary Schools operate as ‘Full Primary’ which includes intermediate aged pupils.

Secondary Education

There are no Secondary Schools currently operating on Great Barrier Island.

SWOT Analysis

STRENGTHS:

- Great Barrier Island needs a facility in which children can be dropped off and left.
- A team of professional advisors will work closely with the community of Great Barrier Island to support and guide the business to be successful.
- There are currently 29 children who attend Playcentre at each session and 13 children who attend Playgroup at each session.
- There are approximately 70-75 children under the age of 6 on Great Barrier Island indicating that a small ECE Service would be successful.
WEAKNESSES:

• No current building to establish the ECE Centre.
• No fully qualified, registered teachers on Great Barrier Island.

OPPORTUNITIES:

• This is a family friendly business - flexibility in working hours and having childcare as an option (if when needed).
• To provide before and after school care as well as holiday programmes to further benefit the parents within the Great Barrier Island Community.
• Some of the residents of Great Barrier Island may be interested in gaining and qualification.
• To create and provide a positive community hub for other uses in the upstairs area, outside of operating hours. Eg. Playgroup, mums and bubs yoga, boardroom rental etc.

THREATS:

• Increases and decreases in the birth rate and therefore occupancy of children attending.
• Cost of fees being too much for parents/caregivers to be able to afford.
• Government change and policies that may affect funding.

Recommendations

Option One: Home Based Service

What is a home-based education and care service?

Home-based education and care services are defined in the Education Act 1989 as those that provide "education or care, for gain or reward, to children who are under the age of 5 years, or who are 5 years of age but not enrolled in school, in -

• the children’s own home; or
• the home of the person providing the education or care; or
• any other home nominated by the parents of the children; and includes the provision of education or care to any child of the person providing the service who is
  • under the age of 5 years; or
  • 5 years of age but not enrolled in school”.

‘Gain or reward’ means that educators must be paid or receive some quantifiable benefit for the service they provide.

The use of volunteer or unpaid educators excludes the service provider from holding a licence as the service provider does not meet the definition of a home-based ECE service under the Education Act 1989.

Information gathered from the Ministry of Education Website.
What will need to be considered to make this a viable option for Great Barrier Island?

Would Aotea Education Ltd be the Service Provider?

If Aotea Education Ltd is to be the Service Provider do they have a person who would step into the Contact Person role?

Who would be employed to be the person responsible and what does this mean in regards to hours, travel, living costs etc?

Who is interested in becoming a Home Based Educator? (To be an educator you would be willing to work in your own home or the home of another person and that the home being used meets all regulations such as being fully fenced).

---

**Service provider**

is the body, agency or person operating the home based education and care service. It is the holder of the licence, and is directly responsible for delivering education and care services in homes, in accordance with the regulations and licensing criteria.

**Contact person**

is responsible for representing the service provider's management, responding to the Ministry on any issue relating to licensing and acting on behalf of the service provider when dealing with the Ministry. They must reside locally within a Ministry region.

**Person responsible/Coordinator**

has primary responsibility for overseeing education and care, comfort, and health and safety of the children, and professional leadership and support to educators within the service. They must hold a current practising certificate from the Education Council, and be available for all licensed hours of operation.

**Educator**

has the designated role of providing education and care directly to children in his or her care and attending to the health and safety of these children.

---

**Overview Home Based Service**

Home environments provide learning opportunities and experiences in contexts that are different from centres. The daily occurrences and materials that are already part of the home environment (such as cooking, shopping, gardening) provide rich learning opportunities for children. A strength for home-based education is the opportunity for children to go out and about in the community. Educators should be encouraged to utilise the equipment, opportunities and resources that are available in their local communities.

The service provider must ensure that the homes used in your service are equipped to provide for the children who attend. Variety, quality and quantity of equipment is required to enable educators to support the wide range of learning and abilities and interests of the children attending.
Option Two: Centre Based Service

What is an early childhood education and care centre?

An early childhood education and care centre is defined in the Education Act 1989 as “premises used regularly for the education or care of 3 or more children (not being children of the persons providing the education or care, or children enrolled at a school being provided with education and care before or after school) under the age of 6 —

- by the day or part of a day; but
- not for any continuous period of more than 7 days.

Information gathered from the Ministry of Education Website.

What will need to be considered to make this a viable option for Great Barrier Island?

Would Aotea Education Ltd be the Service Provider and therefore the ECE Centre would be community owned and operated?

If Aotea Education Ltd is not to be the Service Provider then can a private service provide be found and therefore the ECE Centre would be privately owned and operated?

Is there land available to establish a site? Or is there a building which can be renovated suitably?

If a Centre Based ECE Service is to be established what size would the licence be based upon the current population of approximately 10 under 6 year olds.

How will the ECE Centre be staffed? Initially and long term?

What are the current barriers due to geography and how can these barriers be mitigated?

Basic Timeline of a Full ECE Centre Service Start Up

- Find site
- Secure Site
- Business Plan with Financials
- Secure Finances
- Negotiations of Heads Of Agreement (HOA) and Agreement To Lease (ATL)
- Sign HOA
- Resource Consent
- Sign ATL
- Marketing Planning
- Site Plans – Building
- Building Consent
- Building Commence
- Site Plans – Landscaping
- Content Writing for all Marketing and Documentation
• Resource and Furniture Ordering
• Resource and Furniture Fit Out
• Book Licence and Health Checks
• Consumable Order
• Technology Order and Fit Out
• Operational Planning
• Operational and Educational Documentation
• Landscaping Commence
• Human Resource Planning
• Human Resource Processes – Hiring Staff
• Licence and Health Checks
• Building Complete
• Open Days
• Great Barrier Learning Centre Opens

Relevant Legislation
• Ministry of Education ECE Regulations 2008
• Playground Safety Standards
• Community Health for ECE Centres (commercial)
• Kitchen Registration/ Certification
• Ministry of Education Licence

Initial Implementation Plan
Initial tasks to be carried out week of 2nd July 2018:

➢ Libby to contact Shirley in regards to Orama.
➢ Libby to contact Ministry of Education in regards to Mulberry Grove School, land near Mulberry Grove School and land near Kaitoke School.
➢ Kathy to look into possible funding options for a community owned ECE Centre.
➢ Libby to contact private owners to see in interested in this ECE Centre option.
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Glossary

- ALH or Hub - Aotea Learning Hub
- Te Kura - Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu
- Student - Great Barrier Island Student enrolled with Te Kura
- OTLE - Online Teaching & Learning Environment (Te Kura)
- Te Kura Teacher Aide - Kāiāwhina
- MoU - Memorandum of Understanding
- Island - Great Barrier Island
- NCEA - National Certificate of Educational Achievement
- NCEA Student - Year 11 - 13
- non-NCEA Student - Year 9 - 10
- ILPs - Individual Learning Plans
- NZQA - New Zealand Qualifications Authority
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The ALH was open to all Te Kura Students on Great Barrier Island during the entire School Term 1 2018 Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. The open times were from 0900 until 1300. The Hub was staffed by at least one Coordinator and one Kaiāwhina at all times. Free transport to and from the Hub was offered on all days via the use of the Community Van. The premise of the ALH is the Barleyman Cottage on Mosaa View Road, Okupu, Great Barrier Island. In Term 2, the Hub will be open on the same 4 days as in Term 1, but from 0900 until 1400. This increase of study time will lift academic achievement, as the main issue of low academic achievement is attributed to considerably less time spent on study for our distance learners when compared to Students who attend a regular school.
Chapter 2

Reporting Measures

2.1 Student Engagement: attendance rates at the Hub & completion of Te Kura units

Attendance has been satisfactory and higher than in Term 1 2017 as shown in table 2.1. Furthermore, the attendance rate of 80% or higher has also increased. 6 Students attend the Hub at a rate of 80% or higher. The important reasons for higher attendance are itemized in the following:

- parents/caregivers realizing that Students who attend the Hub regularly achieve academically on average more than Students who do not
- parents/caregivers realizing that ALH Staff are committed and competent to assist Students with distance learning
- parents/caregivers realizing that their children benefit from regular and supervised social interaction with their friends and peers
- Te Kura Teachers and Learning Advisers strongly endorsing the ALH and encouraging regular attendance

It should be noted that table 2.1 does not account for absence due to sickness or being off island. Furthermore, a few Students only attend the Hub when they require assistance with subject matter. In other words, they prefer to study at home, but attend the Hub to get assistance and tutoring for specific subjects like, for instance, maths. Te Kura Teachers and Learning Advisers visited the Hub on the 20th and 21st of February. The average attendance per week was 7.
### Table 2.1: Attendance Term 1, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Dates</th>
<th>Daily Attendance</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Weekly Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed 7 Feb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 8 Feb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 9 Feb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 13 Feb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 14 Feb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 15 Feb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 16 Feb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 20 Feb</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 21 Feb</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 22 Feb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 23 Feb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 27 Feb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 28 Feb</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 01 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 02 Mar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 06 Mar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 07 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 08 Mar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 09 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 13 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 14 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 15 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 16 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 20 Mar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 21 Mar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 22 Mar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 23 Mar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 27 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 28 Mar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 29 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 03 Apr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 04 Apr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 05 Apr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 06 Apr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 10 Apr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 11 Apr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 12 Apr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 13 Apr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.1.1 Term 2 Attendance Prognosis

To increase attendance, ALH staff will continue to talk to parents/caregivers of Students who rarely or infrequently attend the Hub. Empirical comparisons confirm that Students achieve academically better when attending the Hub. I attribute parent/caregiver complacency and not being fully aware of academic expectation levels as the reasons why some Students attend the Hub infrequently. There is potential to increase attendance for two Students. We must, however, fully acknowledge the wishes of parents/caregivers who want their children to study without attending the Hub. I know of three Students on the Barrier who do not attend the Hub. In all cases, personal communication clarified that the parents want their children to study at home. I, after such personal conversations, offered the services of the Hub and assure that we will help when/if assistance is required. We must exercise care not to ask for justification, and reassure that the Hub will help in any way to increase academic engagement and achievement. It is my opinion that parents/caregivers will change eventually their approach, and send their children to the Hub, should their target be achieving NCEA Level 2 and 3. 2 of our regular Students will attend boarding school in Auckland as of Term 2. Hence, we might see a reduction or no net increase in attendance rates next term.

Te Kura Units are not standardized in a form that useful analysis can be made from merely looking at the number of completed Units. Some Units non-NCEA Students work on can be done in 30 minutes. For instance, Units in English that teach punctuation and spelling. Furthermore, some of our Students conduct online Units only, some booklet Units only and some a mixture. Online Units for non-NCEA Students can comprise of “MathsBuddy” or “Reading Plus”. These Units can be finished in about 30 minutes. On the other hand, numeracy Unit Standards (NCEA) must be finished in a time frame of more than one month, as required by NZQA, to prove evidence of working knowledge of numeracy requirements.

Students who perform booklet work only, must mail (via post) their work to Te Kura and, as a result, it will take considerable time to receive teacher feedback. In that sense, a sent off Unit is not completed until the Student receives feedback. We assist all NCEA Students to scan and email their work to Teachers directly using Te Kura systems. This procedure results in a significantly quicker response time from teachers.

Most importantly, it must be acknowledged that Te Kura Units are not equal to Achievement and/or Unit Standards. For instance, when a NCEA Student (year 11-13)
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studies trigonometry, he/she will work on 3 Te Kura Units in NCEA 1. Upon completion of each, he/she will be released an assessment to showcase his/her knowledge in this subject area. For another subject field within the same subject, there might only be 1 Te Kura Unit involved.

Therefore, the useful measurable would be NZQA Standards completed. It makes sense to analyze Standard completions after Term 2 and Term 4. In the following, I have done my best to provide information in regards to Te Kura Units completed as per request.

For non-NCEA Students, we observe:

- 2-10 completed Te Kura Units per week

For NCEA Students, we observe:

- 1-2 completed Te Kura Units per week

2.1.2 Words on Attendance & Academic Achievement

The ALH is notably better endorsed/embraced island-wide than last year. Students who attend regularly are achieving significantly more academically than they could by studying at home. Care should be taken when using attendance numbers and relevant achievement as the short-term measure of the performance of the Hub. Moreover, comparing relative attendance and achievement with main land school numbers will also provide an inaccurate, at times wrong, picture of our overall performance. We are a geographically isolated, very small community and our Students are distance learners. Changing the attitude of families, and the approach used, in regards to secondary education cannot be changed quickly. It is a mid- to long-term goal. I am in regular private communications with parents/caregivers who believe their child is performing academically well. They base this on the amount of the time their child spends on school work and the amount of Te Kura Units they complete. However, these parents are in general surprised to hear that the measure of academic performance are Standards. In other words, the amount of credits their children receive per subject, per term and per year. I need to also point out that some of our senior Students have been exposed over years to a not well enough disciplined and organized learning environment. They have special learning needs, and it will take some time to get them to a level, where they can complete Standards in shorter time-frames.
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2.2 Age of Attendees

The age of our Students are 13 to 18 years.

2.3 Relevant Student Achievement Data - anonymised

- Year 10 Student has been, as a result of outstanding achievement in those subjects, has been lifted to NCEA Level 1 Maths & Digital Technology
- All NCEA Students regularly attending have achieved at ”achieved” or ”merit” level Unit and/or Achievement Standards in Maths/Numeracy and English in Term 1
- NCEA Level 1 Students on track to achieve full numeracy credits by end of Term 2
- First Prize in GBI short story competition went to one of our senior Students
- NCEA Level Academic achievement (Unit and/or Achievement Standards) in maths/numeracy is - according to the teacher - at a satisfying level
- A lift in key competency for self-management and time-management is observed for the majority of our Students
- Regularly attending NCEA Students are showing notable increase in academic engagement

2.4 Improvements in Family Engagement: attendance at parent meetings and Hub activities

In the first two weeks before the onset of School Term 1, Sam Grimshaw (ALH Co-Coordinator) and I visited 10 parents to discuss when we are open, what we do, how we can help their children in academic achievement, engagement and non-academic support. This also gave parents the chance to talk to us about their individual needs and/or to raise questions. We confirmed that whanau is always invited to visit the Hub during open times. Further, we informed them that they will receive weekly newsletters which mention what has been happening and what will be happening in the upcoming week. We concluded that a personal approach as such will be more useful than having an "Open Day" or "Parent’s Day". Personal engagement allows for more direct conversation. In other words, a parent will more likely tell us why their child is not regularly attending.
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Similarly, it is easier for us to talk about academic engagement and performance with parents directly.

The ALH staff also informed Students’ whānau and managed a schedule for the Te Kura Teachers’ Visit on the 20th and 21st of February. Attendance was great for these days, at one time we counted 23 Students and parents in the Hub. This meeting enabled Te Kura to talk to almost all Students and their parents on Great Barrier Island, to create and provide Individual Learning Plans and to answer questions and concerns.

We work in collaboration with the Aotea Family Support Group Charitable Trust, who provide after-school activities for children and youth. We invited their relevant staff twice to the Hub, to meet our Students and to discuss with them what activities they would like to undertake after school.

In Summary,

- all parents and Students receive weekly Newsletters
- private communications were undertaken between ALH Staff and all parents/caregivers
- ALH Staff are in continuous communication with parents/caregivers in regards to academic achievement and engagement, and when other issues arise
- being such a small community, parents and ALH Staff “bump” into each other regularly outside work hours, which provides another opportunity to communicate

2.5 Any Identifiable Lifts in Student Achievement

Academic achievement and academic engagement has been lifted in Term 1 2018, when compared to last year. This has been achieved by receiving Te Kura Learning Plans earlier in the year than usual. By putting all our NCEA Students on a route to focus on achieving Numeracy and Literacy Standards. To increase academic achievement, ALH Coordinators and Kaiawhina assist up to 6 Students per day for at least 30 minutes in a 1:1 situation. In this time, we help them understand what they need to work on (create a learning schedule for them), clarify questions around their Learning Plans with Te Kura, assist with administrative Student tasks (show how to work online, use various software, scan and send off work) and provide competent tutoring with all their subjects. Both Coordinators are highly skilled to assist, help and tutor Students in all their subjects. Our Kaiawhina are also competent to help in almost all subject areas.
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It should not be sneezed at the fact that academic engagement is an issue, especially for distance learners. Students, in general, do not phone their teachers and often disregard emails from them and their Learning Adviser. Te Kura staff have complained over the years how challenging they find it to interact over the phone or in email with parents and Students. As stated by Te Kura Teachers, these issues do not exist for Students who attend the Hub regularly. Te Kura Teachers contact the Hub to talk to Students directly. Similarly, when a Student is "stuck" or doesn’t know what to do, we initiate the phone conversation with Te Kura Teachers and Learning Advisors.

For NCEA Students, we have identified a reduction of completion rates of Standards in maths and numeracy by two weeks or more for 3 Students. All three have received very positive feedback from their teacher in regards to the standard of their work and time to finish Achievement/Unit Standards. They are all working on a "merit", rather than "achieved" level. We are also achieving more in English and Literacy in Term 1 than last year.

For non-NCEA Students, we have received great feedback from the Te Kura Learning Adviser. She is pleased with all of our Students and has repeatedly told us and the Students that they are working on all of their subjects and are completing in a timely fashion.

The Hub provides also a means for our Students, who are at academic and social risk for geographic and other reasons, to socialize. It is a meeting point for them, their friends and peers. We have a commendable social environment, where our Students behave appropriately and include each other irrespective of age, sex and culture. Our new Students have made new friends, and our Students plan non- and extra-curricular activities at the Hub.

Building up on the Hub’s vocational pathways and work experience placements engagement from 2017, 4 of our regular NCEA Students work regularly part-time. I will elaborate on this on page 11.

2.6 Any Changes in Staffing

Sam Grimshaw has taken over Ngaire Avery’s role as part time ALH Co-Coordinator before the onset of Term 1. We have a new ALH Steering Committee Chair Lady. Margie Daly’s management work has improved efficiency and created a better organized work environment for ALH Staff.
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2.7 Any Increase in Vocational Pathways Pathway Opportunities: participation in vocational courses and work experience placements

We are currently placing two Students to undertake an academic Vocational Pathway in the area of Information Technology with “Technicium New Zealand Institute of Information Technology” via the STAR programme. The STAR programme is designed to help Year 11-13 students move smoothly from school into tertiary study or work. Another Student is continuing on her vocational pathway to become a registered horse hoof trimmer. We have supported a fourth Student in identifying academic requirements to study to become an equine nurse.

One of the above-mentioned Students and three others are currently working part-time on Great Barrier Island. Two work with Barrier Air, they help with deliveries, loading and unloading the planes and customer interaction. The CFO of the Airline has stated to me that these jobs were initially intended for the school holidays, but since the Students are doing a good job and are keen to learn more about opportunities in this field of work, he has offered them to continue working during the School Terms. These Students work in the mornings before the Hub opens and on occasion in the afternoons. It is great to have an employer who takes into account our open times and supports academic engagement.

The others are working in a cafe, grocery shop and kitchen. In these roles, they work with customers, take their orders, handle the cash register, help with deliveries and keeping a clean work environment.

We are also continuing to assist Students who are enrolled with Vocational Pathways as a subject with Te Kura to achieve NCEA Standards. It should be noted that it is challenging to cater at the same time for academic achievement as Vocational Pathways studies.

In summary, most of our regular NCEA Students are also gaining work experience via actual jobs outside of Hub open hours, and we are placing or assisting Students with academic, vocational pathways.

2.8 Any Post School Outcomes: information on progression to further learning and/or work for participating students

I understand that progression to further learning and/or work for participating students has been detailed in the previous section. In addition, to increase academic achievement,
we give NCEA-Students (with permission from parents/caregivers) homework. The rationale being that Students continue to study at home (for instance on Mondays, when the Hub is not open due to lack of funding), and to attend the Hub being prepared to continue studying subject matters. We work in collaboration with the Aotea Family Support Group Charitable Trust, which organizes and supervises after-school activities for children and youth.

2.9 **Detail of Interactions with Ngati Rehua o Ngatiwai ki Aotea & Feedback Provided on Programme Effectiveness for Iwi Participants**

We are inclusive to all cultures and take on board any specific cultural needs our Students may have. We have an Iwi-representative mana whenua in the ALH Steering Group. Currently, I am not aware of any Students attending the Hub who would require emenda-
tion to our programmes based on their Iwi. I will, however, clarify with relevant parents whether there are Iwi participants attending and whether our programme is in accordance and effective in regards to Ngati Rehua o Ngatiwai ki Aotea.

Moreover, we are planning for a Marae visit (Kawa) for our Students and Staff in Term 2. The rationale being that the kaumatua or relevant spokes-person will talk to our Students about what we do at the ALH, about bi-cultural awareness and the importance of a Marae.

2.10 **Summary**

While the ALH is a new, community-led initiative on Great Barrier Island, the following four items highlight that the ALH is strongly needed on Aotea, and will continue to be needed:

- risk of low academic engagement/achievement
- risk of social isolation
- distance learning is challenging to say the least
- a portion of secondary-school aged children will always stay on the Island and study with Te Kura
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The vast majority of Students attending the Hub come from low-income families, and at least half live in a single-parent environment. Their parents have on average more than one job and have to cope with living on an Island without reticulated power, heating, water and public transport. Paired with a “she’ll be right” attitude, our Students enrolled with Te Kura are at great risk of under-performing academically. Furthermore, it must be acknowledged that (online) distance learning is administratively challenging. It cannot be expected from Students to stay on top of their Learning Plans and other administrative tasks. Obviously, learning a subject without being in a class-room environment, without having access to laboratories, art and music rooms or PE gyms, and without having constant face to face interaction with teachers makes the task of distance learning more challenging.

In a typical scenario, if the ALH did not exist, Students would be studying unsupervised at home, while the parents are away and working. The Students will be required to do more and more online study, which means that they will be sitting, at home, alone, in front of a computer with internet access. Such a scenario will lead in most cases to constant distraction, academic frustration and friction within the family. Students will not be able to achieve on an appropriate level and they will not adopt a disciplined and structured learning environment. Parents will obviously start being frustrated with their children, and simply expect academic achievement without necessarily understanding why there are issues. To top it off, Students will interact considerably less with their peers and friends, and develop issues that can be attributed to social isolation.

The ALH is community-led and receives island-wide endorsement. From the principals of our three primary schools, the police, parents and the community at large, Te Kura Staff have repeatedly stated in phone conversations, in person and email that Students who attend the Hub are performing better than expected. They are achieving more in less time, and Te Kura Staff can communicate with Students considerably better. Simply because they know when they can reach them over the phone. Two of our Students will attend Boarding Schools in Auckland in Term 2. These Students and their whanau used the services of the ALH as an intermediate, which confirms that parents acknowledge the competent academic assistance we offer.

The ALH Coordinators have considerable expertise in the educational sector with secondary and tertiary competencies in English, Maths, Chemistry, Physics, Biology and can assist with all other subjects. The Kaiāwhina work for Te Kura and, therefore, we
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have a great mixture of competent Staff at the Hub. The few Students who attend the Hub infrequently show up when they require help with subject matters. This highlights again that they know that we can help them achieve academically.

On behalf of the ALH, I sincerely acknowledge the financial support received from Auckland Council and the Great Barrier Local Board. The amount of money we receive goes a very long way for Aotea’s Students. Providing an environment that fosters formal, academic secondary education is of utmost priority for our Island and Community. Students who stay on the Island for secondary schooling will likely continue to live on the Island when they are adults. Educated adults have better employment opportunities, can make informed decisions and help create a stronger community.

Therefore, the financial support for the ALH from Auckland Council and The Great Barrier Local Board will have a long-lasting “ripple-effect” for Aotea. The ramifications of not supporting formal, academic education financially are that many Students do not get a fair chance to complete secondary school, and as a result will likely have less opportunities in their adult lives.

Kind regards,
Ben Assado
Approval of the 2018/2019 Great Barrier Local Board Community Facilities Work Programme

File No.: CP2018/12254

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To approve the 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme for the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board, including all physical works, leasing and operational maintenance projects delivered by Community Facilities.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The Community Facilities department is responsible for the building, maintaining and renewing of all open spaces and community buildings. This includes the community leasing and licensing of council-owned premises.

3. The Aotea Great Barrier Local Board 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme was developed using a combination of local board feedback, staff assessments of assets and key stakeholder input.

4. The following indicative costs have been identified in the 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme:
   i. $110,000 of asset-based services capital funding
   ii. $20,000 of local board initiative capital funding
   iii. $5,000 of local board initiative operational funding

5. The work programme has been developed through a series of iterative workshops between key staff and local boards since October 2017. The programme provided in Attachment A reflects the agreed projects that were presented in the last local board workshop. This report recommends that the board approves the 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme and associated budget.

6. Once approved by the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board, new work will commence from July 2018. Regular updates on the line items will be provided by the Community Facilities’ Stakeholder Advisors.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) approve the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme as detailed in Attachment A.

Horopaki / Context

7. Community facilities and open spaces provide important community services to the people of Aotea Great Barrier Island. They contribute to building strong, healthy, and vibrant communities by providing spaces where residents and visitors can participate in a wide range of social, cultural, art, and recreational activities. These activities improve lifestyles and a sense of belonging and pride amongst residents.

8. The 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme detailed in Attachment A contains information on all proposed projects to be delivered by Community Facilities, including capital works projects, leasing and operational maintenance.
### Capital works programme

9. Investment in the capital programme will ensure that council facilities and parks open spaces in Aotea Great Barrier Island remain valuable and well-maintained community assets that continue to meet the agreed levels of service. Asset-based services capital works includes Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI), renewals and growth and development projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for amount of budget allocated to each local board</th>
<th>Locally Driven Initiative</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Growth and development</th>
<th>Coastal Renewals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As per the local board funding policy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 90% population*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5% deprivation*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5% land*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In proportion to assets in very poor and poor condition requiring renewal, limited to funding available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To specific projects identified as priority projects to meet the needs of new and future residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To specific projects identified as priorities by the coastal specialist team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of projects that can be paid for</th>
<th>Locally Driven Initiative</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Growth and development</th>
<th>Coastal Renewals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any projects that deliver a council owned asset or as a capital grant to an asset made available for public use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development budgets are used for specific projects approved by the Governing Body.</td>
<td>Renewal of and enhancement where required, to existing coastal structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal of existing assets on a “like for like” basis, taking into account current service standards where applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Growth budgets can only be used for specific projects that are required by and benefit new and future residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development budgets are used for specific projects approved by the Governing Body.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth budgets can only be used for specific projects that are required by and benefit new and future residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of local board discretion on allocation to projects</th>
<th>Locally Driven Initiative</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Growth and development</th>
<th>Coastal Renewals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full discretion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited discretion – must be allocated to the specific project.</td>
<td>Limited discretion – must be allocated to the specific project for the purpose of protecting our coastal assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad discretion - can be allocated to any renewal project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local board discretion on scope and design of project within available budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited discretion – must be allocated to the specific project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited discretion – must be allocated to the specific project for the purpose of protecting our coastal assets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*excluding Great Barrier Island
10. The amount of budget available for locally driven initiatives on Aotea Great Barrier Island is determined by:

- fees and charges collected from locally driven initiatives
- plus revenue from fees and charges for local asset based services in excess of that projected by the Governing Body where the local boards sets higher fees, (see section 3 above)
- minus revenue from fees and charges for local asset based services below that projected by the Governing Body where the local boards sets lower fees, (see section 3 above)
- plus any revenue from grants, donations, and sponsorships
- plus any revenue collected from targeted rates set to fund local activities
- plus a general rates allocation

General rates funding will be provided to meet the balance of the costs of providing locally driven initiatives on Aotea Great Barrier Island. This will be based on the expenditure on these activities agreed with the Governing Body in their local board agreements each year net of revenue generated from the items above.

11. The 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme has been created following a series of workshops with elected members from October 2017 to May 2018. All feedback gathered from the workshops has been taken into consideration throughout the process. The proposed work programme in Attachment A contains:

- Number of activity lines: five

Leasing work programme

12. Community leases are a valuable way in which the council provides support to community organisations across the region, commonly on public parks and reserves. These groups provide a wide range of community activities and services aligned with recognised local priorities and are a key part of the mosaic of community activity and infrastructure in Auckland.

13. The draft work programme provides a detailed list of the community leases and licences that will expire or are due for renewal over the 2018/2019 financial year. It also includes the additional leases and licences that will be deferred from the 2017/2018 financial year to the 2018/2019 financial year.

14. Once the 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme is approved, staff will be able to consolidate reporting on routine matters or use the streamlined process for straightforward renewals without variations whilst focusing attention on those community leases that are more complex.

Operational maintenance work programme

15. The regular maintenance of all council-owned built and open space assets plays an important part in:

- increasing the long-term durability of Community Facilities assets
- improving the safety of Community Facilities assets
- ensuring the enjoyment of Community Facilities assets by the users

17. In the 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme, there are three line item dedicated to all maintenance in the local board area:

- Full Facilities Maintenance Contracts – These contracts include all buildings, parks and open space assets, sports fields, coastal management and storm damage
- Arboriculture Maintenance Contracts – These contracts include all tree management and maintenance
- Ecological Restoration Maintenance Contracts – These contracts include pest plant and animal pest management within ecologically significant parks and reserves.

18. Staff will be able to provide regular reporting on maintenance through monthly updates to the local boards and through the quarterly report. Community Facilities is also providing additional weekly updates to all elected members on contractor performance.

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

19. The Community Facilities Work Programme has been created through a combination of local board feedback, asset condition assessments and agreed levels of service.

20. The draft 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme has been considered by the local board in a series of workshops from October 2017 to May 2018. The views expressed by local board members during the workshop have been adopted in Attachment A.

21. The Community Facilities work programme supports the achievement of the following Great Barrier Local Board Plan 2017 priorities:

- Our environment is protected and enhanced
- Our people thrive and life is good.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

22. The 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme ensures that all facilities and open space assets continue to be well-maintained assets that benefit the local community, including Māori. Where any aspects of the proposed work programme are anticipated to have a significant impact on sites of importance to mana whenua then appropriate engagement will be undertaken.

23. Staff are also attending mana whenua fora on a monthly basis to receive feedback on the 2018/2019 Community Facilities Work Programme.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

24. The proposed 2018/2019 Community Facilities work programme will see the allocation of $20,000 of the board’s locally driven initiatives capital budget, $110,000 of the board’s asset based services capital budget, and $379,210 of the board’s asset based operational budget. These amounts can be accommodated within the board’s total draft budget for 2018/2019. As such, the board’s approval will not have significant financial implications unless projects experience a significant overspend or underspend. Regular updates on projects will be provided to the board tracking expenditure and identifying any projects at risk of non-delivery, over or underspend.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

25. If the proposed Community Facilities work programme is not approved at the business meeting, there is a risk that the proposed projects may not be able to be delivered within the 2018/2019 financial year.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

26. The work programme will be implemented as part of Community Facilities’ usual business practice.

27. Work programme implementation will be reported regularly by stakeholder advisors and quarterly through the performance report to the local board.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Great Barrier Community Facilities Work Programme 18_19</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Great Barrier Community Leases Work Programme 18_19</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
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<th>Angie Bennett, Work Programme Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helgard Wagener - Relationship Manager Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
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</table>
### Community Facilities: Build Maintain Renew Work Programme 2018/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>LB Plan Outcome</th>
<th>Lead Department/CCD</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Activity Benefits</th>
<th>Further Decision Points for LB</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>Our environment is protected and enhanced</td>
<td>CF: Operations</td>
<td>Great Barrier Full Facilities Contracts</td>
<td>The Full Facilities maintenance contracts include all buildings, parks and open space assets, sports fields, coastal management and storm damage.</td>
<td>With the maintenance contracts, local board assets are able to be maintained to the approved level of service. These contracts provide for required compliance tasks and scheduled activities including planned preventative maintenance to be completed, and for response to requests for maintenance. These contracts benefit all members of the public as local board assets are able to be fully utilised if they are fit for the intended purpose, and it offers better value to ratepayers if assets remain in service for their expected life.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4</td>
<td>ABS: Opex</td>
<td>$379,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>Our environment is protected and enhanced</td>
<td>CF: Operations</td>
<td>GBFL: Maintaining View Sheds programme 2018/19</td>
<td>Maintaining view sheds across the island for views and safety.</td>
<td>Views on the island are maintained.</td>
<td>No further decisions anticipated</td>
<td>Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4</td>
<td>LD: Opex</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Our people thrive and life is good</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Gooseberry Flat - renew and relocate playground</td>
<td>Options to be approved by local board</td>
<td>Continued use of facility/park/asset</td>
<td>Not scheduled</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Our environment is protected and enhanced</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Pa Point - renew concrete steps</td>
<td>Renew the concrete steps at Pa Point Reserve.</td>
<td>Continued use of park</td>
<td>Not scheduled</td>
<td>ABS: Capex - Renewals</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Our infrastructure is future-proofed</td>
<td>CF: Investigation and Design</td>
<td>Great Barrier - LDJ Minor Capex Fund 2018/19</td>
<td>Funding to deliver minor capex projects throughout the financial year as approved in the monthly local board workshops.</td>
<td>Continued use of facility/park/asset</td>
<td>Not scheduled</td>
<td>LD: Capex</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>LB Plan Outcome</td>
<td>Local District or CBD</td>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Activity Benefits</td>
<td>Further Decision Points for LB</td>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>CL Lease Commencement Date</td>
<td>CL Lease Expiry Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2676</td>
<td>Our people thrive and life is good</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>Lease Roathside Great Barrier Island Golf Club Inc.</td>
<td>Renewal or new lease at 50 Whangaparapara Road, Great Barrier Island. Club was informed by letter on 16 May 2019 to offer options for either renewal or new lease. Current term of the lease is 15 years from 1 September 2007 (final expiry 2022). Club have expressed interest in longer term lease. Deferred from the 2017-2018 work programme.</td>
<td>Developing a sense of belonging and engagement with the community Promoting inclusion and participation</td>
<td>Lease expiry/renewal</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>01/09/2012</td>
<td>31/08/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2677</td>
<td>Our people thrive and life is good</td>
<td>CF: Community Leases</td>
<td>Occupation Licence Review Cenotaph Great Barrier Island Inc.</td>
<td>EDI to be carried out following workshop with the local board on 16 May 2018. Hector Sanderson Road, Great Barrier Island. Deferred from the 2017/2018 work programme.</td>
<td>Developing a sense of belonging and engagement with the community Promoting inclusion and participation</td>
<td>Lease expiry/renewal</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>13/12/2015</td>
<td>12/12/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Community Lease for the Community Room 81 Hector Sanderson Road Claris Great Barrier Island.

File No.: CP2018/13058

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To grant a new lease for the community room at the rear of the local board offices at 81 Hector Sanderson Road Claris.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The community room behind the local board office was previously occupied by Seniornet but is now vacant as they chose not to continue their activities.
3. The vacancy was discussed at the local board workshop on 8 May 2018 and the local board requested an expression of interest be carried out. Three responses were received.
4. The applications were assessed using a spreadsheet tool against criteria from the Auckland Council and local board plans and community needs.
5. Of the three, the application from the Great Barrier Island Health Trust made the best use of the room.
6. This report recommends that a lease be granted to the Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust subject to conditions.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board:

a) grant a lease to the Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust of the community room at 81 Hector Sanderson Road, Claris, subject to one month's iwi consultation and provided no objections are received, on the following terms and conditions:
   i) Term – initial term of five years with one right of renewal of five years.
   ii) Rent – One ($1) plus GST per annum if demanded.

b) negotiate with the Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust payment of a maintenance charge to contribute towards the overall maintenance of the community room section of the building including the cost of power generation.

c) the trust obtaining, at its own cost the required consent(s) to carry out the building modifications to the community room.

d) provide Auckland Council with details of the proposed works for the dental office so that landlord approval can be provided.

e) note that all other terms and conditions will be in accordance with the Auckland Council Community Occupancy Guidelines July 2012.

Horopaki / Context
7. This report considers the leasing of the community room at the rear of the local board offices at 81 Hector Sanderson Road Claris, Aotea Great Barrier Island.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

8. The land is legally described as Lot 1 DP 60013 in certificate of title NA15B/1151 and is owned by Auckland Council under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002.

9. Located on the land is the local board office and meeting room, the community room and the shed used by Fire and Emergency New Zealand for the fire appliance and associated equipment. (Attachment A).

10. As the result of the workshop on 8 May 2018, advertisements calling for expressions of interest (EOI) were placed in the Barrier Bulletin and on the council website from Friday 8 June for a two-week period, with applications closing Friday 22 June. An email enclosing an EOI application and supporting material was circulated to the three parties who had earlier expressed interest in occupying the room.

11. Three applications were received as summarised in the table below showing information about each application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Number served/active</th>
<th>Days/Hours of use</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust.</td>
<td>Dentist and health worker accommodation.</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Dentist – Minimum five days per month or as required. Health worker use to make up to 20 hours per week use.</td>
<td>Can’t share with groups outside Health Centre because of sensitive equipment and confidential records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Island History Research Group Inc.</td>
<td>Preservation and presentation of the history of Great Barrier Island.</td>
<td>20 active members plus those on mailing list</td>
<td>One day/week plus some casual use.</td>
<td>Can share with others. Provide resource to the public for this researching the history of the Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Island Photo Artz.</td>
<td>Photo printing and associated projects.</td>
<td>12 active members</td>
<td>One day/month plus some casual use.</td>
<td>Can share with others. Publish a calendar and postcards of photos of the island for sale. Self-funds similar future projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Staff undertook an analysis of the applications assessing them against the Auckland Council and local board plans, hours of use, how they intend using the building, community need, financial and other resources.

13. The background information provided with each application varied. The Community Health Trust provided a comprehensive package of information backing their proposal.

14. Assessment against the Auckland and local board plans has a degree of subjectivity as the criteria of each plan do not exactly fit with the proposals. Staff therefore interpret the intent of the plans and proposals objectively as possible. Points are awarded to each application on this basis.

15. The ranking of applications after the analysis is as follows:
   - Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust.
   - Great Barrier Island History Research Group Inc.
   - Great Barrier Island Photo Artz.
16. The proposal by the Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust makes the best use of the room to provide an important service to the island community. They intend using the room as a dentist’s room with associated health worker use, to ensure the room is well utilised, anticipated to be at least 20 hours per week.

17. The Dental Project Strategic Plan provided by the trust is in Attachment B.

18. The applications by the Great Barrier Island History Research Group Inc., and Great Barrier Island Photo Artz showed they will each only use the building one day per week and one day per month respectively. There will be some use the room at other times either by individual members or when working on projects. For example, the Photo Artz group publishes a calendar and postcards that are sold on the island. Funds raised from these activities are then used for similar future projects.

19. Using the room to supplement the health services to the island is a practical use of the rooms. A recent mobile dental service was held in the board office area and originally planned for two days was extended to four days with a high level of community satisfaction.

The Trust

20. The Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust was established in 1987 with the purpose of fundraising for a medical centre at Claris. It became a legally incorporated charitable trust in 1988.

21. The trust was given a substantial grant from the ASB Community Trust, as well as a four-bedroom house from the Auckland Hospital Board. This was barged to the island and placed on the land beside the airstrip at Claris. The Community Health Centre was officially opened in 1990. In addition to the Claris Centre, the trust operates Te Kotuku cottage and the former nurse’s cottage at Port Fitzroy.

22. The trust’s mission is:

- focusing on continuing to provide and maintain excellent facilities from which first class health care can be provided including: health promotion, medical, welfare, educational and social functions.
- anticipating and responding to evolving needs in our growing community and paralleling diversification and specialisation within the Health Team with which it is in close co-operation

23. The trust has advised that the dentist to provide the service has been confirmed. Equipment will be purchased and owned by the trust which follows the same model utilised for the delivery of other health services on Great Barrier. If the dentist changes, the equipment is available to another dentist to provide continuation of the service to the community.

The Lease

24. Auckland Council’s Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012 provide for granting a lease of five years with one right of renewal of five years where the group is occupying a council owned building.

25. Rent for community leases is set at $1 per annum plus GST. There is also a contribution towards the overall maintenance costs of the building based on $25 per square metre.

26. In this case there is also the cost of power generation. At the time of reporting we are seeking information in this regard and the proposed solar power project to ensure the dental room power consumption can be accommodated. The recommendation in the report is that the contribution toward maintenance and power generation costs be negotiated with the trust once full details are known.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe /
Local impacts and local board views

27. The occupation of the community room was workshopped with the local board on 8 May 2018 when the board requested the call for expressions of interest and again on 10 July when the applications received were considered. The local board expressed support for the recommendations in this report. The proposal supports the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board Plan outcome: “Our people thrive and life is good”.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

28. Auckland Council is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its broader legal obligations to Māori. The council recognises these responsibilities are distinct from the Crown’s Treaty obligations and fall within a local government Tamaki Makaurau context.

29. The purpose of community leases is to encourage participation and to create local benefits for all communities. The dental services of the trust benefit the whole Aotea Great Barrier community, including Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

30. The works required in the room to accommodate the dentist activity include changing the floor covering and building partitions to create waiting area, dentist’s room and a store area. There will also be associated plumbing and electrical work. The trust will bear these costs including the cost of obtaining a building consent.

31. An associated approval is landlord approval of the works. The recommendations of the report will ask that the trust provided details of the work so that this approval can be processed. There is no cost for this.

32. There are no other financial implications for council.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

33. If the board approves the granting of the lease, it will displace two groups, the Great Barrier Island History Research Group Inc., and Great Barrier Island Photo Artz. Both groups were using the room in conjunction with Seniornet and have continued that use. Notice to vacate will be provided to these groups.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

34. Before granting a lease of longer than six months under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, consultation with both iwi and the community is to be carried out. The community consultation can be met by notifying the unsuccessful applicants and adjacent neighbours as an expression of interest has been undertaken.

35. Iwi consultation will take approximately one month as a presentation has to be made to a Mana Whenua forum together with direct email contact with iwi having a specific interest in Aotea Great Barrier Island.

36. While this process is carried out staff will work with the trust to mobilise the establishment of the dental office.
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Lease Area
Great Barrier Island Community Health Trust
81 Hector Sanderson Road.

Not to Scale
GREAT BARRIER ISLAND COMMUNITY HEALTH TRUST

DENTAL PROJECT STRATEGIC PLAN

BACKGROUND:

Legal status: Charitable Trust since 1987 on Aotea/Great Barrier Island.

Need served: access to a primary dental service.

Importance of needs served: Since December 2015 there has been no dental care available on-island – expensive to access off-island service, care often left until prompted by urgent necessity. Preventative dentistry (i.e. check-ups) delayed.

Target people served: 1004 residents from toddler to older persons (Dental therapists are only on-island for a short time annually).

Anticipated challenges: Finding a dentist who is community social-action minded, finding appropriate space near Community Health Centre (shared equipment), upgrading and fundraising for specific dental equipment.

Model: A community empowerment model. The Health Trust, on behalf of the community, has successfully provided the facilities and equipment for a primary health care team for 28 years. This underlines a proven history in provision of community empowered projects. Other lower socio-economic rural communities in New Zealand are copying this model.

VISION:

A Community-Owned Dental Clinic – serviced by a quality visiting dental team.

MISSION:

To ensure access to primary dental care for every resident on Great Barrier Island. To future-proof the service the community will control the assets and space through the Health Trust’s stewardship.

VALUES:

Community empowerment – ownership of the project and assets; to future-proof access to dental care.

Partnership – with visiting Dentist/dental team who share a community partnership vision. Equitable access to a quality professional service (low cost access).

Teamwork – to shoulder fundraising responsibility together to ensure going forward the quality of equipment is of an agreed high standard.
S.M.A.R.T. OBJECTIVES:

(specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, timebound)

1. To create a Community Owned Dental Clinic – following the same process as the creation of the Community Health Centre.

2. To encourage a suitable dentist/dental team to commit to providing a community driven dental service on Aotea/Great Barrier Island.

3. To lease space in Claris near the Community Health Centre – to share resources.

4. To ensure all equipment is appropriately serviced and modern to ensure that quality dental care can be delivered to all people on Aotea.

5. To communicate Dental Project community-wide once there is an actual service.

MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS PLAN:

Health Trust website and social media (Trust’s face-book page)

Barrier Bulletin

Local notice boards

Mail drop – RD and PC boxes

RISK ANALYSIS:

1. Failure to create a Community Owned Dental Clinic – continuing deterioration in oral health and expensive trips to Auckland to seek emergency care. Control – nil, therefore unable to be put in place and project abandoned or mothballed.

2. Failure to find a dentist/dental team who is community social-action minded. Control in place - continued advertising through known dental and community pathways.

3. Failure to lease space – long delay of dental project, continuing deterioration in oral health. Control in place - unknown

4. Failure to source appropriate equipment through fundraising. Control in place - new avenues will be explored through the NZ dental community (donations of equipment).

MEASUREMENT OF SUCCESS:

Outcome measures

A. Engaging a dentist/Dental team – achieved April 2018 an enthusiastic dentist who is community minded.

Acquiring modern appropriate equipment – basics achieved February 2018 – ongoing donation of equipment offered once space is confirmed.
Leasing a suitable space in Claris – awaiting Auckland Council decision

B. Once clinic opens - Patient satisfaction review - qualitative
   - Number of residents seen - quantitative
   - Reduction of emergency referrals by Aotea Health - quantitative
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To appoint members of the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board to the Aotea Great Barrier Area Plan Working Party.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Planning Committee resolution PLA2018/63 includes a directive for the establishment of a working party to oversee the preparation of the Aotea Great Barrier Island Area Plan. The working party will comprise members of the Local Board, the Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor, and a representative of the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

3. This report recommends that the local board appoints all five board members to the working party.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation

That the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board:

a) appoint all local board members to the Aotea Great Barrier Area Plan Working Party.

Horopaki / Context

4. Previous discussions with the Great Barrier Local Board have considered options for the process of incorporating the Hauraki Gulf Islands into the Auckland Unitary Plan. These discussions have resulted in a Local Board resolution GBI/2018/7 (Attachment A) to support a two-stage process for bringing the Hauraki Gulf Islands into the Auckland Unitary Plan, with the first stage being the development of an area plan for Aotea Great Barrier Island. Stage two will be a plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan, based on the area plan.

5. The two-stage approach was subsequently reported to and approved by the Planning Committee at its 5 June 2018 meeting. The resolution PLA2018/63 is attached as Attachment B.

6. Clause (b) of the committee resolution gives a directive for the establishment of working parties (one for the Waiheke Local Board area and one for the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board area) to oversee the preparation of each area plan. Each working party is to comprise of members of the relevant local board, the Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor, and a representative of the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

7. The appointment of all (five) local board members is considered to be an effective and efficient use of resources for the following reasons:

- the working party will have direct access to all local board members local knowledge and practical insights drawn from the portfolios they are responsible for.

- meetings, workshops and reporting to the working party replaces the need for the same information to be re-reported to the local board.

- a working party of seven members (including five local board members) is a practical size and knowledge base to draw on.
- flexibility for members to be absent for other duties, without having to specifically arrange alternative members.

8. The alternative of appointing a lesser number of board members requires less resource, however additional work will be delegated to the representatives in the form of:
   - acquiring knowledge of other local board members’ portfolios.
   - regularly liaising with the non-working party local board members, so their views are understood and expressed.

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

9. The views of the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board will be integral to the development of the Aotea Great Barrier Area Plan.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

10. The area plan process will involve full consultation with relevant iwi groups.

11. The role of the Independent Māori Statutory Board is to advance the interests of all Māori. At the time of writing this report, the Independent Māori Statutory Board had not yet confirmed its representative.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications


Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

13. No significant risks arise from this decision.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

14. Once the working party is appointed, staff will organise a workshop with the working party to initiate the project and determine the frequency of working party meetings.
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14 Process for the Integration of the Auckland District Council Hauraki Gulf Islands Plan into the Auckland Unitary Plan

Warren MacIennan – Manager Planning - North/West, Peter Vari – Team Leader and Alison Pye – Principal Planner were in attendance via teleconference to present the Process for the Integration of the Auckland District Council Hauraki Gulf Islands Plan into the Auckland Unitary Plan report.

Resolution number GBJ/2018/7
MOVED by Chairperson I Fordham, seconded by Deputy Chairperson L Coles:

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) recommend to the Planning Committee that Option 2 - Area plan using all existing Aotea Great Barrier Island plans including feasibility studies, strategies and board reports, followed by a plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan, be Great Barrier Local Board the process used for the incorporation of the Hauraki Gulf Islands Section into the Auckland Unitary Plan.

b) Thank Warren MacIennan, Peter Vari and Alison Pye for their attendance via teleconference.

CARRIED
MEETING: Planning Committee Meeting of 5/06/2018

Please note for your action / information the following decision arising from the meeting named above:

PLA/2018/63 Bringing the Hauraki Gulf Islands into the Auckland Unitary Plan
CP2018/06997

FILE REF 10

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10

10 Bringing the Hauraki Gulf Islands into the Auckland Unitary Plan

Note: changes to the original motion were incorporated under clause a) and the addition of clause b), with the agreement of the meeting.

Resolution number PLA/2018/63

MOVED by Cr M Lee, seconded by Cr W Walker:

That the Planning Committee:

a) approve a two-stage approach to incorporate the Hauraki Gulf Islands into the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part) being:

Stage 1

i) the development of an area plan for the Waiheke Local Board area using existing plans including Essentially Waiheke Refresh 2016.

ii) the development of an area plan for the Great Barrier Local Board area using all existing Aotea Great Barrier Island plans including feasibility studies, strategies and board reports.

Stage 2

iii) a plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part).

b) approve the establishment of two working parties (one for each local board area) consisting of members of the relevant local board, the Waitāmatā and Gulf Ward Councillor and a representative of the Independent Māori Statutory Board to oversee the preparation of each area plan.

CARRIED
Claris cemetery process and notification options

File No.: CP2018/11394

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To recommend a process and notification option to support establishment of a cemetery at Crossroads Reserve, Whangaparapara Road, Claris, Aotea Great Barrier Island.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Aotea Great Barrier community has a longstanding aspiration for new cemeteries in the north and centre of the island.
3. From at least 2010, the Great Barrier Local Board has been working to achieve this and in 2017 it confirmed its preference that Crossroads Reserve on Whangaparapara Road be further investigated for a cemetery in the centre of the island.
4. Since then detailed investigations have confirmed a cemetery is feasible on this site and initial informal discussions with residents in the vicinity have been held and some concerns and opposition have been expressed.
5. Both a resource consent and reclassification of the reserve are needed before a cemetery can be developed. Reclassification requires public notification. As the resource consent application would be a non-complying activity, it may also need to be notified.
6. It is recommended that the board fully notify both jointly to enable formal community input and transparency and allocate budget to cover these costs.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) request that Auckland Council publicly notify, in full, the non-complying resource consent application to develop a cemetery on Allotment 211 Parish of Aotea, Crossroads Reserve, Whangaparapara Road and at the same time publicly notify its intention to reclassify Allotment 211 as a local purpose (cemetery) reserve under the Reserves Act 1977

b) request that Auckland Council appoint a joint hearing panel of independent commissioners to hear any submissions and make recommendations relating to both proposals

c) note Crossroads cemetery notification and hearings process costs are expected to be in the order of $30,000 and can be funded as part of the board’s 2018/19 cemetery development capex budget.

Horopaki / Context
7. All three Aotea Great Barrier Local Board Plans have championed development of cemeteries in the north and centre of the island in response to community requests that the local board do so. On and off investigations going back prior to Auckland Council’s establishment in 2010 have sought to advance this.
8. While little progress has been made to date on a cemetery in the north of Aotea Great Barrier Island, the following decisions have enabled establishment of a cemetery in the Claris area to now be advanced:

- July 2015: Auckland Council’s Parks, Recreation and Sport Committee delegate decision making to operate, plan for and develop cemeteries on Aotea Great Barrier to the Great
Barrier Local Board. This enabled the board for the first time to lead on the above aspirations.

- December 2015: The Great Barrier Local Board agrees to commence detailed investigations of local parks in the Claris crossroads area for the development of a new cemetery. Initial work is to include geotechnical studies and input from Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust as the representative of mana whenua of Aotea Great Barrier Island.

- February 2017: The Great Barrier Local Board selects Crossroads Reserve on Whangaparaparara Road for further investigation as the most likely site for a cemetery and provisionally allocates $10,000 for works. It again notes that any concerns or support from Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust should be sought.

9. A plan showing the proposed Claris cemetery site at Crossroads Reserve on Whangaparapara Road is included at Attachment A.

Resource Consent

10. Since that time staff and consultants have undertaken more detailed investigations to the point where a resource consent application can soon be lodged. Crossroads Reserve is zoned Open Space 1 (ecology & landscape) in the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan. A cemetery meets the definition of community facilities which are not provided for in this zone. As such the application would be assessed as a non-complying activity.

Reserves Act reclassification

11. At the same time appropriate Reserves Act reclassification needs to be progressed. The site is currently held in fee simple by the Auckland Council as a classified recreation reserve and subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977. This legislation provides that establishing a public cemetery on the site requires it to be reclassified from a recreation reserve to a local purpose (cemetery) reserve.

Consultation to date

12. Community awareness of, and support for new cemeteries in the north and centre of the island is high and has been publicly consulted on through local board plans, annual budgets and the local board reports and resolutions noted above.

13. The Great Barrier Local Board has engaged with Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust as the representative of mana whenua of Aotea Great Barrier Island to understand its views (see paragraphs 34 and 35) and has also undertaken some informal engagement with residents and businesses in the area.

14. In early April 2018, letters were sent to the neighbouring residents and businesses of the proposed Claris cemetery site outlining the board’s intention to further investigate the site. Two verbal replies were received expressing some concerns with the proposal with both wanting an opportunity to more fully express their opinions. Both were asked to provide this response in writing but nothing was received.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

15. Resource consent and reclassification options and implications are assessed here and a recommendation is made.

Resource Consent

16. The Resource Management Act states that a consent authority may grant resource consent for a non-complying activity only if it is satisfied that either the adverse effects of the activity on the environment will be minor; or the application is for an activity that will not be contrary to the objectives and policies of the relevant plan.
17. It also states that in deciding whether an activity will have or is likely to have adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor, it must disregard any effects on persons who own or occupy any land adjacent to the site.

18. Consultants working on the proposal have identified a range of potential adverse effects which are being addressed in the application, including ecology, geotechnical, mana whenua and visual/character. They have expressed confidence that these matters can be addressed and that consent can be obtained.

19. Independent commissioners will decide whether the non-complying cemetery application should be notified or not. If it is considered that the application doesn’t meet the tests for non-notification, it could be notified, either limited notified (e.g. neighbours, affected parties, stakeholders) or fully notified.

20. The board, as applicant can ask that the application be non-notified, limited notified or fully notified.

    Non notification

21. The board could ask that the application not be notified, relying on the application being able to address the matters it needs to, to be non-notified. It is common practice for applicants to assert that the effects of their proposal are less than minor and in some cases this results in non-complying applications not being notified.

22. In this case the applicant would need to demonstrate that it can (amongst other things), mitigate mana whenua, visual/character, ecological and geotechnical (earthworks, stormwater, flooding) effects of the cemetery proposal. Given that some concern has been expressed by some residents in the vicinity of the site, the application would need to specifically address these too.

23. This is the cheapest and simplest option as there is no hearing and associated costs but there is certainly no guarantee that the application won’t be notified. Risks with this approach are that parties who have already signaled concerns and asked that they be able to formally input, won’t be able to and that might have implications. It also doesn’t provide a forum for those who support the application to be heard.

    Limited notification

24. The board could ask that the application be notified to only specific affected persons. The relevant matters of concern to nearby residents could include effects on their amenity values e.g. visual, traffic, noise etc and any effects associated with changes to flooding or other natural hazards.

25. This option enables nearby residents and key interested parties to have their say. Again, this option doesn’t provide the opportunity for other members of the public who may support a cemetery to have their say. Assuming submissions asking to be heard are received, a hearing would need to be held anyway. This has cost and time implications for the applicant.

    Full public notification

26. The board could ask that the application be fully publicly notified. Notice would appear in local/Auckland media and be sent to specific parties with an interest greater than the public generally, for example neighbours and mana whenua.

27. This option has the greatest cost but is also the most open and transparent as it enables anyone to participate and provides the best process for all views to be publicly aired. Given the degree of support the community has shown for establishing a cemetery in the centre of the island, the board could expect submissions supporting the proposal which would add weight to it being granted.

Reserves Act reclassification

28. Reclassification from recreation reserve to local purpose (cemetery) reserve is required as part of the cemetery development process. This must be publicly notified and a hearing held if
submissions are received. It has not always been the practice to appropriately reclassify reserves as part of a development but the legislation is clear that this is a requirement.

29. The Great Barrier Local Board has authority to approve the reclassification provided it is publicly notified outlining reasons and that local iwi are engaged or consulted prior to the board resolving to reclassify. Given that the board is the applicant, independent commissioners would make this decision.

30. It is anticipated that the Reserves Act process will attract submissions and a hearing even if the resource consent isn’t notified as people will wish to have their say if given the opportunity.

Recommendation

31. Subject to the board agreeing budget to cover expected costs, staff recommend that the board ask that the resource consent be publicly notified for the following reasons:

- this is a key project for the board and it is important the board is seen to run an open and transparent process
- reserve reclassification is a publicly notified process anyway and it is expected submissions from persons who have already signaled their opposition to the cemetery will be received and a hearing will be needed. The hearing will jointly consider the resource consent and reserve reclassification matters
- consultants working on the resource consent application are confident they can address all the effects that will need to be addressed to enable the application to be approved (ecological, geotechnical, mana whenua), including impacts on neighbours. It is noted that some of the matters opponents have already raised are not matters which need to be addressed in a consent process.

Hearings Process

32. Assuming the local board supports this recommendation, the resource consent and reclassification processes would be notified separately but together at the same time and in the same media. A further resolution will be sought from the local board to appoint a hearings panel for the reserve reclassification.

33. As the reclassification hearing would run at the same time as any resource consent hearing, it makes sense for this to be a joint hearing and for the reserve reclassification hearings panel to also be the resource consent hearings panel. Independent commissioners familiar with both Reserves Act and resource consent processes would be used.

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

34. Development of a cemetery at Claris is a Great Barrier Local Board led and funded project.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

35. Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust representatives visited the proposed Claris cemetery site with board members, project consultants and staff on 31 October 2017 and also attended a subsequent meeting on 14 February 2018 to discuss the initial site design. Feedback has been taken into account and the site plan amended accordingly.

36. The chair of the Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust has confirmed that Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea hold no objection to the proposed cemetery development and are satisfied that the perspectives and views of the iwi are understood, accepted and reflected in the record of these meetings. Their perspectives and views are understood and will be incorporated into the proposal.

37. It is expected that other iwi will be consulted as part of resource consent consultation requirements.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

38. The Great Barrier Local Board has $30,000 allocated in the 2017/18 year to progress investigations, concept plan development and consenting processes. This amount does not currently include public notification process costs.

39. The board has deferred a decision on allocating capital cemetery development budget in its 2018/19 Community Facilities work programme to the same 24 July business meeting. As the notification and hearings process is part of obtaining consent it is suggested these costs be included in that allocation and recommendation c) reflects that.

40. Costs to publicly notify the proposal are likely to be around $30,000, assessed as follows:

   **Resource consent application**
   - Consultant costs: Costs to prepare the resource consent application are budgeted, but an extra amount may be needed for the hearings process. Providing an estimated cost of up to $5,000 is proposed.
   - Public notification: A notified resource consent requires a deposit of $20,000 on application. A limited notified consent deposit is $10,000. Some savings are anticipated by running the consent and reclassification processes together.
   - Hearings process (if submissions received): A deposit of $3,000 is required. Hearings costs would normally be paid by the applicant but in this case (see below) these are covered by Auckland Council as the applicant is the Great Barrier Local Board.
   - Given the anticipated small scale of any hearing, it is likely the $20,000 deposit will cover staff costs

   **Reserves Act reclassification process**
   - Hearings costs. Hearing commissioners and hearing advisors time will be covered as it’s an Auckland Council application.
   - Public notification and publishing the gazette notice declaring the reclassification will cost up to $1000.

41. If the resource consent wasn’t publicly notified then the resource consent application deposit is $4,500. No notification or hearings costs would be incurred.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

42. The greatest risk for the Great Barrier Local Board is not being able to advance a cemetery on this site given the work undertaken over the last few years to obtain authority for cemetery development, find a suitable site and get to this point.

43. There is a risk that the resource consent application won’t be approved. Pursuing a fully notified consent application alongside reclassification, although more costly and time consuming is not considered to adversely affect chances of success in any significant way.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

44. The next step is to apply for resource consent. If the board seeks non notification then the reclassification process would not be commenced until a consent decision is received.
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Attachment A

Crossroads Reserve, Whangaparapara Road, Claris
Auckland Transport July 2018 update to the Great Barrier Local Board

File No.: CP2018/12989

Te take mō Te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an update to the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board on transport related matters in their area including the Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This report covers:
   a. a general summary of operational projects and activities of interest to the board
   b. an update on the board’s transport capital fund
   c. responses from Auckland Transport to resolutions by the board
   d. an update on local board advocacy
   e. an update on local board transport enquiries
   f. other Auckland Transport news of interest to the board
   g. quarterly report on Auckland Transport’s projects and activities.

Te tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board:
   a) note and receive the Auckland Transport July 2018 update report.

Horopaki / Context
3. This report addresses transport related matters in the local board area and includes information on the status of the LBTCF.
4. Auckland Transport is responsible for much of Auckland’s transport services, excluding state highways and the railway network. They report on a monthly basis to local boards, as set out in their Local Board Engagement Plan. This monthly reporting commitment acknowledges the important engagement role local boards play within and on behalf of their local communities.
5. The LBTCF is a ring fenced capital budget controlled by local boards and delivered by Auckland Transport. Local boards can use this fund to deliver transport projects that they believe are important but are not part of Auckland Transport’s work programme. Criteria for projects are determined by the Governing Body and include that the project:
   - be safe
   - not impede network efficiency
   - be in the road corridor (although projects running through parks can be considered if there is a transport outcome).

Report on Auckland Transport projects and activities
6. Please see below for information on Auckland Transport’s activities:
   - Whangaparapara Wharf Upgrade - Works completed at the end June 2018. Excess materials are to be relocated to Shoal Bay. Final tidy up of Whangaparapara site to be
completed first week in July. Additional piles and bracing installed to upgrade entire fender system and provide protection for fuel lines along external wharf edge.

- **Shoal Bay Wharf upgrade** - Works commenced end June and to continue throughout July. Wharf loading capacity to be increased to 10 tonnes. Installation of new weather protection structure (carport) for freight and forklift. Temporary relocation of Sealink shipping container while works being undertaken. Container to be decommissioned upon completion. On wharf shelter to have new metal sheeting and Perspex installed to provide additional weather protection for passengers.

- **Shoal Bay dingy ramp and rack** - Consent lodged with Auckland Council. Physical works expected to take place in September/October prior to summer season.

- **Shoal Bay mooring pile** - Consent lodged with Auckland Council. Anticipating being able to undertake installation in September when piling contractor on island to undertake other works.

- **Okupu Wharf shed roof** - Works completed in June. Some minor painting works to be undertaken in July.

- **Reconfiguration of Intersection of Whangaparapara / Gray Road** – The work is mostly complete. The project will marking the intersection but will hold off until the weather is more suitable, they estimate in September. They will see if temporary markings are suitable in the meantime.

- **Cowshed Bridge** – Details about repairs or a replacement for the bridge will be forthcoming.

### Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

**Local Board Transport Capital Fund**

7. As of the new electoral term, Aotea Great Barrier Local Board had $328,104 in their Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF).

8. Following the proposal to increase the Local Board Transport Capital Fund, the allocation to the board has increased by $189,732 and is now $517,836.

9. From this they have committed $68,000 for a dust seal on Sandhills Road. This leaves $449,836 unallocated.

**Rough order of cost for Footpath on Hector Sanderson from Claris Café to the Cross Roads**

10. Auckland Transport has provided a rough order of cost to complete the remaining sections of footpath on Hector Sanderson from Claris Café to the Cross Roads:

   - **Section A from Claris Café to Land Fill Road** – creates a new unsealed path adjacent to the seal edge. Includes all necessary earthworks, drainage work and contingency. The Rough order of cost is $10,000.

   - **Section B from Land Fill Road to wall outside Police Station** – creates a new unsealed path adjacent to the seal edge. Includes all necessary earthworks, drainage work and contingency. Rough order of cost is $15,000.

   - **Section K from Grays Place to Cross Roads** – creates new unsealed path adjacent to the seal edge on the Northside. Includes all necessary earthworks, drainage and contingency. Rough order of cost is $20,000.

11. The total cost is therefore $45,000.

12. These costs exclude street lighting, redesign, geotechnical investigation and additional consents that may be required.
Rough order of cost for Whangaparapara Road walking route

13. Auckland Transport has also provided a rough order of cost for a walkway on Whangaparapara Road from the Cross Road to the Hot Pool.

14. Due to the road widths, alignment and the topography of the land, the option to road widen and install retaining structures to provide an off road facility has not been pursued. The following is based on the funding available to the Board and the limited funding assistance from other areas within Auckland Transport. It is important to note that some of the proposed work does not meet Auckland Transport code of practice standards.

15. The following commentary describes where a possible passage or path for walking could be implemented on Whangaparapara Road. This walkway encompasses the use of the existing road, mown grass areas or metalled shoulders and takes into account visibility issues resulting from the multiple curvatures encountered along this route. The route is approximately 2271m long.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chainage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00m Greys Rd end</td>
<td>South side, mixture of using mown grass and metal shoulder area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00 to 493m</td>
<td>Bridge south side (on road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 to 503m</td>
<td>On road south side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503 to 560m</td>
<td>Bridge south side (on road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 to 572m</td>
<td>Golf Club entrance (on road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572 to 683m</td>
<td>On road south side, mixture of mainly on road and metal shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683m to 1155m</td>
<td>On road mainly on south side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155m to 1283m</td>
<td>Cross over to the north side due to left hand bend on the south side (visibility due to left hand bend), after bend cross over to south side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1283 to 1458m</td>
<td>On road, mixture of metal shoulder use however mainly on road south side, crossing over north side due to left hand bend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458 to 2158m</td>
<td>North side, mainly on road prior to entrance to the Hot springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2158 to 2271m</td>
<td>Hot Springs entrance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. A rough order cost is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary &amp; General Costs plus Traffic Management</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing of grass berm</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen or supply and place metal on shoulder</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation pruning or removal</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consents and staff time</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. The rough order of cost excludes the following:

- Consultant fees
- Retaining structures and
• Storm water controls.

18. Auckland Transport is ongoing investigations into rough orders of costs for the following projects:
   • For solutions on the road corridor to address Claris shopping centre carparking safety and congestion issues.
   • Port FitzRoy traffic calmer
   • Shoal Bay footpath (from Mulberry Grove School to Shoal Bay wharf)

19. Auckland Transport is also investigating costs for potential road sealing projects that could be funded by the board, these include:
   • Kaiaraara Bay Road (from FitzRoy wharf to Akapoua bridge/ford)
   • Puriri Bay Road
   • Whangaparapar Road (hot springs to Harpoon)

Local board advocacy

20. In response to resolution GBI/2018/56:
   “That the Great Barrier Local Board:
   b) advocate for traffic to slow down through settlement areas and request a speed engineer to workshop with the board.”

21. Michael Brown, Senior Road Safety Team Leader at Auckland Transport, with specialization for rural road safety visited the island to look at safety concerns. As part of the visit a meeting was arranged with the principal of Okiwi School and visits to areas of concern as previously highlighted by the board including Karaka Bay Road, Port Fitzroy, Claris, Schooner Bay Road, Tryphena, Sand Hills Road and Whangaparapara Road. A workshop on the subject of speed management and road safety in general was held with the board.

22. Update on local board advocacy initiatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Initiative</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to minimise agrichemical use by using alternative methods and advocate to Auckland Transport to follow suit.</td>
<td>Auckland Transport’s maintenance contractors currently use chemical’s during road maintenance. The agreed process is that our contractors will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigate smart energy systems that allow island communities to have their own power systems and pave the way for electric vehicles</strong></td>
<td>Auckland Transport is happy to work with the Local Board to facilitate this initiative. Our Sustainability Team is looking at potential ways Auckland Transport could support the board with this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving and linking existing walkways and cycleways and investigating further opportunities to fill gaps in the network, including horse trails</strong></td>
<td>Auckland Transport currently has no programmed works for walkways or cycleways on Great Barrier. However Auckland Transport is investigating several options for use of the Local Board Transport Capital Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocating to Auckland Transport to continue investigating the use of dust suppressant products on populated roads.</strong></td>
<td>Auckland Transport is not currently funded for dust suppressant products and the Local Board Transport Capital Fund cannot currently be used for this purpose. However Auckland Transport is undergoing a investigating different products, you can find out more information here: <a href="https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/rodney-dust-supression-trial/">https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/rodney-dust-supression-trial/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify key coastal infrastructure needing protection from erosion and develop environmentally sensitive ways to address this</strong></td>
<td>An inspection of the erosion issues affecting Shoal Bay Road, adjacent to Pa Beach in Tryphena, was carried out in May 2017. A report was created that outlines the erosion that has occurred, an assessment of the main cause of the erosion, and a range of options for addressing the erosion. Further investigation is required and Auckland Transport is currently reviewing the report to determine the appropriate response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocate to Auckland Transport to follow Auckland Council’s new procurement approach and directly manage the island’s roading contractor.</strong></td>
<td>The current contract covers Rakino, Waiheke and Great Barrier Island and budget is allocated to this contract not to specific Islands. This contract expires on 30/06/19 and has the potential to roll over for one further term of two years. Auckland Transport will be taking into account Great Barrier Local Board feedback when reviewing the next contracts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress being made on investigations**

23. Update on local board transport enquiries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enquiry</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking enforcement at Claris Carpark</td>
<td>We are working closely with Auckland Council staff to monitor the ongoing use of the car park. Our Parking Enforcement team has sent out target letters to overstayers. If this doesn’t have the desired result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish passages</td>
<td>Working closely with Auckland Council Environmental Services team we have developed indicative costings for the work, both one off and an ongoing basis, to maintain fish access. Currently we are working to source funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport Wharf H&amp;S Review</td>
<td>Auckland Transport is currently reviewing its wharf facilities and operations at Tryphena and Whangaparapara. The team expects to be able to have an H&amp;S walkthrough with the LB and Sealink to close out the H&amp;S report at the end of June.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

24. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no local, sub-regional or regional impacts.

25. Auckland Transport attended a workshop on the 10th of July with the local board.

Traffic Control Committee resolutions

26. There were no Traffic Control Committee resolutions pertaining to this local board area.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

27. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no impacts or opportunities for Māori. Any engagement with Māori, or consideration of impacts and opportunities, will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / financial implications

28. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no financial implications.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

29. The proposed decision of receiving the report has no risks. Auckland Transport has risk management strategies in place for all of their projects.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

30. Auckland Transport will provide another update report to the local board next month.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ben Halliwell - Elected Member Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Helgard Wagener - Relationship Manager Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards |
Environmental agency and community group reports

File No.: CP2018/11595

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”.

Te tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) receive the following reports:
   i. Biosecurity local board general update May – June 2018
   ii. Biodiversity/biosecurity report May – June 2018
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Biosecurity Local Board General Update

Month/Year: 14th May - 14th June 2018
Officers name: Jeremy Warden

Hauraki Gulf Controlled Area- Great Barrier Island

Plague Skink Shoal Bay Wharf

Current activities are focused on caring for the Chickens and maintaining containment fences until the Plague Skink Technical Advisory Group (TAG) come up with a decision on what will be happening with the programme.

Chickens are producing a lot of eggs which are being packed and shipped to Auckland City mission at no cost.

Argentine & Darwin’s ants

Darwin’s ants

Site visit to audit the 1ha Mohunga site. Carried out had searching which identified four nests which were treated with Bifent and Kas sand.

Darwin’s ants are related to Argentine ants. They are similar in colour but slightly smaller. When their nests are disturbed they give off a pungent citronella odour as do the ants when crushed.

They can remain undetected in low numbers below the soil surface and so are less obvious than many other ant species.

Argentine Ant and Plague Skink Surveillance

- Sheal Bay rubbish skips: looked at possible sources that may have contributed to Argentine ants being present which involved follow up surveillance of both the skip site and Barrier cartage depo. No sign of Argentine ants at either location.
- A concerned builder contacted biosecurity regarding swarms of ants in a Caravan he was dismantling on Ocean View Road. Ants were confirmed to be white footed house ants. They are distinct because the workers raise their abdomens when threatened. White footed ants are a common house hold pest ant.
- Two old homesteads in the Claris area had surveillance carried out for Argentine ants with nothing found.
- Hand search around Oceanview Road pond and surrounds. Two nests found which received direct treatments.
- Hand search at Gray Road and Okupu sites. Argentine ants were present at both sites and received direct treatments.

Weed Control

Total Control

- Madeira vine removal at Cape Barrier Road and Whangaparapara lodge
**Strategic Weeds Initiative (SWI)**

- Smilax and Kahili Ginger – Concurrent work at Shoal Bay
  - This season a reduced number of Smilax plants were removed from this area during a grid search
  - A number of Kahili Ginger seedlings concentrated within a small area were removed
- Kahili Ginger – Omata Rd
  - An adult plant was discovered at the southern boundary necessitating further work next season
- Kahili Ginger – Okupu
  - Buffer work carried out with nothing found.
- Kahili Ginger – Sunbeam
  - The last of the area searched with nothing found.
- Moth Plant – Kairara Bay point
  - A small number of adult plants were cut and pasted and seedlings treated. Control at this site is making good progress.
- Climbing Asparagus – Harpoon Hill
  - A number of seedlings were removed from the middle of the site with one property remaining to complete the grid search.

**Wharf and Airport Mustelid and Rodent Pest Surveillance (April)**

- Port Fitzroy 51% Bait take, 2 x kiore caught in DOC200, 2x Wax tag=Rat
- Tryphena- 41% Bait take 3x Ship Rat caught in DOC200, 3x Wax tag=Rat
- Whangapararapa- 84% bait take 2x Ship Rat in DOC200's, 5x Wax tag=Rat
- Okupu -100% bait take, 1 x Rat caught in DOC200, 1x wax tag=Rat
- Claris airfield environment – 37% bait take
- Claris residential-35% bait take

**Bait Stations at Transfer Sites (April)**

- Southern Stations- Medlands 40%, Okupu 100%, Puriri bay 100%, Mulberry grove 0%
- Northern Stations- Moolahehe 38%, Okivi 100% & Kawa 72%

**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>1x Rat</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty</td>
<td>1x Kiore</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickards</td>
<td>1x Kiore</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellins</td>
<td>0x Rat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaparara Jetty</td>
<td>0x Rat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Rat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okupu Boat Ramp</td>
<td>1x Rat</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Rat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Grove Boat Ramp</td>
<td>0x Rat</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puriri Bay Boat Ramp</td>
<td>1x Rat</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Rat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** No new species of pest animals detected. Bait consumption very high at Whangaparapara and Port Fitzroy.
Dog Work

Assist with rodent detection work on Hauturu Little Barrier for a week. Nothing detected in areas and routes travelled during the surveillance.

Rabbits

Awana paddocks
Fumigation of warrens north of the campground has been completed. Work has now started along the beach fore dunes. Low numbers of rabbits noted.

Cats

A total of 14 cats were captured and euthanised in Awana over the past month.
Great Barrier Island Rabbit Control Shooting
May 2018

Good Wood Aotearoa Ltd

Introduction

Good Wood Aotearoa was contracted by Auckland Council to undertake 104hrs and Morton’s for up to 16hrs of Rabbit control.

Over the available time between arriving on the 18th May and departing on the 22nd May, we completed 104hrs for Council sites, 16hrs for the Morton’s Palmers beach site and some additional hours over 4 nights. See attached spreadsheet.

Further non-chargeable hours beyond this were spent during the day on dropping off carcasses picked up around houses, school grounds, roads, tracks and general high use public areas to local residents for their use. Rabbits shot in out of the way sites were either left or thrown into the bushes in passing as the cost of retrieval is a cost on efficiency and effectiveness. Additional hours were also conducted as we had a spare night waiting for ferry and the guys cannot sit still.

Hunters utilised in this operation were Glen Coulston, Shaun Gifford, Neville Alexander and Ross Wharf.

Methodology approach

A combination of foot and vehicle hunting from 4pm through until 7am was utilised.

Suppressed .22 and .17HMR rimfire rifles were used for all shooting. .17HMRs used for longer range shoots where rabbits were wary and hard to get closer to.

Night hunting was conducted with thermal scopes and cameras. Airstrips were shot from the elevation of the HiLux enabling hunters to see the rabbits in the longer grass. They were then also foot shot as it was evident the vehicle activity at night disturbs the animals. Afternoon shooting over warrens around Okwi township with the .17’s at range again proved very productive.

Rabbits in built up and public areas were retrieved while those in more discrete areas were left.

All 4 nights were exceptionally good conditions for shooting. Dark, clear and cool.

Results and Findings

The attached spreadsheet outlines the nightly kills and effort by site and by night.

In total 443 rabbits were shot over 4 nights and 148hrs. This was a dramatic reduction in raw numbers per effort than the 3 previous control rounds the past 2yrs year with 1028 shot over 3nights and 117hrs in Nov 17, 1573 rabbits shot over six nights and 255hrs in June 17, and likewise back in June 16 when 1044 were shot over 6 nights and 288hrs. It suggests, and observations concur, that the nett population on the island has climaxed and collapsed this summer as discussed below. This tally however also partly reflects the team having gained block knowledge from the last rounds of shooting therefore becoming more efficient, and, the fact we have extra new thermal
technology added (with 3 units rather than 2) from previous control visits making our effort even more effective.

Okiwi township which is a large and complex area to cover for the hours available, with a lot of edge invasion from the warrens on Okiwi station and in the forested PCL impacting the site. This reinvasion renders control ineffectual for achieving lower density at the present levels of effort being resourced, especially being a built up site that adds complexity to control effort.

It was noted across the island there has been a dramatic reduction in the rabbit population this summer. Its correlates with reductions occurring in Auckland and Northland this season where rabbit populations have crashed due to a wet summer and potentially a high fly population this year combined with the usual selection species population cycle. Grass flies are a primary vector of RCD (or RHD) and it is interesting to note that while sheep farmers have suffered this season from bad fly strike, rabbit populations have also crashed suggesting the disease may have had another bout of increased efficacy due to high vector numbers. R selective species are prone to mass reproduction and overcrowding which in turn leads to disease and vulnerability to environmental changes.

The attached maps show the majority of hunt track logs. Some are missing due to some forgetfulness turning on at start up times. Photographs of collected rabbits on the second night were also taken.

In summary Kaitoke, Awana, Okiwi airstrip and Palmers rabbit numbers are low. Okiwi Township had moderate numbers but much lower than we have previously encountered. Over the fence in the DOC Whangapoua campground however numbers remain high. The thermal scope and an evening walk out to go fishing showed literally hundreds are still present in this enclave. No hunting effort was conducted on the DOC land at Okiwi, being out of the scope of our contract, and, DOC requesting we do not disturb them for their contractor. The Station and Campground really need some warren fumigation conducted and shooting on a more regular basis with both thermal equipment and .17s.

Rabbits amongst the houses at Okiwi remain highly problematic with safe shots often unavailable and rabbits extremely wary thus giving not much chance for a second thought at shooting when seen. Past regular shooting has educated these rabbits and the presence of building lights makes stalking animals at night harder as they can see you more easily. We however accounted for 94% of the rabbits we observed out over the 3 nights in the town.

**Liaison and consultation**

All landowners and occupiers in the control areas where suitable to shoot have been spoken to prior and/or during shooting operations. All spoken to have given their support. A handful of properties due to their confined and closely built environments are not suitable to shoot safely within.

Notifications were also distributed via the schools networks.

Department of Conservation Permits were obtained for Kaitoke and Awana.

Police Central comm centre were notified of the weeks shooting activities with job notifications lodged and closed each night. The local community police station was also informed.

**Rabbit carcass usage and non-wastage**
As previously mentioned, Rabbits shot outside of the high public use, airstrips and residential areas were not retrieved as it would have been too time-consuming impacting on ability to deliver effective hunt hours, picking up was not considered necessary to prevent a public nuisance or health risk and we had enough to keep local community requests filled.

All rabbits shot and found in high public use spaces, near road and farm tracks, buildings and high use areas were picked up and disposed of. Some that were shot disappeared into holes and undergrowth however and could not be retrieved.

Disposal time for those animals retrieved is not included in the accounted contract hunt hours. Disposal included topping up DOC's predator bait freezer, supplying dog food to residents, predator bait to Glenfern sanctuary, carcasses supplied to residents who wished to eat a few, waste rabbits (offal and small rabbits) given to pigs and for garden compost. The balance that were suitable brought back for a pet food company and bait for mainland predator control programmes and to keep the contract price low by supplemented cost recovery.

![Image](image-url)
It was noted Awana has a very high pig population at present. While Al West has a few semi-domestic pigs present, there were also many other feral pigs visiting the site. 18 pigs were observed in Bill Curreen’s paddocks. None were shot as these were not within our mandate.

A Black Petrel was observed every night on this trip, about 400m south of windy canyon on the roadside. This bird must be resident as for the last 3 years we have encountered it there on the same corner of the road (Heading south second left hand corner that has a grassy pullover lip on its right). It has no bandings. It is also probably only a matter of time before it gets run over, as it likes to sleep on the warm tar seal! It is quite possible other birds are also present potentially and interesting to know if this is within the colonies known range or is a possible population enclave.

**Recommendations**

Ideally Okiwi station, Whangapoua campground, Mayby’s and Waterhouse’s should have Pindone and or Fumigation operations conducted where rabbit warrens occur. This should then be followed by 3 monthly shooting for 2 years with 2 nights per shooting period. Monitor counts should be used to govern when the numbers and warrens are significantly reduced enough to the point where reducing the maintenance shoot effort in future is not going to compromise the level of control gained.

The current collapse in rabbit numbers is the Achilles heel that requires exploiting this coming year during pre-spring recruitment. If poison work was conducted by Envirokiwi to target the warrens around Okiwi Town, Okiwi station and the DOC campgrounds, followed by shooting, some excellent results to maintain low residual populations could be achieved.
The warrens in Whangapoua Camp, along the edge of the DOC and Maby’s paddocks at Okiwi town, and below the Okiwi ranger station remain the strongest warrens at present and are primary sources of reinvasion at the airfield and the town. The thermal cameras showed good numbers of mature rabbits were still present in these locations despite the recent population dieback. Whangapoua campground magtoxing would have a good outcome and given this does not involve soil modifications it does not impact on the historic/archaeological fabric present. Within all the treatment areas, establishing prefeeding a month before shooting to draw rabbits into safer shooting zones is a possible option if landowners can ensure the rabbits are not disrupted during this prefeeding period.

Awana rabbits I suggest could be maintained or brought to lower levels with periodic shooting of 2 times a year for 2 nights each round and occasional magtoxin fumigation of any burrows located. The work conducted this last season on warren destruction has certainly impacted the population with some warrens in the southern dunes appearing extant and then population now at a manageable level by shooting and infrequent magtox.

At Kaitoke the rabbits population is well under control although it should continue to be treated every 6 months and any warrens fumigated when found. Neal Hodgkins frequent shooting obviously keeps a lid on them. At the Okiwi airfield rabbits were observed high tailing at the northern end before the vehicle even approached the southern run way purely in reaction to the sound of the vehicle and its lights approaching up the strip. Walking the runway in turn resulted in further kills of these vehicle shy animals. It also requires sustained frequent shooting until the Whangapoua camp warrens are destroyed and high re-infestation rates removed.

Palmer’s Beach, the rabbits are being kept at low levels just with shooting, but where any warrens are found these should be noted and magtoxin applied as well to prolong the time gaps between maintenance shooting. Currently twice a year shooting is keeping the population in check. Warren discovery and destruction could see it reduced to once a year shooting.

Thermal Cameras should be used for monitoring and counting rabbits as it is passive on the populations and counters the effects of light shyness associated with spotlight shooting. With every year of use, their accuracy at confirming population densities verses spotlighting as a tool is highlighted. Increasing light shyness over time clearly results in skewed counts. Rabbits will sit and are easier for counting (rather than running rabbits) and equally be missed altogether (wiser rabbits having already moved before the light arrives on them), or, be double counted (running back through the light).
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## Rabbit Kills and Hunt Hours by Site and Date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Awana</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Kaitoke</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Okiwi Village</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Palmers</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Whangapoua</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Total Rabbits</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
<th>Total hrs</th>
<th>Hrs Non contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2018</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/05/2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/05/2018</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/05/2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>443</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Whangapoua" was only the Okiwi Airstrip and road edge back to Okiwi DOC base. The DOC Campground and DOC Okiwi station paddock areas were left alone at DOC’s request so as not to disturb the areas for their contractor.

1 feral cat shot at Okiwi.

David Spiers lawn area in Okiwi village was not shot as he requested we not shoot there but his property over the stream at Nathan’s was shot.

Thermal imaging from the road side indicated numbers on David’s lawn were similar to those at Endtz, Waterhouses and Mabys.

Thermal imaging from the airstrip, road side and mabys paddocks indicated very high numbers still on the DOC lands adjoining particularly the Whangapoua campground.

Non Contract hours were also spent each day dressing out and disposing off carcasses picked up from high public use areas and doing extra shooting just because we happened to be here and the guys wanted to set a target of getting 400 at least.

Carcasses were dropped off at Endtz, Cleaves, Hodgsons and Nathans for their personal use (pigs, dogs, garden, etc), and, the DOC predator freezer stocked up. The rest were kept for mainland predator bait and petfood.
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Pest coordinator

- Kids from Okiwai School have been taught how to enter data into trapNZ.
- A permit to trap on DoC land is being prepared.
- Some trap boxes have been modified to accommodate mouse traps that rats can’t access. If successful we will look at modifying more.
- The contractor is looking at building the next lot of boxes to reduce price and shipping requirements.

Ecology conversations

- Bat roost boxes
  Bat roost boxes are being designed and built by Envirokiwi to install in Okiwai Park.
- Bio-library
  A bio-library with an in-built Weta motel is being built to allow residents easy access to biodiversity information and monitoring that has occurred on the island. The library will also have identification books and resources for backyard trapping. This is proposed to be installed next to the community garden in medlands and provides an area in which the ecology vision group can meet and do trap demonstrations for residents.
- Monthly meeting
  The May monthly meeting was attended by eleven people and covered funding opportunities for community groups, an overview of Auckland council projects, and updates on current community conservation initiatives.
  A summary was given out to all attendees and the eco-vision mailing list. An update was sent to the barrier bulletin for publication and included news of our overwintering royal spoonbills returning to Whangaparapara Harbour.

- Taonga of the month
  The Taonga highlight for June in the barrier bulletin article was Duvaucel’s gecko. The article highlighted facts on the species and information on how to attract lizards to your garden including rat and mouse control, keeping the cat in check and creating habitat. A table was provided for planting fruiting and nectar providing trees for lizards.
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Dunua ra’s gecko on Mokohinau Islands, J. Wairepo

- Actea garden bird survey
  The garden bird survey is all go this week, with results to be collated over July.

- Pest control
  200 wooden trap boxes and 200 rat traps have been ordered to assist with community-directed rodent control.

Community

- Pests not pets
  An article was submitted for the barrier bulletin highlighting importance of not keeping pet mice and rats on Aotea Great Barrier. Pet rats are always Rattus norvegicus. This species is
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not known to be established on Aotea Great Barrier. The rules in the Regional Pest Management Strategy state that rats cannot be knowingly transported to or within islands of the Hauraki Gulf.

- Claris Queens birthday market day
  A table was set up at the Claris market day with information on Argentine ants, plague skinks, rodent control, planting guides, threatened species and the Treasure Island’s program.
  An activity was taken with kids at the market who had to check for stowaways in a backpack and find all five pests in the quickest time. Species in the bag included plague skink eggs, an adult skink, argentine ants in a pottle, Darwin’s ants in a pottle and a packet of seeds in a shoe.

Glenfern Sanctuary

- Rodent peninsula tracking
  Assistance was given to the Glenfern team to help with the peninsula rodent tracking and rebaiting of traps.
  The tracking came back at 18%
  An ornate skink was spotted on one of the trap lines, along with Keruru and abundant fantail.
  It was a wet day; I’ll let the photos speak for themselves...

View from Glenfern Ridge  |  wet finish  |  can you spot the Ornate skink
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Pest animals

- Plague skinks
  The plague skink feasibility report has been sent through and will be reviewed by the biosecurity team over the next month.
  The eggs from the chicken are going to be donated to the Auckland City Mission on a monthly basis.
  The field team continue to maintain the fence, respond to new incursions and manage the chickens until a decision is made on the future of the project.

- Argentine ants
  An Argentine ant call out to Oceanview Road from a contractor was responded to this month.
  The ants were identified as Iridomyrmex species.
  Search and destroy methods have been deployed at some Argentine ant sites with contact insecticides to identify nests that have persisted in control areas post spring/summer baiting.
  Work has commenced in the Gray Road and Okupu sites with small nests found in both locations.

- Darwin’s ants
  A trip to the Mohunga Darwin’s ant site found multiple nests throughout north facing banks by a green house, an additional nest was located in a damp location which was unexpected.
  These finds indicate that the operational plan for Darwin’s ant’s eradication needs to be reviewed at the next Tactical advisory meeting.
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- Goodnature project (Windy hill)
  The windy hill good nature project is due to be completed at the end of July.
  A decision has been made to discontinue funding for this project due to below average
  results in regards to rodent tracking which has fluctuated around 30% from the projects
  commencement.
  A meeting is scheduled with biosecurity animal specialist to assess the future of the tools
  once removed from windy hill sanctuary.

![Graph showing rat tracking tunnel results]

Pest plants

- Equestrum sp.
  The horse tail (Equestrum sp.) located at Mulberry Grove was treated in late May and will be
  periodically checked to see the success of the treatment.

- Lantana
  A mature fruiting lantana plant was identified in Claris and has since had fruit removed to
  reduce the chance of spread
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- Madeira vine
  A new Madeira vine infestation which was identified during coastal weed surveillance was visited after its removal by contractors. Small sections of vine remain and larger areas above a waterway will need to be vial treated.

- *Egeria Densa*
  Egeria was identified in a landowner’s pond. The land owner has been advised it will need removal and not to transport the weed outside of or around the property.

- Cape pond weed
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Cape pond weed was identified in the same pond as the Egeria, the landowner has been advised not to move the plant elsewhere while a removal option is discussed.

Pond with Egeria and Cape pond weed Cape Barrier Road

Treasure Island’s ambassadors

- The Treasure Island’s ambassadors visited the wharf 15 times in May.
- There are fewer cars during the winter months but ambassadors have noted at least 1 load of interest on every sailing.
- The Kauri dieback cleaning station at sealink does not seem to be effective, perhaps due to the placement. The ambassadors have only noted 2 people use it since advocating. The weeds growing in the station have since been removed (Pictured)
- The Treasure Island’s sign had also come down and was sitting behind a bin this had been put back up by biosecurity staff.

Personal development, meetings & training

- Local board meeting (18-19 work program review)
- Engagement survey catch up
- Great Barrier Local board environment update & water quality project update
  - Suggestions for riparian plantings proposed
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- Goodnature A24 catch up with Great Barrier local Board

Local board request:

- Environment report cards Great Barrier Island.
  NIWA has just completed a research report on intertidal habitats (summarising the fieldwork around GBI that is mentioned in the fact sheet). The report is with GBI Manawhenua for review at the moment, but should also be available later in the year as well. Please see the report cards attached.
The overall environmental health score from A to F is based on average scores for soil quality and trace elements.

**Soil quality:** Soil samples are tested at five sites within the reporting area for seven key soil chemical, physical and biological factors including:
- soil acidity
- amounts of carbon and nitrogen
- plant available nitrogen
- plant available phosphorus
- soil density
- air filled space (macroporosity).

**Trace elements:** Soil samples are tested for eight trace elements including arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel and zinc.

Grades will vary for individual sites, land use and soil type.
MONITORING BACKGROUND

Auckland Council monitors soil quality to observe and report any changes that occur in the extent, quality or health of the region’s soil resources. Soil quality refers to the ability of the soil to sustain biological production (for example the amount of tiny microbes in the soil), maintain environmental quality (for example water purification), and promote plant and animal health.

Recommended guidelines for soil quality are those defined by nationwide studies and trace element background concentrations are taken from a regional study (as outlined in ARC TP 153). Soil quality guidelines are refined over time as a result of new research and continuous monitoring, therefore changes can be reflected in overall grade scores.

MONITORING INTERPRETATION

Test results reveal that Great Barrier Island has an overall soil health grading that’s good (grade B) which is attributed to various factors, including:

- all sites are regenerating with new indigenous [native] plant cover
- disturbance to the land from grazing and timber cutting stopped several decades ago, allowing the land to recover. However, at a few sites soil may not have fully recovered from compaction from stock treading or machinery (indicated by low macroporosity)
- trace elements are all within levels that normally occur in soil and scored an A grade.

MONITORING RESULTS

Data used to produce this report card includes:

- Number of sites – 5
- Land use/last year sampled (number of sites)
  - Indigenous (native) sites/2012 (5 sites)

Summary of monitoring results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil test</th>
<th>Number of sites outside guideline range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil acidity</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total carbon</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nitrogen</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant available nitrogen</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant available phosphorus</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk density</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air filled space (macroporosity)</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace elements</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIND OUT MORE

This report card is part of a series prepared by the Auckland Council’s Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit, which undertakes monitoring and research to provide information and evidence to inform the council’s activities and reporting. Auckland’s environment must be healthy and resilient in order to support life and lifestyle. More report cards can be found at: aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/stateofauckland. The report card series includes reporting on freshwater, terrestrial, marine, air, soil, capacity for growth, demographics and quality of life.

GET INVOLVED

Auckland Council provides more than 20 environmental programmes across the region for you to get involved with and improve your local environment.

For more information: e-mail monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or call us on 09 301 0101.
The overall grade is made up of five indicators:

- **Land cover**: Based on different ecosystems mapped in NZ Land Cover Database 3 (2000).
- **Native plants**: Average of four sub-indicators which reflect the diversity and biomass of native plants and the regeneration of native saplings and seedlings.
- **Birds**: Average of three sub-indicators which reflect the average diversity and conspicuousness of native birds, and the total number of bird species found within the reporting area.
- **Weeds**: Average of three sub-indicators which reflect the abundance and relative dominance of weedy and exotic trees, saplings and seedlings.
- **Pests**: Average of four sub-indicators which indicate the number of pest-free sites, and presence of rats, mice and possums in the landscape.

**Note**: Includes forest data only. From 2015 wetland data will also be reported.
CURRENT ECOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The Great Barrier reporting area includes Great Barrier Island (Aotea), Little Barrier Island (Hauturu) and the Mokohinau Islands. The vegetation predominantly comprises native regrowth following logging, kanuka forest and/or manuka scrub and forest are the most common components. Not surprisingly, this local board has the lowest percentage of urban cover (approx 0.3%). Most of the remaining land cover is characterised by pasture, mainly on low-lying, flatland surrounding the lower reaches of the major rivers. Most of Hauturu and some of the Mokohinau Islands have remained unmodified by human activity associated with farming and resource extraction by European settlers. However, much of Great Barrier island has been significantly affected from burning and logging of forests, mining, gum digging, and draining of wetlands to create farmland.

Despite this, Great Barrier Island still supports a high diversity of native flora and fauna. The island also retains extensive freshwater wetlands, saltmarsh and dunelands, all of which are nationally uncommon habitat types. Approximately 55 per cent of the remaining native vegetation remnants on Great Barrier Island are in protected areas.

KEY BIODIVERSITY SITE

GREAT BARRIER ISLAND (AOТЕА)

Great Barrier Island (Aotea) is of national and international significance for conservation of New Zealand’s unique biodiversity due to its high biological diversity and abundance of relatively unmodified native ecosystems. The island supports at least 560 native vascular plant species, which represents nearly a quarter of the New Zealand flora, and these include at least 75 threatened and uncommon plant species, and three plants endemic to Aotea. Around 5000 species of land and freshwater invertebrates are thought to inhabit the island. Great Barrier also supports one frog species as well as a wide range of indigenous reptiles including eight skink species, five geckos, and possibly additional (as yet undiscovered) species. Among offshore islands only Little Barrier and the Mercury Islands support a comparable diversity of reptiles.

Great Barrier’s avifauna includes at least eighty-two different bird species, although some of these are seabirds that may only be occasional visitors to the island. This total is almost a quarter of all the bird species recorded in the New Zealand region. The bird fauna includes large healthy populations of threatened species such as kaka, brown teal, kereru, NZ dotterel, wrybill, fernbird, and marsh crake.

FIND OUT MORE

This report card is part of a series prepared by the Auckland Council’s Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit, which undertakes monitoring and research to provide information and evidence to inform the council’s activities and reporting. Auckland’s environment must be healthy and resilient in order to support life and lifestyle. More report cards can be found at: aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/states_of_auckland. The report card series includes reporting on freshwater, terrestrial, marine, air, soil, capacity for growth, demographics and quality of life.

GET INVOLVED

Auckland Council provides more than 20 environmental programmes across the region for you to get involved with and improve your local environment.

For more information: e-mail monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or call us on 09 301 0101.
GREAT BARRIER ISLAND

RIMU is working with research company EcoGIS to map rocky reefs in the Hauraki Gulf using satellite imaging technology. Currently, there is no large-scale mapping of intertidal (area exposed to air between low and high tide levels) and subtidal (underwater) rocky reefs in New Zealand, meaning we have no detailed knowledge of how much of a particular subtidal habitat exists or how often it changes. RIMU uses multispectral analysis of satellite imagery to identify both physical habitats (reefs, sand and mud) and biological habitats (kelp forest, urchin barrens, algae areas) on Hauraki Gulf rocky reefs down to a depth of 15 metres (limited by light penetration). So far, results from this work show us that for Great Barrier Island there are approximately 24 km² of rocky reef. Of this total, 74% (or 18 km²) is subtidal while the remaining 26% (or 6 km²) is intertidal. The coverage of large brown seaweeds found on the subtidal reefs was estimated to be 72% (or 13 km²), making this the dominant habitat found on these subtidal reefs. Subtidal reefs at Great Barrier Island had 2% (or 0.3 km²) classed as having urchin barrens, while other small areas were classed as either bare rock, or had “surfing algae” assemblages present.

Recently we completed a research program to assess whether elevated nutrients were contributing to the presence of a green algae (Microdictyon umbillicatum) washing up on the beaches of Tryphena Harbour. The program ran from October 2012 to February 2014 using a range of techniques including: underwater video, water and seaweed sampling, and nutrient isotope analysis (a type of nutrient fingerprinting).

Nutrient levels of the surrounding oceanic waters are similar between Tryphena harbour, adjacent Great Barrier Island sites and

Leigh on the mainland. The isotope analysis of Microdictyon tissue suggests that human generated sources of nutrients periodically contribute to nutrient loading within the harbour.

The unique physical setting of Tryphena Harbour likely facilitates the presence of Microdictyon. The harbour floor is dominated by coarse sand and shell hash providing substrate for Microdictyon attachment, while the harbour itself is protected from large ocean swells and clear oceanic water provides optimal growing conditions.

Overall, the results do not provide strong evidence that the proliferation of Microdictyon in Tryphena Harbour is due to elevated nutrient levels in this location. However, the optimal physical conditions for seaweed growth within Tryphena Harbour mean that even relatively small amounts of anthropogenic-sourced nutrients will likely promote the long-term persistence and proliferation of Microdictyon within the harbour.

GREAT BARRIER ISLAND MONITORING SITES

In the absence of comprehensive data for some areas, report cards are not available. In these areas fact sheets have been generated until more information is collected.

FIND OUT MORE

This report card is part of a series prepared by the Auckland Council’s Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit, which undertakes monitoring and research to provide information and evidence to inform the council’s activities and reporting. Auckland’s environment must be healthy and resilient in order to support life and lifestyle. More report cards can be found at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/statesofauckland. The report card series includes reporting on freshwater, marine, soil, terrestrial, air, capacity for growth, demographics and quality of life.

For more information: e-mail monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or call us on 09 301 0101.
The overall grade is made up of five indicators:

**Water quality**: Water samples are tested for temperature, oxygen concentration, turbidity and the levels of pH, ammonia and nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus). The results of this testing are compared against guidelines for Auckland to produce a water quality index.

**Flow patterns**: This involves monitoring the hydrologic connectivity of the river to upstream and downstream reaches and the floodplain using the Stream Ecological Valuation (SEV), which is a method of assessing the ecological health of our rivers.

**Nutrient cycling**: This involves monitoring the inputs and processing of minerals, particulates and contaminants using the SEV biogeochemical functions.

**Habitat quality**: This involves monitoring the diversity and quality of habitats using the SEV habitat provision functions.

**Biodiversity**: Field assessments and samples are collected to assess the type and amount of native plants and animals using the SEV biodiversity functions.

The reporting area consists of Great Barrier Island and Little Barrier Island, which cover 320 km² of land representing 6.5% of the region. The reporting area has the largest native vegetation (92%) of any of the reporting areas.

The extent of impervious surface (hard surfaces) is likely to be lower than the regional average of 9%.

Total rainfall in 2013 (1396 mm) was 10.4% less than the long term average (1712 mm). There are 29 years of rainfall record from the Port Fitzroy and Claris rain gauges.
MONITORING BACKGROUND AND INTERPRETATION

Auckland Council’s State of the Environment (SoE) monitoring programme has been building a record of Auckland’s environment for more than 25 years. This information is critical to the effective management of Auckland’s natural environment, after all, you can’t manage what you don’t monitor.

The monitoring programme shows there is a strong relationship between the health of rivers and the type of land cover in the surrounding catchment. Rivers that drain through forested catchments (particularly native forests) typically have excellent water quality and ecology, while rivers that drain from urban catchments typically have poor water quality and ecology.

The Great Barrier reporting area is predominantly forested and as a result, the health of the area’s rivers is likely to be excellent. Rivers in this reporting area tend to have riparian margins with lots of trees and bush, which provide shade, leaf litter and woody debris to the stream and anchor the stream banks. The absence of urban development means there is very little channel modification or pollution from discharges or stormwater.

The data used to produce this report card is from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River name</th>
<th>Site location</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Date range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native forest average</td>
<td>DOC hut</td>
<td>Water quality</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiaara Stream</td>
<td>DOC hut</td>
<td>SEV</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiote Creek</td>
<td>Hot Springs Track</td>
<td>SEV</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaka Bay Stream</td>
<td>Karaka Bay Road</td>
<td>SEV</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maby Stream</td>
<td>Maby Road</td>
<td>SEV</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rerorara Bay Stream</td>
<td>DOC reserve</td>
<td>SEV</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryphena Stream</td>
<td>Meuldland Road</td>
<td>SEV</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is impossible to monitor every characteristic of every freshwater environment, hence for some areas, such as Great Barrier, we monitor ecological health but have used results from similar catchments to infer water quality.

FIND OUT MORE

This report card is part of a series prepared by the Auckland Council’s Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit, which undertakes monitoring and research to provide information and evidence to inform the council’s activities and reporting. Auckland’s environment must be healthy and resilient in order to support life and lifestyle. More report cards can be found at: aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/stateofauckland. The report card series includes reporting on freshwater, terrestrial, marine, air, soil, capacity for growth, demographics and quality of life.

GET INVOLVED

Auckland Council provides more than 20 environmental programmes across the region for you to get involved with and improve your local environment.

*For more information: e-mail monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or call us on 09 301 0101.
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Appendices 1-6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There is a growing national and global urgency to develop effective biosecurity and eradication strategies for invasive herpetofauna. As world leaders in biosecurity management, New Zealand has gained a reputation for providing innovative solutions to management issues posed by pest species. The plague skink (*Lampropholis delicata*) is New Zealand's only pest lizard species, and its establishment on Great Barrier Island (Aotea) provides a critical opportunity to develop tools and strategies necessary to detect, contain, control and eradicate them.

Since their listing as an Unwanted Organism under the Biosecurity Act (1993) in 2010, very little progress has been made towards developing effective detection, control and management strategies for the plague skink. The species is established throughout much of the North Island, and on five islands within the Hauraki Gulf (Kawau, Rakino, Waiheke, Rotoroa and Pakatia islands). Its arrival on Aotea Great Barrier *elicited* a response from managers as the island contains many sensitive threatened species and ecosystems and could operate as a stepping stone population to even more pristine Gulf islands.

Early response activities between 2013 and 2015 consisted of efforts to delimit the population range, test the efficacy of trapping tools, and promote awareness of the species amongst Aotea’s residents and visitors. In early 2017, a shared commitment was made between the Department of Conservation and Auckland Council to undertake a feasibility assessment for the eradication of plague skinks from Aotea which resulted in the creation of an internationally collaborative, multi-agency management team to lead the project.

The feasibility assessment has been designed to achieve three goals:
1. Determine the feasibility of eradicating plague skinks from the island,
2. develop effective tools and methods that are transferrable to other sites; and
3. future-proof eradication via containment

Selected eradication tools to be trialled were:
- insect sticky traps,
- increasing predator pressure on plague skinks using a flock of contained domestic chickens,
- heat-fumigation,
- a plague skink detection dog; and,
- scented lures.

These efforts are guided by a statistically-based eradication model and undertaken in accordance with a pragmatic and adaptive Operational Management Plan.

Due to capacity and logistical limitations trial progress has been slower than anticipated.

Insect sticky trap trials involving a prescribed level of effort are in progress and are yet to be concluded. Preliminary results suggest the traps are able to significantly reduce all age classes of plague skinks, indicating they may be a promising tool for the ‘knock-down’ phase of an eradication effort. So far only a single frequency and duration of trapping has been applied and it
is our hope to modulate this to determine the full potential of the tool in on-going trials over the coming season.

Chicken trials involved the release of 200 domestic chickens into a 0.2 hectare fenced cell for 80 days. Preliminary skink density assessments indicate that the chickens have reduced adult plague skinks by 82%, but that they were less successful at locating and consuming plague skink eggs. As with the insect sticky trap trial, the chicken trial has not been completed with variation to duration and stocking densities and changes to substrate management, and therefore their utility as an eradication tool cannot yet be evaluated, despite promising indications.

Bespoke lizard containment fencing was installed in stages between May 2017 and January 2018. The fence was designed to prevent plague skinks from dispersing beyond their 12 hectare population range extent. However, during fence construction plague skinks were intercepted in three locations just outside of the fence, most likely the result of imperfect detection tools and methods applied during delimitation efforts the previous summer. This has resulted in increased complexity, risk and cost associated with achieving delimitation and containment goals.

As plague skink activity reduces significantly throughout the winter months, trials should be discontinued until spring 2018, when temperatures and skink activity levels increase. Thereafter, trials should be completed according to the schedule prescribed by the eradication model, so that it too can be evaluated for its utility within the project.

In May 2018, plague skinks were discovered at two additional sites on the island (Claris Sports Club and Omanawa Lane), adding further complexity, risk and cost to the project and also triggering a ‘stop and re-evaluate’ point in the project. Efforts to respond to these incursions have been minimal due to limited remaining project resources and the onset of winter; however, both sites must be prioritised for delimitation and containment efforts if eradication of plague skinks from the island remains an objective.

As such there are three options for project progression for consideration:

1. Stop the programme and declare plague skinks established on Aotea, ceasing all support for eradication tool development.
2. Continue with trials to their completion to allow the development of tools to deal with future incursions elsewhere, but cease all eradication efforts, declaring plague skinks established on Aotea.
3. Continue with trials to their completion, and continue with delimitation and containment activities at the Shool Bay Management Area (status quo) and Omanawa Lane (future proofing eradication as an option), with a review of eradication feasibility once current trials have been concluded.

Despite the suite of setbacks, nothing has arisen to indicate that a future eradication operation will not be feasible if trials result in successful outcomes. Whilst Option 3 comes with the highest level of complexity, investment and risk, it also represents the greatest ecological benefit if successful, and is therefore the optimal course of action for the 2018/2019 financial year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional contractors (technical advice, research, data management)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissions</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical works support</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demobilisation</td>
<td>148,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken trial</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>78,200.00</td>
<td>78,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping and lure trials</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60,250.00</td>
<td>60,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other trials</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repair</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46,000.00</td>
<td>46,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>194,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delimitation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL¹</strong></td>
<td><strong>$163,790.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$345,345.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$712,415.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Total cost includes a 10% contingency
1. INTRODUCTION

The plague skink (*Lampropholis delicata*), also known in New Zealand as the rainbow skink and in Australia as the delicate skink, originates from Eastern Australia (Chapple et al. 2016) and was accidentally introduced to New Zealand in the 1960s. The first record on Aotearoa Great Barrier Island (henceforth referred to as Aotea) was from Tryphena Wharf, Shoal Bay in April 2013 (Wairepo 2015). Since then, Auckland Council has actively managed the incursion via ongoing trapping and containment efforts, and supported research on the management of this species.

In 2015, the population range was delimited through an intensive and statistically supported trapping framework, and it was determined to be restricted to a seven hectare area surrounding Tryphena Wharf. Assuming that the population initially established at the wharf, the high densities and the current distribution of the population suggest that they have been present in the area for more than a decade, potentially two.

In 2017, Auckland Council (AC) and the Department of Conservation (DOC) provided funding to undertake research into the feasibility of eradicating the population. The feasibility study is being led by Jacqui Wairepo and Jamie MacKay (Wildland Consultants Ltd; WL) with guidance from a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) consisting of James Reardon (TAG chair and DOC herpetologist), Keith Broome (from DOC, also representing the Island Eradication Advisory Group), Chris Green (experienced in eradication of the Argentine ant), Rod Hinchmough (DOC biosecurity and herpetology), Fred Kraus (University of Michigan, USA; invasive reptile expert) and Richard Griffiths (Island Conservation). Envirokiwi Ltd (EK) are the operational contractor appointed to undertake field work, with George Wilson leading the team as Operations Manager.

Works during the feasibility assessment have been guided by an *over-arching Operational Plan* (Appendix 1) that was designed to cover both the feasibility assessment and provide a basic framework for a potential eradication attempt. Other plans and reports have been written to cover specific elements of the feasibility assessment, including an Assessment of Ecological and Arboricultural Effects (Appendix 2), a Chicken Management Plan (Appendix 3), and a Communication Plan (Appendix 4).

This document reviews all works undertaken between July 2017 and June 2018 and presents a draft Feasibility Report for the project goals, as described below. For brevity, a range of acronyms are used throughout this report, these are listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBMA</td>
<td>Shoal Bay Management Area (defined in Section 3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>Barrier Building Supplies (defined in Section 3.4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IST</td>
<td>Insect Sticky Trap (defined in Section 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTN</td>
<td>Captures per 100 Trap Nights (defined in Section 0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. GOALS, STRATEGIES, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES

The following goals, strategy and objectives were identified in the Operational Plan and are outlined in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 below.

2.1 Goals

This project began with twin goals, with a third goal included after situations arose that threatened the future of eradication as an option:

1. Determine the feasibility of eradicating plague skinks from Great Barrier Island by 2021 and confirm eradication by 2024.
2. Develop transferable methods and tools for the eradication and containment of invasive lizards that can be used elsewhere.
3. Future-proof eradication via effective containment of skinks at Shoal Bay, while determining feasibility.

2.2 The Strategy

The goals are supported by a strategy consisting of seven phases:

2017 - 2018
1. Delimitation
2. Containment
3. Tool and strategy development

After phase 4 is complete a decision point is reached on whether to move to the following subsequent phases:

2018 - 2024
5. Population knock-down
6. Detection and elimination of all remaining sub-populations and individuals ('mop-up')
7. Eradication achieved ('confirmation of absence' through post 'mop-up' monitoring).
### 2.3 Objectives and Outcomes

The objectives that this project set out to achieve, along with expected outcomes and achievement status are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives: Feasibility Assessment (2017-2018)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Achieved/In progress/Not achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Containment achieved by November 2017</td>
<td>1.1 Containment fence has been completed, with sufficient confidence that the skink population has been contained within fence.</td>
<td>Not achieved – fence has been constructed; however, skinks are known to be present outside of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Fence appropriately maintained and integrity tested and confirmed.</td>
<td>Achieved – fence is effective at containing skinks and is robust to large weather events with regular maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 There are no established populations elsewhere on GBI, and pathways to other parts of GBI are effectively managed.</td>
<td>Not achieved – a second breeding population has been discovered elsewhere on the island (Omanawa Lane). It remains unknown if this originates from the Typhena population or is a separate incursion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Delimitation of the plague skink population range achieved by April 2018.</td>
<td>2.1 The true population range edges will be identified.</td>
<td>In progress – delimitation of skinks outside of the fence has commenced but has not been determined with 95% confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Areas that are currently free from plague skinks will be identified and excluded.</td>
<td>Not achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop effective eradication tools and strategies to eradicate plague skinks from contained cells by April 2018.</td>
<td>3.1 Tools will be assessed as effective at removing population to achieve knock down, and/or mop up.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Tools will be assessed as ineffective and will be discontinued.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Determine feasibility of eradication from GBI by May 2018</td>
<td>4.1 Project will launch into eradication with phases 5-7</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Feasibility trial extended for a further year</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Project will continue with experimental tool trials
4.3 Project will be discontinued

*Note:* Significant biosecurity improvements are required to make an eradication sustainable.

Decision on whether to proceed with an eradication across the containment area by June 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives: Eradication (2018-2024)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knock-down achieved by December 2020</td>
<td>5.1 Defined as one skink per hectare or cessation of skink reproduction in all locations except houses and cliffs using any of the tools assessed as capable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mop-up achieved by 2021.</td>
<td>6.1 No skinks are caught for a year, and in accordance with agreed monitoring standards (tbc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Confirmation of absence achieved by 2024.</td>
<td>7.1 No skinks have been caught for three consecutive years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Alternatively, a period statistically defined as providing &gt;95% confidence that skinks have been eradicated can be used to confirm absence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. THE SITES

3.1 Overview

As of May 2018, there are two known breeding populations of plague skink on Aotea; only a single population was known at the time this project was initiated. Two plague skinks were recently detected at a third site, although at the time of writing the consensus of opinion, based on limited data, is that this does not represent an established population. The locations of the three sites are shown in Figure 1 and described in more detail in the following sections.

3.2 Shoal Bay Management Area (SBMA)

3.2.1 Overview

The Shoal Bay Management Area (SBMA) is located at the southern end of Aotea and is the immediate hinterland to the Tryphena Wharf (Figure 2). This area is the site of the first detection on the island and has been centre of most operational work described in this report. The current fenced area is approximately 12 hectares.

3.2.2 Topography and habitats

The SBMA is predominantly north facing and rises steeply from the coast before sloping more gently towards a central ridgeline to the south. Much of the area is navigable on foot, but a series of coastal cliffs make access challenging and staff with abseiling experience and climbing equipment will be required to work within these areas. Several gullies and spurs dissect the treatment area, and ridges and spurs present the best location for barrier fences (Figure 2).

Complex habitats within the SBMA presents a range of challenges for the project. Some habitats such as pine needle litter and damp rain-channelling gullies, are less likely to be favoured by plague skinks; however, it is now known they will readily disperse through these types of environments to reach optimal habitats. Optimal habitats, such as sunlit dry coastal broadleaf vegetation, are present throughout the SBMA, and within these areas where plague skinks are present they are frequently observed at high densities.

Key vegetation and habitats within the SBMA include:

- Pohutukawa - pūriri karaka forest.
- Manuka kanuka scrub.
- Private residential dwellings and gardens.
- Eroding soil/rock cliff faces.
- Kanuka forest.
- Radiata pine forest.
- Rocky coastline.

Full vegetation descriptions are provided in the assessment of ecological effects prepared for the resource consent application to clear vegetation for fence construction (Appendix 2).
Figure 1: Location map showing the Shoal Bay Management Area, Omanawa Lane and Claris Club.
3.2.3 Climate

Climate records from Port Fitzroy show temperatures for the west coast of Aotearoa ranging from a monthly minimum of 8°C to a monthly maximum of 25°C. Consequently, although some days during the year will be too cold for plague skink activity and skink activity levels over winter are probably much reduced, climatic conditions existing at Shoal Bay could permit activity throughout the year. Many sheltered sunny sites within the Shoal Bay area are likely to create micro-climates suitable for plague skink activity even on days when average air temperatures fall below the threshold for skink activity.

The driest period of the year is from January to April and most rain falls over winter from May to August. Storms are possible on Aotearoa at any time of the year and heavy rain events can cause localised flooding and slips.

3.2.4 Land Status and Social Licence

The Tryphena Wharf area and areas immediately adjacent, along with the foreshore reserve at Gibb’s Landing, are administered by the Auckland Council. The remainder of the SBMA is privately owned, including a property owned by the OEII National Trust (Figure 2).

Permission to work on private land has been granted by landowners and there is a general willingness by residents for plague skink containment and eradication work to continue. However, continued consultation is required to sustain the buy in from landowners and ensure any concerns are addressed. A detailed Communications Plan has been included in Appendix 4.

3.3 Claris Club

3.3.1 Overview

On May 4th 2018, Auckland Council Biosecurity received a call from a local resident who had captured a skink on his trailer that had been transporting wood from his property at Omanaia Lane to the Claris Sports Club, 10 kilometres north-east of the SBMA (Figure 1). The skink was confirmed as a plague skink and a network of 50 invertebrate sticky traps (hereafter referred to as ISTs, Section 3) were placed around the club grounds. These were run for a total of 14 nights and a single additional skink was captured on an IST. This individual had been scavenged, with only a rear foot left by which to identify its species. Close examination of lamellae counts confirmed it as a plague skink. No further captures were made. This indicates one of the following two options: i) two or more skinks were brought to this location on the resident’s trailer from an existing population at his residence (see Section 3.4), and there is potential for more to still be present but

---

2 Temperatures at Tryphena Wharf regularly exceed this during the summer months.
if in low abundance, extremely difficult to detect; ii) plague skink have previously been brought to the Claris Sports Club, and have yet to fully establish in this location.

### 3.3.2 Topography and habitats

The Claris Sports Club consists of several buildings with large flat grass areas to the north and west. To the east and south of the main Club building are areas of manuka-kanuka scrub, along with plantings of ake ake and other native species. There are areas of leaf litter below this vegetation, along with piles of wood and building materials which provide some cover for skinks. To the south of the main Club, the ground slopes down into a wetland area which has patches of mature kanuka on high spots throughout it.

### 3.3.3 Climate

Climate information for this site is similar to that outlined in Section 3.2.3.

### 3.3.4 Land status

Claris Sports Club is a privately owned property, covering 3.4 hectares of land that is framed by wetland, a residential property and Whangaparapara Road. The majority of the site is mown sport fields, with two buildings.

### 3.4 Omanawa Lane

#### 3.4.1 Overview

In response to the report outlined in Section 3.3 above, subsequent surveys confirmed a resident breeding population at a residential property on Omanawa Lane, 1.7 kilometres north-east of the SBMA (Figure 1). The resident is a builder who transports materials from his property across the island. Additionally, his property is located only 70 metres from the local building supply yard (Barrier Building Supplies, BBS), which has been identified as a high risk pathway site, despite not having had plague skinks detected on-site in April 2018 during a surveillance operation. The detection of an established, breeding population at Omanawa Lane is considered to have significant implications for the feasibility of this project.

#### 3.4.2 Topography and habitats

The Omanawa Lane property where plague skinks were detected faces north west. There are extensive areas of lawn separated by manicured and heavily mulched flower and vegetable gardens. Immediately north of the site where plague skinks were detected, the land slopes down into a creek, and the vegetation is mature kanuka forest – i.e. shaded, dark understorey, mainly of ponga. The area to the east is covered in mature kanuka also. To the west are patches of native scrub, and other private properties with associated areas of lawn and buildings
3.4.3 Climate

Climate information for this site is as outlined in Section 3.2.3.

3.4.4 Land status

The Omanawa Lane site is a private residential property.

4. THE TARGET SPECIES, IMPACTS, AND BENEFITS OF ERADICATION

4.1 Target species

The plague skink is a small lizard, with adults measuring approximately 40-50mm from snout to vent (SVL) and having a lifespan of two to four years (Chapple et al. 2011). It is a heliothermic, diurnal forager with both active and passive foraging techniques (Howard, 2003). The plague skink is an opportunistic, generalist feeder, subsisting on a wide variety of invertebrates with a preference for insects and spiders (Chapple et al. 2011; Lunney 1989).

Like many of its Australian congener, the plague skink is oviparous, reaching sexual maturity in one year and with eggs taking between 40-60 days to hatch (Peace, 2004). Plague skinks are a gregarious species and they often nest communally, with communal clutches having been observed to contain up to several hundred eggs. Individual clutch size can vary, and is significantly correlated with female body size, with mean individual clutch sizes varying between locations from 3.0-4.75 (Peace, 2004; Chapple, 2015; Baker, 1979). While hatchlings are typically observed in New Zealand over the summer months, hatchlings have been observed to emerge during the winter months with increasing frequency, suggesting a high level of reproductive plasticity consistent with observations in their native range.

Within its native range, plague skinks occupy a wide range of habitats including supralittoral zones, forest margins, woodland, coastal zones and urban gardens and other human occupied areas (Chapple, 2015; Howard, 2003). Microhabitat refuges can take the form of wood piles, leaf litter and stones, in all of which positive correlations between skink abundance and areas of dense leaf litter connected to patches of bare ground below a higher canopy have been noted (Peace, 2004). This is most likely connected with the requirement to forage and bask with quick retreat options to avoid predation and aggressive competition, and such habitat conditions are abundant across Aotearoa. A recent encroachment of plague skinks at the Bream Head Reserve in Whangarei illustrates their ability to establish in relatively in-tact native closed canopy forest in the presence of a diverse and abundant native lizard fauna.

In both its native and invaded ranges, the plague skink has proven to be a robust species, maintaining dense populations despite high levels of both predation and competition.
Whilst plague skinks are a well-known invasive species here in New Zealand as well as in Hawaii it is important to acknowledge that their invasiveness seems strongly influenced by propagule size and circumstance. Records on intercepted plague skinks to the South Island describe 47 separate incursions, 23 from Australia, the remaining 24 from the North Island totalling 50 individuals (pers. comm. D. van Winkel), yet the first established breeding population has only just been detected in 2018. Our opinion is that plague skinks do not easily establish from small numbers of adult skinks but rather from the transport of communal nests where several clutches of eggs may result in a one-time release of a dozen or more neonates with good genetic diversity due to the varied parentage of those eggs. Of course, once established their steady spread through innate dispersal behaviours is quite rapid in suitable habitat as observed on Aotea.

Plague skink behaviour reported from published studies or from observations in New Zealand that can inform management include:

- Successful generalists that has been observed in industrial areas of urban Auckland with no vegetation present, which is indicative of their efficiency at exploiting any available resource.
- Capacity to reproduce several times per year in areas of long-term establishment, as observed throughout the Auckland region.
- Hatchlings are immediately mobile; however, Anderson & Bergin (2002) report that the majority of a population are likely to remain at the core, with sub-adults frequently found at edges.
- Studies demonstrate that plague skinks will consume live invertebrates in preference to fruit-based or protein-based lures (Thoresen & Perrot n.d.). Observations suggest that predatory instincts trumps scavenging instincts (pers. obs. J Wairepo 2014).
- During warmer months skinks have been observed actively foraging and basking until sunset (but retreat into micro-habitats during mid-afternoon heat).
- Home range data for individuals is estimated to be c. 20sqm (Anderson & Bergin, 2002).
- Whiting (1998) observed an increased rate of capture for males of an unspecified Lampropholis species when lured by trapped females on sticky traps.

4.2 Impacts

4.2.1 Ecological impact

Plague skinks have become established throughout much of the North Island and are also present on several off-shore islands in Auckland’s Hauraki Gulf, namely Kawau, Waiheke, Rotoroa, Motutapu and Rangitoto Islands. Whilst the exact date of their arrival and establishment remains unknown in these locations (with the exception of Rotoroa Island), their presence was formally detected and recorded in 1981 and 2007 (Rangitoto and Motutapu respectively), and between 2012 and 2014 for the others. Plague skinks arrived on Rotoroa Island through restoration planting activities that began in 2012, when more than 8000 plants were taken to the island from a North Island nursery supplier.

Despite being present in New Zealand for more than 50 years, a thorough understanding of the ecology and biology of plague skinks as an invasive species within our ecosystem is still lacking,
with little hypothesis-based research having been undertaken on current and potential future impacts on our native herpetofauna and terrestrial macro-invertebrate fauna. The high reproductive potential of plague skinks means that population densities can rapidly reach very high levels leading to competition for resources with native skink species (Peace, 2004). Another concern is prey subsidisation whereby the potential for rodent, cat, mustelid or hedgehog populations to grow in abundance in response to high prey availability from plague skinks implies an increased threat to native lizard and invertebrate taxa (Reardon, 2014). This potential relationship remains poorly understood for plague skinks. However, it is assumed to be via their high reproductive capacity, subsequent competition for resources and their prey subsidization potential that the plague skink is expected to have the greatest impact within New Zealand ecosystems. High abundance of plague skinks may lead to much wider impacts on the entire localised ecology of each area that they have invaded, as has occurred on Guam with abundant introduced brown tree snake (Boiga irregularis) populations (Kraus, 2015). In Hawaii, plague skinks are believed to have completely displaced other skink species which had been introduced and established earlier.

Their potential to transfer novel diseases to populations of ‘At Risk’ and ‘Threatened’ indigenous lizards is an additional risk, particularly with shared micro-habitat use, as is commonly observed on Aotearoa. Equally, plague skinks may impact native disease and parasite relationships. It is the native copper skink (Oligosoma aeneum) that has been identified as the most ecologically similar to plague skinks due to their common microhabitat use and diurnal/crepuscular foraging behaviours as invertebrate generalists. However, they differ in that the copper skink is much more cryptic in its behaviour, forages almost entirely under cover and avoids open areas. Given their substantial range expansion in the past decade, along with their ability to thrive in almost all habitat types, it could be hypothesized that the plague skink will adapt to whatever resources are available, potentially resulting in complete niche overlaps with all native species with which they come into contact. Within the SBMA, the moko skink (Oligosoma moko) occurs in high densities across a significant proportion of the management area, alongside copper skink and ornate skink (Oligosoma ornatum). As such, the plague skink population overlaps the niche of all three of these skink species, and all three should be considered as potentially vulnerable to the above-listed impacts.

### 4.2.2 Economic and Social Impact

There are no commercial businesses that operate within the SBMA at Tryphena Wharf, however, goods and materials get stored on a concrete platform immediately adjacent to the core infestation area, separated by a 10-15 metre section of skink proof fencing. Storage of freight at the wharf may facilitate plague skinks stowing away and being accidentally transferred around the island. This provides a clear pathway and vector source for plague skinks to be transferred in numbers to a recipient property, which could have significant economic and social consequences, should the property be one of the locally based commercial businesses. For example, the incursion site at Oamarawa Lane is within very close proximity to BBS. If plague skinks expand their range into the BBS yard, consequences could arise due to the local community sourcing materials from an alternative supplier as a result. Additionally, an infestation at BBS would represent a pathway for skinks to invade virtually all other residential and commercial areas of the island.
4.3 Benefits of eradication

4.3.1 Ecological benefits

As described above, plague skinks occupy the same habitat as to three indigenous skink species within the SBMA, two of which hold the national threat classification “At Risk”. Whilst the negative impacts of plague skinks on other skink species are not fully understood, the establishment of any super-abundant non-native species to an environment where indigenous and endemic values are being protected should be cause for concern. There are no known instances of a super abundant invasive species having no impacts on native ecosystems. Anticipated impacts have been identified and are discussed in Section 4. Aotea is a biodiversity hotspot for herpetofauna in New Zealand, with populations of thirteen species of indigenous lizards present, including Nationally Vulnerable chevron skink (Oligosoma homodonotum) (Hitchmough et al. 2016). There is inherent value in indigenous herpetofauna assemblages that are free from non-native competitors and eradication will preserve this value on Aotea Island.

One of the goals of the project is to develop transferable methods and tools for the eradication and containment of invasive lizards that can be used elsewhere. Proceeding to full eradication will allow the tools to be fully tested and fine-tuned to the benefit of any other area where novel incursions of plague skinks occur (and potentially other skink species not yet present in New Zealand).

4.3.2 Social licence

Throughout the five-year duration of plague skink management on Aotea, advocacy work has been a key priority for Auckland Council. This work has taken the form of signage, articles in the local newsletter, information stands at local market days, pamphlet creation and distribution and a significant number of conversations in person, via email and telephone. Key messages have maintained a focus on the importance of not bringing more skinks (or their eggs) to the island, and not transferring them from within the SBMA around the island. This project also highlights the need for increased social awareness for biosecurity protection measures in general and aligns with the Predator Free 2050 and Pest Free Auckland campaigns. The fact that this project has oversight from an international collaboration of subject experts provides assurance to the community that the project is of both international and national significance.

4.3.3 Economic benefit

Preventing plague skink establishment at BBS through eradication will remove the risk of any financial repercussion that may arise from negative public perceptions around the spread of the species. This is also relevant for other locally based companies that move high-risk items around the island.

Within a wider context, the development of methods for detecting and targeting small, cryptic, invasive vertebrates is an important advance relevant to all countries connected to international trade routes have to deal with, and therefore this project is considered to be of international significance and economic benefit.
5. TOOL & STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT – EXPERIMENTAL TRIALS

5.1 Overview

The key components within the works programme over the past year have been to delimit and contain the incursion at SBMA, and to test insect sticky traps and chickens as efficient tools for use in an eradication effort.

5.2 Delimitation and Containment

The 2017/2018 feasibility year has focused on evaluating a range of tools via their application within experimental trials, which were designed to develop and test strategies which may be employed in a future eradication operation. These included both physical tools (such as traps) and theoretical tools (such as statistical modelling to guide trapping effort).

Throughout the summer of 2016/2017 (prior to the commencement of the feasibility assessment) intensive trapping was undertaken to determine the extent of the plague skink range, and select an appropriate route for the containment fence. Fence construction began in April 2017, with some sections of fencing being located only a few metres beyond plague skink capture locations (Figure 3). At that point in time, a plague skink detection dog was anticipated to be fully trained within a period of months, and consequently a strategy was selected to use the dog to detect any outliers that may have been beyond the fence.

As construction of the fence progressed throughout the winter and spring of 2017, intensive delimitation grids were set up at selected locations along the fence’s southern boundary, and at the fence ends, to the east and west of Tryphera Wharf. Trapping grids were run for no less than 14 nights during fine, warm weather conditions, and consequently plague skinks were detected in a several locations outside of the fence (Figure 3).

The most likely scenario for the southern boundary outliers are that disperser skinks had already progressed beyond the fence-line prior to its installation; however, the lack of highly sensitive tools to detect these individuals meant that they evaded all efforts to accurately delimit the true range extent. Conversely, it is possible that the satellite population at the eastern fence end is a separate incursion, possibly brought to the island on beehives from the landowner’s property in Thames, which is known to be infested with plague skinks.

At this stage of the assessment, neither delimitation nor containment objectives have been achieved. Any ability to eradicate plague skinks would first require the completion of these steps and significant resources are required to do so.
To achieve this, a number of issues must first be resolved. The first containment fence has been completed; however, as described above, skinks are beyond the fence in some areas. Since the discovery of this, the project team has lacked the capacity and resources to delimit the true extent of skinks in this area, in part due to the delay in a fully trained detection dog becoming available, and due to contractor staff limitations on Aotea. The requirements for gaining sufficient confidence in our delimitation efforts are detailed in Section 5.6.

5.3 Trapping cells

5.3.1 Invertebrate Sticky Traps (ISTs)

Various types of glue-based ‘sticky traps’ have been used in international herpetological monitoring for several decades. Traps can be secured discretely at the base of habitat patches or along pathway edges to target terrestrial lizards, or alternatively on tree trunks or branches to capture arboreal species. A lizard becomes entrapped from the moment it comes into contact with the glue surface, with a single foot often proving sufficient. Vegetable cooking oil is all that is required to remove the adhesive, with excess wiped off with a tissue leaving no harm to the lizard.

Insect Sticky Traps (ISTs) are extremely effective in capturing large numbers of small, fast and aggregative terrestrial lizards, and capture high numbers of plague skinks across all age classes. ISTs can be discretely placed along dispersal pathways. Their compact size enables traps to be discretely inserted into ground vegetation, rock banks and other areas that are too small and impractical for bulkier traps to be placed. Additionally, the self-baiting mechanism of the attractant-infused Trapper and Insect Monitor® glue cards further enhances trap efficiency by capturing insects attracted to the cards.

Four important disadvantages of ISTs have been identified:
- The immobilisation of captured skinks renders them particularly vulnerable to predation by ants, rodents and birds, as well as heat stress,
- Glue adhesion to the cardboard backing of the trap is reduced after rainfall,
- They frequently become fouled with leaf litter, soil or debris rendering them ineffective,
- In some habitats one species of exotic ant is capable of completely covering the sticky surface with leaf litter in a matter of hours, disabling it (Figure 4).

ISTs must be checked daily in accordance with legislation, and should be replaced if:
- too many captured invertebrates may provide escape opportunities,
- they become wet,
- oil has been applied to the surface to remove a skink, or
- ants have covered them with leaf litter/soil debris.

In the 2017/2018 feasibility trial ISTs were used to trap plague skinks within experimental cells and as the main tool for surveillance and delimitation activities. Descriptions of the experimental trials are provided in in the following sections.
Figure 4: IST completely covered in leaf litter by ants.

5.3.2 Trap Only Cell

Methods & results

A grid of 512 ISTs was installed throughout a 0.2 hectare fenced cell (Trap Only Cell, Figure 5: Plague skink barrier installed on a vehicle easement track which bisects the Trap Only Cell to prevent plague skinks dispersing out of the containment area.) on 6 December 2017. The location of this cell was selected based upon several plague skinks having been trapped in the area the previous season. The location of the cell intercepts an easement vehicle track, and this provided the opportunity to overcome the logistical challenge of creating an enclosed trial cell that cannot be fenced across the entire perimeter (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Plague skink barrier installed on a vehicle easement track which bisects the Trap Only Cell to prevent plague skinks dispersing out of the containment area.
The grid was run for 37 nights between 6 December 2017 and 9 April 2018 resulting in a total of 14,336 trap nights. Plague skink densities within this cell proved to be very low with only two plague skinks captured.

In order to compare trapping success between different cells, captures have been converted into “number of plague skinks per 100 trap nights” to give a relative abundance of plague skinks in each cell. This is a standard measure used in pest mammal trapping analysis and the purpose of this is to account for variability in the number of trap nights (defined as number of traps multiplied by the number of nights that each trap was set) thus giving an index of abundance. The index is calculated as:

\[
\text{Plague skink captures per 100 trap nights} = \frac{\text{number of plague skink captures} \times 100}{\text{number of trap nights}}
\]

The standard abbreviation of this index is “CTN” and this will be used throughout the results sections.

Correcting capture success for trapping effort gives a relative abundance of 0.01 plague skinks per 100 trap nights (CTN) within this cell. The last plague skink was captured in the cell on 11 December 2017 and there have been over 12,000 trap nights to date following that capture.

Statistical modelling of eradication requirements for this cell suggests that trapping a further 38 nights (during suitable weather conditions) with no further plague skink detections within this cell will provide confirmation of eradication with 95% confidence, and provide a useful proof of concept for eradicating a low-density plague skink population using trapping alone.

An independent monitoring method is required to confirm eradication and at this stage we are relying on a detection dog to perform this function.

5.3.3 Trap and Lure Cell

Background

Due to the Trap Only Cell not having a sufficient plague skink density to demonstrate ISTs ability to ‘knock down’ a population, a secondary cell was required for trial. Trapping and lure trials were combined within this cell for two reasons:

1. To demonstrate the capacity of ISTs to knock down a high-density plague skink population, and
2. To determine whether the capture probability of ISTs can be increased using non-toxic palatable lures.

These two objectives are each described below.

Confirmation of plague skinks present

Before the trials were able to commence, confirmation of a medium to high density population was required. A location close to the containment fence was selected for its abundance of high quality habitat and observations of plague skink presence (Figure 3). A grid of 245 ISTs was installed in the Trap and Lure Cell on 14 March 2018 and run for two nights, resulting in the
capture of 26 plague skinks (relative abundance of 5.31 CTN) and confirming the presence of skinks in the required density.

1. Trapping trial – methods & results

The trial commenced on 27 March 2018 using a grid of 292 traps within an enclosed cell of 0.13 hectares. Between 27 March and 19 May 2018 the grid was set for 39 nights in four sessions resulting in a total of 11,388 trap nights. During this time 132 plague skinks were captured consisting of 34 adults and 98 juveniles and the relative abundance of plague skinks within the cell reduced from 5.3 CTN in trapping prior to the lure trial (14-16 March 2018) to 0.3 CTN in the final trapping session (10-19 May 2018), Figure 6). Despite the high number of hatchlings recruiting into the cell throughout the trial period, the overall decline of skink captures was significant (p < 0.001).

![Graph showing relative abundance of plague skinks](image)

*Figure 6: Relative abundance of plague skinks within the Trap and Lure Cell divided by trapping session*

2. Lure trial – methods

In conjunction with the trapping trial, three lure treatments were applied to all traps within this cell:

- Control (no lure)
- Cinnamon (Connovation “Smooth in a Tube” possum lure).
- Fish (Connovation “Lure-It” salmon feral cat and mustelid lure spray).

Treatments were distributed sequentially across the grid (Table 2) and both adults and juveniles were captured on all treatments. Large numbers of juveniles were captured throughout the trapping period, which was expected due to the trial being run during the peak hatching recruitment month.
Table 2: Lure trial layout across trapping grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

After 27 nights of trapping the control treatment had captured the most skinks (52) followed by ‘fish’ (46) and cinnamon (29) (Figure 7).

Results indicate a significant decline in the number of skinks caught in all three treatments over 27 trap nights (Figure 8, p < 0.001). Furthermore, control and fish treatments trapped significantly more skinks than the cinnamon treatment (both control and fish significant at p < 0.001) (Figure 8).

![Graph](attachment://attachment_B.png)

Figure 7: Percentage of skinks captured using three treatments (cinnamon, fish and control) by age class. Red bars indicate juvenile plague skinks and grey bars indicate adult plague skinks.
5.3.1 IST trapping discussion

ISTs have been used to manage the plague skink population at the SBMA since 2013 and are considered to be the most efficient tool to capture plague skinks of all age classes. However, their capacity to successfully knock-down or eradicate plague skinks remained unconfirmed, and therefore required prioritisation during these trials. Although the trials have not yet been completed, if we are prepared to accept that IST catch rates are an acceptable index of abundance then the IST grids have significantly reduced skink abundance and results are therefore promising at this stage. Once trials have been concluded, an independent monitoring tool (such as a detection dog) will be required to form an unbiased assessment and confirm if plague skinks remain present within the cell.

The critical and outstanding issue is how much more trapping effort, of what duration and frequency is necessary to ensure an area is eradicated of skinks using this tool. Whilst preliminary modelling has been undertaken to provide a theoretical answer to this question, the required duration of trapping has not yet been achieved and therefore this aspect of the feasibility study remains incomplete. The completion of this trial would be a critical focus of any continuation of the programme.
The lures that were trialled in the Trap and Lure Cell did not improve trapping success, with the control trap yielding similar results to the fish lure. The glue on the ISTs are infused with an invertebrate attractant and it may be that this, along with the resulting invertebrate activity, already serves as a sufficient lure. Should these trials continue, further lure testing is planned, including the use of a fruit lure.

5.4 Avian biocontrol (chickens)

5.4.1 Background

Throughout the history of plague skink management at Aotea, the idea of using an avian predator has been discussed on numerous occasions. This idea arose from repeated anecdotal observations and reports of populations of lizards being significantly reduced in the presence of weka, pūkeko, ducks and chickens within New Zealand environments. Additionally, an international precedent has been set, with the use of domestic ducks to control golden apple snails in rice paddy fields in China (Liang et al. 2013) and raptors to control common vole “plagues” in Spain (Paz et al. 2013).

This eradication feasibility assessment has presented the first opportunity to test this concept as a viable option, with domestic chickens presenting as the easiest, lowest risk and most cost effective of avian choices.

Advantages

One of the key advantages of using chickens lies in their diurnal foraging activity which coincides with peak plague skink activity, ensuring that skinks are susceptible to predation to some degree. Due to their high commercial use in New Zealand, chickens can easily be acquired in large numbers, and easily cared for, with well-defined management guidelines issued by MPI (Animal Welfare (Layer Hens) Code of Welfare 2012). An additional advantage to using commercial chickens is the ease with which they can be re-sold or donated after the completion of the programme.

Disadvantages

Animal welfare guidelines require that chickens be checked daily to ensure they are healthy and have sufficient food and water. Whilst this is not considered to be a serious disadvantage, the associated daily contractor costs have been unexpectedly high due to distance between the SBMA (southern Aotea) and the Envirokwi yard (northern Aotea). Due to MPI restrictions and social constraints, it has not been possible to sell or donate eggs produced by the chickens, with resulting logistical difficulties associated with their disposal. The experimental design requires that the chickens and all associated infrastructure (coops, nest boxes, feeders and drinkers) are moved between areas on a semi-regular basis, which is also a time consuming and expensive process.
5.4.1 Chicken trial

Plague skink population density assessment

Prior to the chickens being released, the chicken cell (a 0.2 hectare fenced cell within the SBMA) was trapped with ISTs in a 2x2 metre grid system for seven nights to determine plague skink population density. A capture-mark-recapture method was used and this was to be replicated to compare skink density pre and post chicken trial. Overall, 35 skinks were caught (21 adults 14 juveniles), with only a single skink re-captured. This gave a plague skink relative abundance of 1.81 CTN. Statistical modelling from this capture data estimated plague skink density within the cell prior to chickens being released at 252.34 skinks per ha (165.35 – 384.99 CI), which is equal to 42.90 (28.1 – 65.44 CI) skinks within the trial cell. If this estimate is correct, then the pre-trapping exercise captured between 54.2% and 81.6% of the total population within one week (not including any eggs that may have already been laid into the ground).

Chicken management

On 12 December 2017, 200 chickens (150 hylines and 50 mixed heritage breeds) were released into the chicken cell. The chickens were provided with large coops with raised perches for roosting, nest boxes, automatic treadle feeders, and hanging drinkers fitted with drinker ripples. Food and water were checked and topped up daily. Chicken health was checked during this process and eggs were collected (Appendix 3 for the detailed Chicken Management Plan). On 9 March 2018 (80 days later), the chickens were moved to a holding cell.

Results

Following chicken removal, the grid of ISTs was re-established in the cell and six nights of trapping was undertaken, resulting in 24 plague skinks (four adults and 20 juveniles) captured. A further four were captured opportunistically by hand during works in the cell, but as these were opportunistic they were not included in Figure 10. An 82% decline in adult plague skinks was observed between pre- and post-chicken trapping. The number of juveniles captured increased by 43%; however, the overall number of skinks captured in the post-chicken trapping was 31% lower than the number captured in pre-chicken trapping (Figure 9).

![Figure 9: Number of skinks captured pre- and post-chicken trial. Red bars represent pre-chicken trapping and grey bars represent post-chicken trapping](image-url)
Discussion

The number of chickens and the duration of time selected to run this first experimental trial were determined via a ‘best guess’ approach, based on the size of the cell, and the incubation period of plague skink eggs from the point of oviposition (40-60 days). The resulting 80 day duration was to cover an initial 10 day ‘learning’ period (to ensure the chickens were fully aware of their targeted prey species), followed by the maximum known 60 day oviposition period, plus 10 buffer days to account for any hatching anomalies.

Whilst the high number of plague skinks captured following the removal of chickens from the trial cell may seem discouraging, the significant reduction in adult plague skinks is promising. The high number of juveniles captured suggests two critical issues: i) throughout the 80 days female plague skinks were not being predated rapidly enough to prevent them from depositing a large number of eggs into the ground, and ii) the chickens were unable to access a proportion of the egg nests, which may have only hatched after the removal of chickens and therefore not been vulnerable to predation at all. This is a realistic assumption as the post-chicken trapping did not commence for several weeks following the removal of the chickens from the trial cell, due to capacity constraints. Fortunately, there are a few easy solutions to better manage for these situations, such as tailoring the periodicity of each chicken trial to target hatchlings at certain times of the year (i.e. chickens should be returned to a cell for a second run through following the end of the hatching season in early May).

The trial was designed to involve minimal input by way of vegetation manipulation as it was assumed the chickens would work their way through leaf litter, woody debris and clump-forming sedges (Gabriola spp.). Throughout the trial period it became apparent that a greater level of input would be required from the field team, as larger stacks of woody debris and other organic matter were creating micro-habitats for skinks to take refuge in and use as nesting sites. As a result, habitat within the chicken cell has been adaptively managed, and is regularly modified by removing woody debris and tough, fibrous ground vegetation.

One of the most important observations noted during the chicken trial was the capture of an adult plague skink taking refuge in loose bark on a dead kanuka trunk approximately 1.2 metres above the ground. This skink was caught by hand and serves as a key example of skinks adapting their behaviour in response to significant disturbance and predation (i.e. evading both trap capture sessions and chicken predation for more than 90 days). Whilst it’s known that plague skinks are competent climbers and regularly observed climbing in urban environments, this is the first observation of tree climbing behaviour since plague skink work commenced at this site in 2013. The implications of this are noteworthy and should the project progress into a second chicken trial, on going vegetation management will be crucial to the success or otherwise of chickens as a management tool.

5.5 Technical challenges to be resolved

5.5.1 Plague skink detection dog

A key limitation to the plague skink management work on Aotea has been the lack of a highly sensitive detection tool, without which there is little confidence in our ability to detect individual dispersers and very low density populations. Several attempts have been made to train a dog to detect plague skink and their eggs over the years, however, until very recently no dogs have proven to be suitable for this type of work.
The project engaged conservation dog trainer Guus Knooper of K9 Trainer to develop a certified dog for this task early 2017, and whilst there have been a few setbacks, the world’s first plague skink detection dog ‘Harper’ is expected to be certified by July 2018. The lack of a dog thus far has been a critical setback for the project, by way of undertaking detection, delimitation and surveillance work, and is therefore considered to be an integral tool to successfully progress in these areas.

### 5.5.2 Delimitation

ISTs have been the main tool utilised to detect plague skinks and delimit the outer range of the dispersing population. Modelling has informed us of the effort necessary to achieve 95% confidence in our detection probabilities using ISTs, yet within the field programme to date our efforts have not approached those thresholds. Thus, we have been operating with only limited confidence in our assumptions of presence/absence. This has been confounded by the absence of a trained plague skink detector dog (as described above), which we had anticipated could lend confidence to our assumptions based on imperfect data.

Upon the discovery of plague skinks (of all age classes) outside of the recently constructed containment fence, traps were set up in grid and transect configurations in suitable microhabitats and along track edges to attempt to accurately delimit the true population range edge. This resulted in the discovery of a well-established, breeding population beyond the current containment fence, however, the range remains unconfirmed.

In response to these uncertainties, a change in strategy was developed involving the establishment of an intensive trap line set at 150-200 metres beyond the outer most plague skink capture point. This line was designed to be substantially ahead of the expanding range edge of the skinks, with the distance selected according to an estimated population dispersal of 160 metres per year.

This new line had traps set at 2 metre spacings and to date has been run for 26 nights during fine weather conditions. No plague skinks have been caught on any trap at this line. However, it is early in the trapping effort required to confirm absence so this will need to be maintained if the programme continues.

### 5.5.3 Cliff tops

Within the incursion zone a number of areas with difficult access remain untested for feasible management strategies. These areas are all relatively small and can be strategically isolated so that they cannot harbour residual skink populations. Once isolated, habitats can be simplified in order to make them less hospitable and drive any resident skinks out to the periphery where they can be trapped. Tools to be used to achieve this include: i) weed whackers to trim grasses and remove habitat, ii) lures and traps placed at top and sides of cliffs, and iii) mobile heat devices to penetrate deeper crevices.

### 5.5.4 Residential housing

Several residential houses are present within the management zone, all of which are located adjacent to the foreshore. At each property, a number of additional structures are also present, generally in the form of garden and storage sheds. Skinks are unlikely to be residing within the...
living areas of housing, however, beneath the houses, and within sheds and other uninhabited structures, skinks are very likely to be present. A viable solution to manage these sites has been investigated, however at the point of writing this report, in situ trials have not been undertaken. These areas will be left until the end as a strategic measure, and then treated with an approach of heat (and possibly gas) fumigation. These approaches are outlined in greater detail in section 5.7.

5.5.5 Internal pathway management

Plague skinks have now been confirmed in two new locations: 1. Omanawa Lane, 2. Claris Sports Club (see Sections 3.3 and 3.4).

Omanawa Lane: To date, 12 skinks have been captured at this site, confirming the presence of a breecing population. This skink population has not been contained, and the extent of its range remains unknown due to its recent discovery (May 2018) and limited remaining resources (funds and capacity) available to divert into this finding.

Claris Club: To date, two skinks have been captured at this site, one of which was captured at the point of its arrival on a trailer which had travelled there from Omanawa Lane. This provides some confidence that we are not yet dealing with a well-established, breeding population, and it is possible that these were two individuals transported by the builder from the population at his residence.

The implications of these detections confirm that pathway management to the island, and within the island, remains a significant challenge for which additional resources would be required to address.

5.6 Statistical modelling

External contractor Dr. Marleen Baling was engaged to undertake statistical modelling tailored to meet the specifications of trapping grids, delimitation and post-chicken follow up trapping, based on the use of ISTs and their capture probabilities in each area. In reality, we hope that in the near future a dog will be available to supplement the use of ISTs and to guide their placement in delimitation, low-density population detection and eradication confirmation objectives.

The report is provided in Appendix 5, with key results briefly summarised below:

5.6.1 Delimitation

The newest delimitation line has been set up with 614 ISTs at 1.5-2 metre spacings. This configuration requires thirteen trapping nights per month, for eight consecutive months (33 weeks) to declare absence at the plague skink delimitation line with 95% confidence.

5.6.2 Trap and lure cell

The trapping regime required following the last plague skink capture to declare eradication success with 95% confidence, with trapping grids set up at 1.5-2m spacings is outlined in Table 3: Trap nights per month required at 0.1, 2 and 3 months following the final plague skink capture in the trap and lure cell to declare eradication success with 95% confidence.
Table 3: Trap nights per month required at 0, 1, 2 and 3 months following the final plague skink capture in the trap and lure cell to declare eradication success with 95% confidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 months</th>
<th>1 month</th>
<th>2 months</th>
<th>3 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.3 Chicken cell – post-chicken trapping effort

Four trap nights per week = 1 session. Trapping grids should be set up at 1.5-2m spacings. Twelve consecutive sessions, each resulting in no plague skink captures, are required in order to declare eradication success with 95% confidence.

5.7 Heat treatments

There are numerous dwellings, structures, and other areas within the infestation areas where the use of traps or chickens to target plague skinks will be difficult or impossible. The use of ‘heat-fumigation’ has been used successfully in several countries to treat a variety of structures for pest species, including commercial buildings, agricultural imports, shipping containers and residential properties.

All reptiles can be killed by high temperatures, and most species have critical thermal maxima that are undamaging to humans or their cargo. Exceeding these temperatures for only a few minutes may be sufficient to kill hitch-hiking pests, and either convective or radiant heat sources may be effective.

Fred Kraus of the TAG has used this method to treat shipping containers for brown tree snakes at ports of entry in Guam. Similarly, heat treatment is also currently used at New Zealand ports of entry to treat pest invertebrates in cargo containers. Similar tenting-and-heating methods could be used for plague skinks once discovery of their critical thermal maximum indicates what target temperature to use for such treatments.

An expert in the field of alternative pest control methods was engaged to provide an assessment of the potential for their ‘Thermo-bug’ heat treatment machine to be used. The Rotorua based company, Alpeco Ltd, is one of a few around the country that use targeted heat to treat pests in residential and commercial spaces. Alpeco’s Director, Heiko Kaiser, visited the SBMA with the project managers on 2 May 2018, paying particular attention to dwellings and structures around Gibbs Landing. In his opinion it will be possible to kill all plague skinks within a structure (without damaging it) using heat alone. Additionally, it has been suggested that heat may also be used in conjunction with alternative methods such as ‘misting’ or ‘fogging with hydrogen cyanide gas. Whilst this may be a very effective option (and therefore warrants consideration), fumigation with any toxic substance will come with restrictions and require approval before use. If toxicity trials were required, these would need to be undertaken ex-situ and this would also require an Animal Ethics approval. It’s also important to note that the use of a toxic gas has the potential to be met with resistance by landowners, due to their ‘Aotea poison free’ campaign.

An in-situ heat trial was to be scheduled mid-late May 2018 at one of the residential properties within the SBMA; however, the unexpected discovery of plague skinks at Omanawa Lane meant that additional resources (funds and time) required diversion in response to this. As a result, this trial has not yet occurred.
The importance of an in-situ trial is to provide a baseline understanding of the technique and effort required to encase a complex structure (a garden shed and a wood large wood stack), heat it, and confirm mortality of plague skinks residing within. Expected outcomes of this trial are: i) demonstration of proof-of-concept, ii) gaining an accurate understanding of the logistical costs associated with getting all the equipment to the island, getting sufficient power supplies for each property (in the form of one or more generators), encasing a range of structures and required timeframes for each residential property.

A report has been submitted by Mr. Kaiser, and the following is a summary of his recommendations for heat:

Heat is a very effective approach to treating pests, provided the heat can be captured for the required duration to kill/flush out the target species. This can be achieved through the encasement of the treatment area. Once the heat has been created, sufficient air circulation is also required to ensure the heat can access all areas. Setup can pose a challenge as it requires an energy source.

A trial is recommended to identify and find solutions for site-specific challenges.

5.8 Bait development

Previous research (Waipao 2015) has demonstrated that paracetamol is acutely toxic to plague skinks. This research hasn’t progressed beyond proof of concept and obtaining an LD50 value, and at the present time there is no suitable bait matrix for delivering paracetamol to plague skinks. A palatable toxic bait would be an extremely useful tool; however, developing and registering a new toxin is a large and complex project in its own right and does not fit easily within the terms of our current project.

Should lure trials demonstrate a particular substance as effective at increasing detection and capture likelihoods by a statistically significant amount, this may be sufficient to justify obtaining funding for a proof-of-concept trial using paracetamol.

5.9 Research

5.9.1 Research challenges

The project has identified a number of important research questions which have been ranked according to high, medium and low priority within the context of a future eradication (these are listed in the Operational Plan appendix). The list was distributed to several universities with no success at gaining student interest. The major constraint with getting university students to undertake research pertains to the difficulties in gaining the required Animal Ethics Approval to undertake research anywhere outside of the SBMA. Whilst some of the research opportunities are appropriate to undertake in situ, many of them are not, and these are typically the ones which are more suitable for students. It’s also important to consider that some of the research questions are not suitable to be undertaken within the SBMA due to their potential to undermine any future eradication efforts (i.e. capture-mark-recapture exercises may result in trap avoidance behaviours that make it substantially more difficult to removal all skinks from an area).
If trials are to continue, it is recommended that an external researcher be contracted to address a number of high priority questions and gain all the appropriate permissions so that location is not a constraint.

### 5.9.2 Population genetics

Associate Professor James Russell (University of Auckland) and Dr Andrew Veale (Unitec Institute of Technology) are collaborating with the program in a population genetics study of plague skinks in New Zealand. The study is currently in the sample collection phase and the relevance of the study for this project is the potential to determine whether novel incursions of plague skink on Aotea (such as outliers on the eastern edge of the SBMA and the recently discovered Omanawa Lane population) are closely related to the core SBMA population (indicating within-island dispersal) or unrelated (indicating a novel incursion from the mainland). A third year Unitec student is participating in this research as part of her final year project, which is expected to be completed by December 2018. Results will be communicated to the project as they become available.

### 5.10 Discussion – tool & strategy development

The tools and methods that are both in progress and on the remaining list of trials to be prioritised have been selected according to the mandatory criteria of an eradication. These criteria are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory criteria of an eradication</th>
<th>Applicability of tools and methods to criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding and resources should be sufficient to fund the program to its conclusion.</td>
<td>Efforts made to find cost effective control options that will be financially sustainable over a period of five years or more. Over the longer term, chickens are estimated to be a very cost efficient tool, although set up and maintenance costs have been higher than initially expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All necessary actions must be permitted.</td>
<td>All activities undertaken have the support of affected landowners, and are in accordance with all appropriate legislation and animal welfare requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The biology of the species must make it susceptible to the control technique(s) being applied. The target species must be removed at a rate exceeding that of its own rate of increase.</td>
<td>- Chickens were selected for use due to their predation of all age classes and their ability to consume eggs via their active and destructive foraging behaviours. - LSTs are the only tool that has been confirmed to capture all age classes and sexes. - All plague skinks will be vulnerable to lethal temperatures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration / reinvasion must be accounted for and prevented.</td>
<td>This has been accounted for and eradication will not be considered feasible until such a point that reinvasion can be prevented with a high level of confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The target species must be detectable at low densities.</td>
<td>Both the detection dog and chickens were selected for trial based on their anticipated ability to detect individual skinks and populations at low density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the target species play a keystone role in the ecosystem it is being removed from, restoration efforts must be made to negate any adverse ecological impact.</td>
<td>High densities of indigenous skinks are present within the SBMA, therefore plague skink are not considered to play a keystone role in the local ecology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite not having completed any of the trials, and therefore not having definitive answers with respect to their utility in an eradication effort, each of the tools being tested has demonstrated the potential to be extremely effective in removing plague skinks from an area. The notable reduction (82%) in adult plague skinks following the 60 day chicken sweep through provides sufficient confidence in their abilities to target and predate skinks. It has been acknowledged that a higher density of chickens may be more effective at reducing the skink population, alongside an increased level of vegetation management. Both of these adaptations to the initial method warrant trial. Given the current level of investment in this method and the promising results thus far, the ability of chickens to knock down and mop up plague skink populations must be thoroughly evaluated and trials run to completion.

Similarly, the ability of ISTs to reduce a plague skink population within a cell is very promising. Despite the acknowledged disadvantages of these traps, they remain the most versatile and successful of all of the trapping devices available. The decline in captures of all skinks (including and in-spite of juvenile recruitment) is statistically significant and therefore this method must be continued to completion in order to determine whether it can be used as both a knock down and mop up tool for an area.

Statistical modelling using capture-mark-recapture data (see Section 0) has indicated that skinks are developing trap avoidance behaviours to ISTs following release. The model identified the capture probability of the first capture (in the chicken cell) as 0.299, with that dropping to 0.0083 for the recapture probability. The implications of this are that ISTs are not ideal for capture-mark-recapture density assessment studies due to the negative experience of being immobilised. Furthermore, it suggests that for skinks which do not become fully entrapped and escape an IST (i.e. their tail gets stuck and they autoinsect it to escape, which has been observed), then that skink will become extremely difficult to entrap without using alternate means.

Whilst the lure trials did not increase the capture probability of the ISTs, this information is still meaningful and supports the observation that live invertebrate prey are the greatest attractant to plague skinks.

As previously discussed, the lack of a fully trained detection dog has set the project back in a number of areas including accurate detection of individual skinks, surveillance, and having an independent tool by which to measure the success of other tools. It was anticipated that the dog would be used to measure the success of the chickens, the traps and containment fence, and without the dog our confidence in efforts to date is no sufficient to determine the utility of each of these efforts or the feasibility of eradication.

Due to the capacity and resource constraints, it has not been possible to achieve all the project objectives and goals within a single field season. Therefore, to properly determine feasibility and to achieve reportable and sound conclusions from our eradication tool trials we need to extend operations for another season.
6. PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY

At present there is a high risk of plague skinks reinvading the island, and the lack of effective biosecurity pathway management between the mainland and Aotea are considered to be the greatest threat to the sustainability of any eradication project. This threat is evidenced by the discovery in May 2018 of what appears to be a relatively recently established population on the island. Plague skinks are reliant on human mediated dispersal to reach offshore islands and currently uncolonised areas. Both eggs and adults are frequently detected as stowaways in a range of cargo making the species a very efficient disperser.

One of the biggest challenges to biosecurity on Aotea is the fact that it is inhabited and there is a constant stream of people and goods arriving and departing the island each day. Huge quantities of freight arrive on the island each year to support the resident community, and the current biosecurity regime is insufficient to prevent transport of plague skinks. If an eradication is to proceed, biosecurity procedures must be greatly improved. A long standing advocacy campaign has been in place and resulted in several successful interceptions however, the required commitment to pathway management will require a substantially different strategy.

Plague skink detection dogs would be an essential part of this strategy, with two dogs in place to inspect cargo prior to its departure from the mainland, and upon arrival to the island. The development of methodologies to allow freight to be treated before being shipped to the island would also be beneficial for increasing biosecurity effectiveness and this may be investigated during the feasibility study. Treatments could include the use of chemical fumigants or heat, but heat is safer to use and more acceptable to the community of Aotea.

Regular island-wide surveillance is conducted in a range of high-risk locations on the island and this should be continued, as it is also a critical component of the sustainability of any future eradication programme.

An incursion response plan will be developed as part of the eradication planning process should eradication be deemed feasible. This will build on knowledge gained during recent incursions on Rakino Island, Hauraki Gulf and in Blenheim and Picton, Marlborough Region.

7. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ACCEPTABILITY

7.1 Overview

Since the discovery of plague skinks on private land on the island, the project has been reliant on the support of several affected landowners and stakeholders in the Shoal Bay area.

Auckland Council Biosecurity advisor, Jeremy Warden has played a crucial role in gaining and maintaining landowner support to undertake work and research across these private properties. To date, there has been on-going support from all affected landowners.
7.2 Landowners and stakeholders

The resource consenting process required written confirmation of support from all affected landowners, which was gained. To date, only two negative encounters have been received by landowners with regard to work being undertaken. These included resistance against having chickens on one particular landowner’s property, and a resistance to the use of chickens by a landowner who lives several properties away from the SBMA and is the local egg seller to the area. In both situations the landowners were spoken with and did not communicate any further concern.

Local island archaeologist, Don Prince, has been engaged throughout the process to undertake assessment work and ensure that all sites of archaeological significance are respected and avoided during the works process. This involvement has been integral to the social acceptability of the fence-construction process.

Some of the fence route passes through land protected under a QEII Open Space Covenant. The QEII National Trust local representatives who were consulted throughout the resource consenting process have expressed a high level of support for the project, granting full permission to install the fence and undertake required trapping works.

The fact that the incursion zone is centred on the main port of entry to Aotea makes it very visible to visitors arriving at the island. Auckland Transport has been consulted regarding key pieces of work for this project since 2013. Obligations of project staff include wearing hi-vis safety vests, and not working within close proximity of wharf operations machinery during boat arrival and departure times.

7.3 Local Government

The Great Barrier Island Local Board have supported the project throughout its duration and receive monthly updates from the local Auckland Council team. In addition to providing regular stakeholder updates, the project management team have communicated in person with local board representatives at a morning tea held on the island in November 2017 (for affected landowners and local board representatives) and presented at their monthly meeting in March 2018. Local Board members have expressed particular support for the use of chickens, traps, non-toxic lures and heat-based fumigation trials, due to the current island-based demand for a ‘toxin-free Aotea’. All approaches being used support this social demand and have received a lot of positive feedback following media releases (articles and television interviews).

7.4 Local iwi

Local iwi, Ngati Rauia have also been engaged as part of the stake holder update email process, and also to undertake a blessing upon unexpected archaeological discoveries in December 2017. During the blessing process, iwi Chairperson and two island-based kaumatau were shown around the SBMA and expressed interest in and support for the project.
8. LEGAL ACCEPTABILITY

8.1 Overview

There are a number of legal requirements which must be adhered to including obligations under the Resource Management Act (1991), The Wildlife Act (1953), the HSNO Act (1996) (if toxin trials are to be pursued), and the Animal Welfare Act (1999).

Legal requirements for the project are discussed below.

8.2 Resource Management Act requirements

A Resource Consent for vegetation clearance and earthworks required for fence construction was granted on 15 February 2018. Gaining the resource consent was a challenging process to navigate, taking eight months to apply, process and approve. This was significantly longer than was anticipated, and as a result a number of aspects of the project were delayed by several months.

To adequately contain plague skinks within the SBMA, another fence will need to be constructed, which will require additional resource consent permissions pertaining to increased vegetation removal and earthworks potentially through different or better quality habitats than were impacted during the first fence. Additionally, the new fence may need to cross several watercourses including one reasonably large watercourse which may be classified as “Permanent” under the Auckland Unitary Plan. A resource consent approval will be required for stream-bank disturbance associated with culvert construction and this could lead to a more complex application than the previous one. However, there may be ways to avoid stream crossings by following ridgelines, and descending down spurs instead of gullies. The trade-off for this would be an increased management area.

Should a new resource consent be required, this process must be prioritised by Auckland Council’s consenting team and not be the cause of further delays.

8.3 Wildlife Act Requirements

A permit under the Wildlife Act is required to handle indigenous skink species. The original high-impact Wildlife Authority Permit that was granted to Auckland Council in 2013 has expired. This permit allowed the handling of indigenous skinks captured as bycatch during all Auckland Council plague skink work. A variation application was submitted to extend this permit by a period of time, however the application was submitted outside of the permissible deadline, and therefore a new permit will need to be sought. DOC permissions have indicated that this will not be a problem and will allow the opportunity for the permit to be better tailored to the project.

8.4 Animal Welfare Act requirements

To allow for the opportunity to conduct experimental research on the mainland or another of the Hauraki Gulf islands where plague skinks are present, animal ethics approval under the Animal Welfare Act will need to be gained on a case-by-case basis per trial. The use of ISTs
may be considered as controversial, however, due to the nationally significant context of the trial it is not envisaged that there will be significant issue with this. It is a requirement of the Wildlife Act that all live capture traps (in this case ISTs and potentially pitfall traps if a suitable opportunity for their use is identified) must be checked at least once in every 24-hour period. This requirement has been followed throughout the project.

9. ENVIRONMENTAL ACCEPTABILITY

9.1 Overview

The proposed eradication methodology requires the construction of fences to enclose the entire skink population and to divide the infestation area into smaller management units ("cells"). Fence construction requires some vegetation clearance and the use of a trenching saw to construct a narrow (2 cm wide) slit to place the fence material into. Vegetation clearance and earthworks have the potential to cause negative ecological impacts and these were considered in the Assessment of Ecological and Arbourcultural Effects report that was submitted as part of the resource consent application (Appendix 2). Once fences are constructed, the current eradication methodologies of live trapping and the use of chickens as biocontrol have relatively minor potential impacts.

9.2 Potential ecological impacts

9.2.1 Overview

Potential ecological impacts of the eradication methods can be summarised as:

- Injury to and/or mortality of indigenous lizards
- Vegetation loss
- Increase in pest plant infestations
- Loss of stream habitat
- Increased sedimentation

These impacts are described in more detail below.

9.2.2 Injury to and/or mortality of indigenous lizards

Indigenous skinks are frequently caught on ISTs as bycatch. When they are captured they are carefully removed using vegetable oil spray to break down the glue and a toothpick to gently prize the lizards off the card. This technique has been developed and refined over several years with all field operatives having been trained in the procedure. Some mortality of trapped indigenous skinks does occur due to heat, stress or predation. However, with careful management to address these risks, incidental mortality can be minimised.

Vegetation clearance associated with fence construction has the potential to injure or kill indigenous skinks and geckos. The EK staff who are involved in vegetation clearance ensure that all vegetation is cleared in a manner that will reduce the risk of injury or mortality to indigenous lizards, and cleared vegetation is stacked within the project area rather than mulched, thus allowing any undetected lizards the opportunity to disperse.
9.2.3 Vegetation loss

In order to construct the skink-proof fence, ground cover vegetation and some shrubs/small trees have to be removed. Wherever possible the plants were cut at ground level leaving the roots intact and thereby allowing plants to re-sprout. This is already occurring around the older areas of fence and re-growing vegetation is managed to prevent it impacting the fence. The majority of the vegetation within the project area consists of early successional stage scrub vegetation that is well represented in the surrounding area and the ecological effects on this vegetation are considered to be less than minor. The fence does pass through some pockets of mature vegetation and in these locations an arborist accompanies the fencing crew to ensure that the fence avoids damaging any mature trees. There is a large seedbank of indigenous plant species within the soil in the project area and it is likely that indigenous species will rapidly regenerate once project-related disturbance ceases.

9.2.4 Increase in pest plant infestations

Vegetation clearance for fence construction has created open areas that are susceptible to invasion by light-demanding pest plant species. This situation is being monitored, and any pest plants observed along the fences are being controlled as part of routine fence maintenance. The resource consent for the fence states that the fence must be removed at the end of the project, and at this point the cleared areas will be monitored for pest plant infestations for a period of five years or until canopy closure, whichever is sooner.

9.2.5 Loss of stream habitat

It is possible that the proposed new delimitation fence line will need to cross watercourses. If this is the case, temporary culverts will be required that are able to carry sufficient water flow without causing erosion downstream. Culverts must also be designed to prevent skinks from crossing the fence during periods of low flow. If culverts are required, a full assessment of effects for each culvert will be completed and mitigation (likely in the form of stream restoration once the culverts are removed) will be offered to offset any negative ecological impacts.

9.2.6 Increased sedimentation

Works within the riparian margin of watercourses have the potential to increase the amount of sediment entering watercourses and receiving environments. If any earthworks or vegetation clearance are required in riparian margins, appropriate permits will be obtained and best practice sediment control methods will be followed at all times.

9.3 Assessment of effects

The ecological benefits of the eradication are considered to far outweigh any potential ecological impacts, particularly as mitigation measures have already been put in place to minimise the potential impacts associated with vegetation clearance. The eradication will result in a net gain in biodiversity values of the infested areas.
10. CAPACITY

The current project team is drawn from a range of organisations and backgrounds (Section 0). Additional support is provided to the project by Auckland Council’s island-based Biosecurity and Biodiversity Advisors Jeremy Warden and Shantii Morgan.

Capacity issues with operational activities and project management were identified during the 2017-2018 feasibility year. Unexpected events such as responding to plague skinks outside of the containment fence and the discovery of archaeological remains during fence construction placed extra pressure on both the operations and project management team so unplanned response works had to be prioritised over planned fence construction and research tasks. An additional factor that influenced project management capacity was the unexpected duration of the resource consent application process, which ended up taking approximately eight months to conclude.

With careful planning these capacity issues could be better managed; however, by their very nature eradication projects are fraught with situations which arise unexpectedly and must be reactively managed. Without the resources in place to deal quickly and efficiently with the unexpected, the additional pressures on limited resources can quickly escalate to the point that project objectives, goals and deadlines can no longer be met. Should the project continue (irrespective of how the goals may change), it is recommended that contingency funding be made available to recruit other operational contractors at short notice if response works are required to ensure that planned works by Envirokiwi are not impacted. In some DOC managed incursion response and eradication programmes there has been a call put out for many staff to contribute a week of their time. This has been used early in programmes, e.g., the Great White Butterfly eradication in Nelson. But to achieve successful eradication that programme required up to 40 temporary staff, mostly for field teams but also support, such as data management. Local managers can also be approached for approval to co-opt staff for short periods. However, for Aotea this has been difficult due to the local office being short staffed in recent times.

To fully pursue an eradication, additional contingencies (e.g., purchase orders requests, budgets and contractors) should be prepared to allow measures to quickly be put in place to support the project team.

The result of the diverse assemblage of people involved has ensured that a wide and robust suite of skills and experience are contributing towards this project. At the time of writing the team is lacking a data manager; however, there are several skilled people who have been involved in the project who could be suitable replacements. A key gap in the team at present is the lack of researchers to undertake key research objectives that will benefit the eradication project (see Section 5.9). To address this gap and ensure research objectives are not delayed further, it will be necessary to engage an external non-University based contractor.

The operational contractor, Envirokiwi, have been involved with this project since 2013 when plague skinks were first discovered on the island. They have developed a strong skill set and integral relationships with locally affected landowners that cannot be matched by any other known agency. It is therefore strongly recommended that Envirokiwi retain the core operational role they currently have with this project, acknowledging their capacity constraints and managing for them.
11. OPTIONS

11.1 Overview

Due to several unexpected delays in process and permissions, capacity limitations and the failure to date to have a proven plague skink detector dog working, the project is not yet at a stage where the management team can determine whether it will be feasible to eradicate plague skinks from Aotea. Despite the discovery of skinks outside of the containment fence and in a novel location (Omanawa Lane) there is still sufficient confidence in the potential of the methods and tools being trialled to retain eradication as a future option. The triggering of a previously defined ‘stop/go’ point, with this detection beyond the containment fence forces a re-evaluation of the wider terms of operating. Whilst this detection significantly increases cost, risk and complexity of any potential eradication we do not believe it, in itself, makes eradication infeasible.

Based upon the current status of the project, three options are available for consideration into the 2018/2019 financial year. These are outlined below, each presented with risks, benefits and estimated costs of all activity associated with the option. Summaries of estimated costs for the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 financial years are provided within each option with a more detailed breakdown of estimated costs provided in Appendix 6.

11.2 Option 1

11.2.1 Summary

Discontinue all work, remove all fencing and infrastructure, with no further investment in this project on Aotea. In doing so, declare plague skinks established on Aotea. Management of the project would be undertaken by Auckland Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To cease the project is to decide to declare plague skinks established on Aotea. Within a short space of time this decision will be irreversible as the species continues to spread.</td>
<td>1. No further expenditure on the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Without completing the trials to a satisfactory conclusion, we will not have definitive answers on the efficacy of tools tested and will essentially seriously limit the value of the investment to date in this programme.</td>
<td>2. Avoidance of landowner conflict associated with intensive eradication activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local population may be less inclined to support any future efforts to control or eradicate this or other pest species.</td>
<td>3. Allows the limited biosecurity capacity on Actea to refocus on other priorities such as Argentine ants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plague skinks may spread to islands and sanctuaries where mammalian pests are absent or managed and provide a new threat to herpetofauna species within these areas.</td>
<td>4. Removal of fencing and chicken infrastructure on GBI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.2.2 Estimated costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional contractors (technical advice,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research, data management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissions</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical works support</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demobilisation</td>
<td>148,400.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken trial</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping and lure trials</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other trials</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repair</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decontamination</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 163,790.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.3 Option 2

11.3.1 Summary

Continue experimental work both on Actea (trials in progress) and on mainland (future trials) but accept that island eradication from the island is infeasible due to skinks outside of the fence and novel population detections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This option represents the decision to declare plague skinks</td>
<td>1. By completing the trials to a satisfactory conclusion, we will have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established on Actea. Within a short space of time this decision</td>
<td>definitive answers on the efficacy of tools currently being tested and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be irreversible as the species continues to spread.</td>
<td>this will validate the investment to date in this programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Affected landowners may discontinue their support of trials</td>
<td>2. Avoidance of landowner conflict associated with intensive eradication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being undertaken on their land if eradication is no longer the goal.</td>
<td>activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local community may be less inclined to support any future efforts</td>
<td>3. Will eventually allow the limited biosecurity capacity to refocus on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to control or eradicate this or other pest species.</td>
<td>other priorities such as Argentine ants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Ongoing cost of $1,000 per year for five years following fence removal to meet Resource Consent conditions
2. Total cost includes a 10% contingency
4. Plague skinks may spread to islands and sanctuaries where mammalian pests are absent or managed and provide a new threat to herpetofauna species within these areas.

### 11.3.2 Estimated costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional contractors (technical advice, research, data management)</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissions</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical works support</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demobilisation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>148,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken trial</td>
<td>78,200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping and lure trials</td>
<td>60,250.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other trials</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repair</td>
<td>46,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delimitation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL(^3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$345,345.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$163,240.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11.4 Option 3

#### 11.4.1 Summary

Extend feasibility study for a further year to fully assess the likelihood of success of an eradication attempt. Work will include continuation of delimitation, containment and experimental trial efforts (status quo), which will be run in conjunction with a significantly upscaled delimitation effort at Omanawa Lane, Claris Club, and subsequent surveillance operation (estimated 15 sites).

---

\(^3\)Total cost includes a 10\% contingency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continued engagement and expectation of local landowners may be</td>
<td>1. Public confidence that AC and partners takes invasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strained with the expanding remit necessary to quantify and contain</td>
<td>pest species seriously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populations beyond the current operational area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Our effort to contain both plague skink populations may fail if</td>
<td>2. The option to eradicate is preserved for a better informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the detection dog does not prove to have the required detection</td>
<td>future decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitivity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The most comprehensive and precautionary approach to ensure that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premature abandonment of the incursion is avoided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11.4.2 Estimated costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional contractors (technical</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advice, research, data management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissions</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical works support</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demobilisation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken trial</td>
<td>78,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping and lure trials</td>
<td>60,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other trials</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repair</td>
<td>46,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>194,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delimitation</td>
<td>22,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL[^7]</strong></td>
<td><strong>$712,415.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^6]: Any work that may be undertaken in the 2019/2020 financial year is dependent upon the results of the 2018/2019 financial year and therefore costs cannot be estimated at this stage.

[^7]: Total cost includes a 10% contingency.
12. CONCLUSION

The development of successful tools and strategies for the management of invasive herpetofauna is of critical significance at both national and global scales. This feasibility assessment represents an opportunity to fill important knowledge gaps required to manage New Zealand’s only invasive lizard, and protect the indigenous lizard fauna of Aotearoa, an island of exceptional ecological value.

Outcomes of this programme will also be highly influential in the pending decision on whether or not to respond to plague skink establishment in the South Island.

A number of unexpected events and delays have arisen throughout the assessment period, placing increased strain on operational capacity and forcing the project to accommodate a reactive delimitation effort whilst trying to pursue the primary goals. Although it remains unconfirmed, it is suspected that whilst skinks outside of the southern fence boundary were probably already there below detectability levels, the eastern fence end and Omanawa Lane incursions may be the result of separate incursions. The resulting delays in progress and trial completion have meant that no meaningful conclusions are currently able to be drawn around eradication feasibility, despite preliminary results demonstrating promising outcomes.

The extended timeframe required to gain Resource Consent for fence construction caused the greatest delay to the project and discoveries of plague skinks outside of both the containment fence and SBMA represent the greatest increase to project complexity and risk. These factors, combined with a lack of external and internal pathway management strategies, mean that before eradication feasibility can be determined a significant further investment in this project will be required.

Options to progress include: 1. Complete discontinuation of works and declaration of plague skink establishment on Actea, 2. continuation of trials to completion at SBMA to allow the development of tools to deal with future incursions elsewhere, with cessation of eradication activities and declaration of establishment, and 3. continuation of trials to completion and future proofing eradication opportunities via the continuation of delimitation and containment efforts at SBMA and Omanawa Lane sites.

Despite the suite of setbacks the project has experienced thus far, nothing has arisen to indicate that a future eradication operation will not be feasible if trials result in successful outcomes. Whilst Option 3 comes with the highest level of required investment and the greatest associated level of risk, it also represents the greatest benefit if successful. In view of this, Option 3 provides the optimal potential for achieving eradication and Option 2 would ensure that investment to date in tool testing and development is not prematurely terminated before the benefits of investment are secured.
13. REFERENCES


Appendix 1. Operational Plan
Appendix 2. Assessment of Ecological and Arboricultural Effects
Appendix 3. Chicken Management Plan
Appendix 4. Communications Plan
Appendix 5. Estimating probability of eradication success of plague skinks
## Appendix 6. Breakdown of estimated costs

### Aotea Great Barrier Plague Skink Eradication Feasibility Assessment: Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 70,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional contractors (Technical advice, research, data support)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 40,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
<td>$ 12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical works support</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency fund for operational support if there are capacity issues</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical works support</td>
<td>Fence removal</td>
<td>$ 150,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicken infrastructure removal</td>
<td>$ 3,400.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer and storage costs for removed materials</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income from selling chickens and infrastructure</td>
<td>$ 6,500.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weed control (annual cost; resource consent requirement for 5 years following fence removal)</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demobilisation</td>
<td>$ 148,400.00</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken trial</td>
<td>Complete Trial 1</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour to establish new cell</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials to establish new cell</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete chicken trial (8 pulses of 80 days per pulse)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre- and post-chicken trapping</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move chickens between cells (4 times; between pulses)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicken trial</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping and lure trials</td>
<td>Complete Trap and Lure trial 1 (assuming 25 sessions of trapping with 4 nights of trapping per session)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour to establish new cell</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials to establish new cell</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Trap and Lure trial 2 (assuming 30 sessions of trapping with 4 nights trapping per session)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trapping and lure trials</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other trials</td>
<td>Trial trial - structure</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complex garden habitat</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other trials</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repair</td>
<td>Maintenance of containment and internal fences ($500 per month)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency for fence repair following extreme weather events (estimated at 4 times per year)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance and repair</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>New SBMA containment fence labour</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New SBMA containment fence materials</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensate Lane containment fence labour</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensate Lane containment fence materials</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delimitation</td>
<td>SBMA (finish trapping outer delimit line)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensate Lane</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delimitation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 additional sites</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost total</td>
<td>$ 148,400.00</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
<td>$ 513,950.00</td>
<td>$ 148,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency %</td>
<td>$ 14,890.00</td>
<td>$ 100.00</td>
<td>$ 31,385.00</td>
<td>$ 14,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>$ 163,290.00</td>
<td>$ 1,100.00</td>
<td>$ 545,335.00</td>
<td>$ 163,240.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Great Barrier Local Board

**Governance forward work calendar - July 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Tuesday, 3 July</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment update:</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- final report on feasibility study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- biosecurity/biodiversity updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- work programme updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Libraries - Draft proposal for expanded regional Mobile Library &amp; Access service - BY MEMO</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities partnerships policy - BY MEMO</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide feedback on policy options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Tuesday, 10 July</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>GI project - with Paul Ivory</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport update - prioritisation LTEF</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claris cemetery</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology session: Hub &amp; Skype 10min Skype with Sue</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**GREAT BARRIER LOCAL BOARD ON RECESS - 16 to 20 JULY 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Tuesday, 16 July</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Tuesday, 31 July</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop with AFEED &amp; DGI/DGR</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop with Paul Henry SOLAR power project introduction with Reid Technology</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Empowerment Unit update</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rohan McIntosh - IT/ connectivity report - to present findings</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion document: Indoor Sport Facility Plan - BY MEMO?</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Tuesday, 7 August</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment update:</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- work programme 18/19 projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Treasure Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the Code of Conduct</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Board Services update: Communications strategy / booties workshop</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Tuesday, 14 August</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport update</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Management: Dogs &amp; Pigs &amp; stock</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Define opportunities / potential approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local board engagement strategy</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Define opportunities / potential approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Tuesday, 21 August</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cemetery operation</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Define opportunities / potential approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agenda run through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council's Quarterly Performance Report: Great Barrier Local Board for Quarter four report</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Code of conduct report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Governance Forward Work Calendar - July 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Governance Role</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 21 August 2018</td>
<td>Dig Management Bylaw and Policy report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide feedback on policy options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Draft Golf Facilities Investment Plan report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Draft Resilient Recovery Strategy report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Facilities partnerships policy report - Draft</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide feedback on policy options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Emergency water supply report</td>
<td>Local initiative / preparing for specific decisions</td>
<td>Confirm priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>ATEED six monthly report</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/ keeping informed</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Open Space Management Framework report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Low Carbon Auckland report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 28 August 2018</td>
<td>Community Empowerment Unit update</td>
<td>Oversight and Monitoring/ keeping</td>
<td>Receive update on progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>AFSG</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Arts Trust</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Health Trust</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>DigIt</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Aotea Ed</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tryphena Hall</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 4 September 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Environment update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Project Streetscapes – Transfer of AT and Waste Solution services to Community Facilities (P17)</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 11 September 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Auckland Transport update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 18 September 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Agenda run through</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Draft post public consultation Resilient Recovery Strategy report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 25 September 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Community Empowerment Unit update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 2 October 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Environment update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>PLEASE DO NOT CHANGE: Great Barrier Local Board 2038/2019 capital and Local Grant Round One</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>Determine allocation of funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 9 October 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Auckland Transport update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 16 October 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Agenda run through</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Panuku Development Auckland Local Board Six-Monthly Update report</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Governance Role</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 16 October 2018</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board applications for local and capital grants under one 2018/2019 report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 23 October 2018</td>
<td>Sports Facility Investment Plan report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 30 October 2018</td>
<td>Project Streetscapes report</td>
<td>Input to regional decision-making</td>
<td>Provide direction on preferred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 23 October 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 30 October 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 6 November 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 13 November 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 29 November 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 6 December 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 27 November 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Tuesday, 4 December 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 11 December 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Tuesday, 18 December 2018</td>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance Forward Work Calendar - July 2018**
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To note the Great Barrier Local Board proceedings taken at the workshop held on 5, 12 and 26 June 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.

Te tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) note the record of proceedings for the workshop held on 5, 12 and 26 June 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 - 5 June 2018</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record - 12 June 2018</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record - 26 June 2018</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Guia Nonoy - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>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 at Claris Conference Centre, 19 Whangaparapara Road, Claris, Great Barrier Island on Tuesday 5 June 2018 commencing at 9.00am.

PRESENT
Chairperson: Izzy Fordham
Members: Luke Coles, Jeff Cleave, Sue Daly, Shirley Johnson
Also present: Helgard Wagener, Jacqui Fyers, Guia Noncy, Jeremy Warden, Shanti Morgan, Taryn Wilks, via Skype: Miriana Knox, Rebecca Barclay, Sonia Parra and Katrina Morgan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Environment update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff gave the board an update on the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriana Knox (via Skype)</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>a) Biosecurity and biodiversity matters on the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Warden</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Coastal weed survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanti Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Ecology Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Barclay (via Skype)</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Trap library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Parra (via Skype)</td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Rabbits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taryn Wilks</td>
<td></td>
<td>f) Freshwater management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Waicare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Septic tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Septic checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stream walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g) Proposed I&amp;ES work programme 2018/19 – follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda run through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guia Nonoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgard Wagener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Fyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Morgan (via Skype)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Workshop Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Board position</td>
<td>Define board position and feedback</td>
<td>Board and staff discussed the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Terrestrial and marine research facility feasibility study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgard Wagener</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Actea Great Barrier Island Visitor Strategy and implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Fyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guia Nonoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record**

Workshop record of the Great Barrier Local Board held at Great Barrier Local Board office, 81 Hector Sanderson Road, Claris, Great Barrier Island on Tuesday 12 June 2018 commencing at 9.15am.

**PRESENT**

Chairperson: Izzy Fordham

Members: Luke Coles, Sue Daly

Apologies: Shirley Johnson, Jeff Cleave (left at 9.30am due to council business)

Also present: Helgard Wagener, Jacqui Fyers, Rodney Klaassen, Cushla Buchanan, Ben Halliwell, Michael Brown, Alexandra Clement-Jones, John Mauro. via Skype: Tracy Massam, Katrina Morgan, Miriana Knox, Danielle Kennedy, Rikki Stancich and Morag Vasilaki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Facilities update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Discussions were about the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Klaassen</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>- Rough order of costs – FitzRoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushla Buchanan</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Massam (via Skype)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shared roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Morgan (via Skype)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Health &amp; Safety delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Auckland Transport update</td>
<td>Oversight and monitoring</td>
<td>- Road materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Halliwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cowshed bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Item</td>
<td>Governance role</td>
<td>Summary of Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Climate Change Action Planning. Low Carbon Auckland and addressing climate impacts | Input to regional decision-making | Staff talked through the Auckland Climate Action Plan presentation. The board provided feedback on the proposed:  
- options for priorities for integration into the regional plan (based on key concerns)  
- actions that could be incorporated into Local Board planning  
- areas that the local board would be keen to see addressed at all levels of Government. |

Alexandra Clement-Jones  
John Mauro |

5. Achieving Local Board Plan outcomes through Sustainability Initiatives | Input to regional decision-making | Staff talked through the Achieving Local Board Plan outcomes through Sustainability Initiatives presentation. |

Miriana Knox (via Skype)  
Danielle Kennedy (via Skype)  
Rikki Stancich (via Skype)  
Morag Vasilaki (via Skype) |

The workshop concluded at 3.45pm.
Great Barrier Local Board Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Great Barrier Local Board held at Great Barrier Local Board office, 81 Hector Sanderson Road, Claris, Great Barrier Island on Tuesday 26 June 2018 commencing at 9.00am.

PRESENT

Chairperson: Izzy Forcham
Members: Luke Coles, Jeff Cleave, Sue Daly
Apologies: Shirley Johnson (on leave)
Also present: Jacqui Fyers, Maclean Grindell, Mike Sinclair, Christine Dewse, via Skype: Kathy Cumming and Helgard Wagener

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Board member discussion</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclean Grindell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sinclair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Dewse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Empowerment Unit update</td>
<td>Keeping informed</td>
<td>Staff gave a brief update on the following:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kathy Cumming (via Skype) | Oversight and monitoring | ● Early childhood education (ECE) contract  
● IT report  
● ActeaOra water testing workshops  
● Actea Education Trust’s winter workshop. |

The workshop concluded at 12.30pm.