Date: Tuesday 14 August 2018
Time: 9.30am
Meeting Room: Reception Lounge
Venue: Auckland Town Hall
301-305 Queen Street
Auckland

Komiti Taiao ā-Hapori Hoki / Environment and Community Committee

OPEN ATTACHMENTS

ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS
UNDER SEPARATE COVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Summary of Environment and Community Committee information - updates, memos and briefings - 14 August 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>20180706_Process for finalising Regional Pest Management Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>20180706_Approach to Cat Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>20180720_Auckland Council Zero Carbon Bill Submission_Final</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>20180724_Briefing PFAS Testing Whenuapai</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>20180720_Analysis of Auckland Council programmes against findings in Hauraki Gulf Forum's State of Our Gulf 2017 report</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>20180801_Memo - long-term management of myrtle rust</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>20180803_Global Activity Memo - August 2018</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>20180807_Response to the petition presented to the 12 June 2018 meeting</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The attachments contained within this document are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Councillors require further information relating to any reports, please contact the relevant manager, Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson.
Memorandum 6 July 2018

To: Environment and Community Committee, Local Boards and Independent Māori Statutory Board

Subject: Process and timeline for adoption of Regional Pest Management Plan

From: Dr Imogen Bassett, Principal Advisor Biosecurity

Purpose
1. To outline the forward process and indicative timeline for the adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan.

Summary
- The proposed Regional Pest Management Plan was approved for public consultation at the 14 November 2017 Environment and Community Committee.
- Public consultation on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan was carried out in March 2018 in parallel with consultation on the Long-term Plan. Approximately 1,400 submissions were received and are now being analysed.
- This memo sets out the forward process and indicative timeframes up to adoption of the final Regional Pest Management Plan. Key milestones include:
  - workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018
  - engagement with mana whenua – September – October 2018
  - workshop with Environment and Community Committee – October – November 2018
  - formal feedback from local boards at business meetings – October – November 2018
  - approval of final plan by Environment and Community Committee – March 2019.
- The approach to stakeholder engagement on cat management is outlined in an accompanying memo from Councillor Hulse.

Context/Background
2. Auckland Council is currently reviewing its 2007 Regional Pest Management Strategy. The new Regional Pest Management Plan will prescribe council’s approach to pest management to reflect best practice and changes to various pest plants and animals in the Auckland region. The review is also in direct response to, and compliant with, the National Policy Direction for Pest Management 2015.
3. An initial public discussion document on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan was released in 2015, and used as a basis for engagement with mana whenua, stakeholders and elected members.
4. At its November 2017 meeting, the Environment and Community Committee approved the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan for public consultation alongside the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 (Resolution numbers ENV/2017/161 to ENV/2017/167).

Discussion
Submissions received
5. Consultation on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan took place in February to March 2018. Approximately 1,400 submissions were received; a significant increase on the approximately 400 submissions that were received on the 2015 discussion document. The submissions are currently being analysed to identify key themes arising from feedback.
Next steps for finalising the plan

6. The proposed approach to finalising the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan is to:
   - meet with targeted interest groups (for example submitters commenting on proposed cat control, and those commenting on industry impacts) to discuss their feedback and, where possible, clarify points made in submissions and discuss potential solutions.
   - workshop options for addressing key topics raised through feedback with mana whenua, local boards and the Environment and Community Committee.

7. An indicative forward process and timeframe up to adoption of the Regional Pest Management plan is shown below in Table One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table One. Process for adoption of final Regional Pest Management Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Milestone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Coding of submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analysis of submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workshops with local boards on local feedback received from the public on proposed plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mana whenua sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local boards resolve formal feedback at business meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Environment and Community Committee workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Staff draft final plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Environment and Community Committee adopt plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Closing the loop with local boards and submitters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Note that there will be no formal hearings. The general public has now had two formal opportunities (2015 and March 2018) to provide feedback on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan.

9. The approach to finalising the plan is to therefore hold targeted discussions on key topics rather than provide for another round of broad general public input through a formal hearings process. This approach is consistent with the Biosecurity Act provisions.

Funding the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

10. The proposed Regional Pest Management Plan presented a step change in pest management in Auckland, and therefore required a significant increase in investment.

11. As part of consultation on the Long-term Plan, the council sought the community’s views on two options for increased investment in the natural environment funded by a targeted rate.

12. On 31 May 2018 the Governing Body approved the introduction of a natural environment targeted rate to raise $311 million for environmental initiatives, including addressing kauri dieback and targeted ecological protection (Resolution number GB/2018/91).

13. This level of investment allows substantial (approximately 80 per cent), but not full implementation of the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan. Some changes to the proposed plan will be made to fit the funding envelope. These will be workshopped with elected members in late 2018 as set out above in Table One.

Next steps/implementation

14. The project team will progress development of the final Regional Pest Management Plan in line with the process and indicative timeframes outlined above.

15. If you have any questions about the information in this memo please contact Mara Bebich, Stakeholder Manager on 021 020 11736 or mara.bebich@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Memorandum

6 July 2018

To: Environment and Community Committee, Local Boards and Independent Māori Statutory Board

Subject: Cat submissions on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

From: Councillor Penny Hulse – Environment and Community Committee Chair

Purpose
1. This memorandum provides an update on stakeholder engagement in relation to the cat management approach proposed in the Regional Pest Management Plan.

Summary
- The proposed Regional Pest Management plan introduces the use of micro-chipping to distinguish between owned cats and those that may be managed at high biodiversity value sites to protect native species.
- The proposed plan was consulted on in March 2018 alongside the draft Long-term Plan 2018-2028. Through the public consultation process some stakeholders expressed concern at this approach to cat management.
- In light of the volume of queries to elected members and misinformation circulating in the community in relation to this issue, a meeting will be held by Councillors Hulse and Casey with stakeholders in September 2018 to discuss the proposed approach to cat management.
- The next steps and timeframes for adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan are outlined in an accompanying memo from staff dated 6 July 2018.

Context
2. An extensive consultation process on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan has been undertaken to date, including opportunities for the public to make written submissions on a discussion document in 2015 and formal written submissions on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan in March 2018.
3. Submitters also had the opportunity to give in person feedback through Have Your Say events aligned with the Long-term Plan consultation in March 2018.
4. Submitters’ positions are well-documented across the wide range of topics covered by the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan and the plan is adopted under the Biosecurity Act 1993, which has no requirement for formal hearings.
5. Therefore, the proposed process for finalising the draft plan is to use submissions analysis and workshops with elected members to inform adoption of an operative plan. This process is detailed in an accompanying memo from staff.
6. Stakeholder engagement on cat management issues will be led by councillors, as outlined below.

Discussion
7. The proposed Regional Pest Management Plan introduces the use of micro-chipping to distinguish between owned cats and those that may be managed at high biodiversity value sites to protect native species.
8. Elected members have received a number of queries from members of the community in relation to the cat management approach in the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan, and may be aware of misinformation in the community specifically in relation to this.
9. Councillors Hulse and Casey, supported by staff, will meet with stakeholders in September 2018 to clarify the proposed cat management approach and address any stakeholder concerns.

10. The timing of this meeting in September 2018 will allow for all submissions to the draft Regional Pest Management Plan on this issue to be coded, summarised and available as supporting information for the meeting.

Next steps

11. Staff will liaise with representative stakeholders to set up the proposed meeting in September 2018.

12. The process and timeframes for adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan are outlined in the accompanying memo from staff.

13. Adoption of the operative Regional Pest Management Plan is expected to be in March 2019.

14. If you have any questions about the information in this memo please contact Mara Bebich, Stakeholder Manager on 021 020 11736 or mara.bebich@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Submission

Zero Carbon Bill Discussion Document

Ministry for the Environment

July 2018

Please direct questions or correspondence to:
John Mauro, Chief Sustainability Officer
john.mauro@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
021 221 6502
Mihi

**Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,**

**ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,**

**ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,**

**ōna mana ā-īwi taketake mai, tauiwi atu.**

**Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,**

**wenerau a te mano.**

**Kāhore tō rite i te ao.**

*Footnotes*

1. Although such additional spend may be only a few percentage points of overall capital spend, oil price fluctuation can often be greater than those few percentage points and large-scale efficiency investments can provide a high average rate of return. See, for instance, McKinsey & Company (2008), *The carbon productivity challenge: curbing climate change and sustaining economic growth.*
growth, where action on climate change results in greater growth, productivity and overall well-being\(^2\).

4. Moreover, a successful and productive Auckland, like any city, is predicated on a number of requirements with direct connections to the low emissions transition and to building resilience to climate change. These include transport choice, clean energy, public green space provision, and a high-quality and safe built environment. These have been shown to improve economic outcomes including agglomeration benefits, and lower and avoid costs.

5. While challenges exist to making the transition just and equitable, a low emissions and climate-ready transition done well is likely to help reduce the burden on our most vulnerable populations. A just transition can help to mitigate energy insecurity and projected cost escalation, reduce documented air quality and health costs associated with burning fossil fuels and from poor quality built environments, and help to reduce risk from the impacts of a changing climate like increased flooding, temperatures and sea level rise.

6. Auckland Council has long advocated\(^3\) for stronger leadership from central government to support New Zealand’s transition to a low emissions and climate-ready future, including advocating for a clear government mandate to provide businesses with confidence to make long-term investment decisions, policies and legally binding targets, financing mechanisms and monitoring of progress\(^4\).

7. More specifically, Auckland has called for sector-based leadership from Government including but not limited to:

   - **Transport and land use**
     - Targets and prioritised transport investment to reduce emissions, reflected in the Government Policy Statement (GPS) for Transport
     - Integrated transport and land use outcomes across agencies through funding signals in the GPS and National Land Transport Plan (NLTP)
     - Investigation and implementation of land value capture funding mechanisms to link infrastructure costs directly to the benefit/value created
     - Acceleration and extension of low emission, rapid public transport and active transport networks
     - Emissions standards and/or age limits for New Zealand’s vehicle fleet

   - **Built environment and energy**
     - Addressing issues of competition in the building materials sector that impact on construction costs including for brownfield development

---


\(^3\) See, for example, submissions on the NZECS: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.gov.nz/Openc/2017/02/ENV_20170214_AGN_6825_AT_files/ENV_20170214_AGN_6825_A T_Attachment_S1131_1.PDF or on the NZ ETS: http://www.mfe.govt.nz/sites/default/files/media/NZETS_reviewstage1%20 %20Auckland%20Council%2000019.pdf

- Development of a social cost of carbon for inclusion in business cases across Government
- Review and update of the building code and allowing local governments to mandate higher standards
- Requirement of a minimum energy efficiency standard
- Mandatory building energy ratings to raise awareness and drive market demand

**Waste**
- A substantial increase to the waste disposal levy to facilitate movement toward a low emissions economy and better materials management, while creating employment and business opportunities from a more circular economy
- Targeted regulation to reduce commercial waste to landfill
- *Product stewardship* or ‘extended producer responsibility’ (EPR) to shift responsibility for recovery, recycling and disposal of products to the manufacturer
- Amendment of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 to either give greater control of waste reduction to councils or apply the same responsibilities to industry
- Regulatory changes and considerations such as a more ambitious renewable energy target (up to 100 per cent renewable)

8. Cities are a key part of the transition and play a critical role in helping countries meet and exceed emissions reduction targets of the Paris Agreement to avoid catastrophic climate change. Given its size, emissions, economic and social roles, and current and future climate impacts, Auckland’s success in a zero carbon, climate-resilient transition is critical to the Government’s success – and vice versa.

9. Auckland is taking action on a number of fronts to plan, fund and build climate solutions to help deliver on national targets, often in partnership with central government. Our existing regional target of 40 per cent reduction of 1990-level emissions by 2040 is ambitious but new evidence suggests that those targets may not be significant enough to align with the national and global ambitions of the Paris Agreement to which C40 Cities like Auckland are committed to locally.

10. Auckland Council has been reviewing existing strategies, targets and action plans and is currently undertaking the development of an integrated climate action plan that tackles both adaptation to climate change and emissions reductions. There are multiple opportunities to align with government direction, ambition and frameworks in the development of our approach locally and are optimistic about our collaboration, especially in light of our joint launch event on 7 June 2018 in Auckland and partnership agreement.

**Discussion Document Questions**

*Emissions Targets (Questions 1-4)*

11. The first four questions in the Discussion Document relate to emissions targets. We reiterate our previously-stated position that long-term predictability and transparency for all sectors is a prerequisite to a planned and smooth transition that minimises negative impacts on jobs,
livelihoods and fairness. Furthermore, recent evidence suggests an urgency in developing pathways toward climate stabilisation – some accounts suggest such pathways need to be locked in by 2020\(^5\). Therefore, **Auckland Council supports a 2050 target in legislation now instead of a goal to reach net zero by the second half of the century** – noting as well that the details for target setting and establishment of the Commission are vaguer in the latter approach.

12. Evidence and current commitments suggest that the best target for New Zealand is the target of net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases by 2050 instead of simply net zero carbon dioxide or net zero long-lived gases and stabilised short-lived gases. Auckland Council has and continues to support including methane in the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) as a matter of priority. Likewise, Auckland Council has previously supported net zero emissions from all long-lived climate pollutants by 2050 and sustained emissions reductions in methane and other short-lived climate pollutants. Recent evidence and reflections on our Paris Agreement commitments; consideration of broad co-benefits, innovation, opportunities and potential economic impacts; and deliberation on the different time scales to reach temperature stabilisation have influenced us to **support a more ambitious position of net zero emissions from all greenhouse gases by 2050**. Such a target would be a strong driver for technological development, innovation and the development of incentives to ensure sectors like agriculture are supported in planning and alignment to the target.

13. Meeting emissions targets should primarily come from domestic reductions including new forest planting. We consider this an “invest now in New Zealand” approach with short-term price implications but long-term benefits realisation. That said, we support a phased approach to using international carbon units (e.g., initially using international carbon units with a planned approach to phasing out their use). Using international units is less ideal given that the ancillary benefits accrue locally but we recognise that their use is likely realistic given the implications of an ambitious target. **We support stronger language in the Bill that international carbon units be used to offset residual emissions after all other means of reducing domestic emissions have been exhausted.** We also suggest better defining “strong environmental safeguards.”

14. **Auckland Council does not support revision of the target downward/later if circumstances change.** This would interfere with the predictability and transparency necessary to steer policy direction and likely result in slippage. However, we would support a more ambitious ratcheting of the target, including one to emissions positive or earlier delivery (e.g., net zero by 2040).

**Emissions Budgets (Questions 5-10)**

15. **Auckland Council supports having in place a series of three emissions budgets to help provide predictability and progress on reductions through political cycles.** Five year cycles help focus on action and provide adaptability and agility in meeting targets. The role of the Commission should be made explicitly clear in this process.

---

16. Any allowance for the Government to alter emissions budgets should be taken quite carefully, and done frugally given the perceived and actual risks and impacts. Adjusting the third/final budget in the sequence should be done sparingly and without pushing responsibility for emissions reductions into the future. Allowing such careful modifications of the third/final budget may add some pragmatic flexibility but should only be done when the subsequent budget is set and with a high degree of caution and frugality. We do not support adjusting the second budget – even in 'exceptional circumstances.'

17. Auckland Council generally supports the proposed considerations for the Government and Commission to take into account when advising on and setting budgets. Scientific knowledge about climate change, an awareness of technology relevant to climate change, and policies like energy policy underpin what a zero carbon transition requires and pathways to get to net zero. Economic, social and fiscal awareness of potential impacts on the economy, sectors, taxation, and public spending and borrowing will help mitigate unintended and undesirable economic and social consequences from the transition. Obligations to Te Tiriti o Waitangi are of critical consideration as is a commitment to integrate and reflect Ta Ao Māori. Finally, as suggested in the Discussion Document, consideration of a sustainable and circular economy, global and local leadership (to which Auckland is committed) and creating a just and inclusive society are paramount.

18. Plans to meet emissions budgets should expediently follow within a set timeline from budget setting. We recommend that Government take into account a number of issues when setting plans, including but not limited to: consideration for a just and equitable transition, consideration of local government and urban needs, consideration of investing in New Zealand to gain a wide range of benefits beyond but associated with carbon reduction, and consideration of offshore impacts and leakage.

Climate Commission (Questions 11-13)

19. Auckland Council supports the role of an independent body to oversee New Zealand’s climate change commitments. We have previously stated support for the body to be given the right powers to enable domestic and international targets to be met against a carbon budget, that it is placed outside political cycles, that it has a clear remit to support the work of local government and that budget and plans are linked to required actions by local government, and that its work encompasses both mitigation and adaptation.

20. We therefore support the function of the Climate Change Commission to advise and monitor New Zealand’s progress toward emissions goals as stated in the Discussion Document. Specifically, we believe the Commission should advise on emissions budgets and monitor progress, provide independent advice on focus areas in the economy and related considerations, enable a periodic check-in on the target level (but not a regression), monitor progress toward addressing climate risks and help frame up a national climate adaptation plan, and advise on how/when we use international emissions reductions toward our target (more below). While we do not support a full decision-making role in setting policy under its

---

own authority at arm’s length from Government, we suggest strong language in the final bill that urges Government to seriously and fully consider advice in its decision-making.

21. The Commission’s role regarding the NZ ETS should be carefully considered. Simply advising the Government on policy settings may place unnecessary weight on political cycles and dynamics, while providing full decision-making power, while pragmatic to achieve targets, may carry the weight of an unprecedented transfer of traditionally government decision-making. A hybrid approach is recommended, likely landing in the strength of the Bill’s final language in how the Government “should” or “must” “receive” or “act on” recommendations from the Commission on things like the number of units available in the NZ ETS. Concomitantly, we suggest careful selection of Commission members and clear transparency in the selection process. This includes ensuring a range and balance of domestic and international expertise and that there are no significant gaps.

22. Note that Auckland has taken a similar approach with the formal appointment by the Mayor and Councillors of an Independent Advisory Group to check and challenge Auckland’s climate action plan, targets, actions and our implementation progress. One recommendation that flows from our appointments is the recognition of public health as a crucial component to the expertise of the Commission. Such expertise is not recognised in the Discussion Document.

Adaptation (Questions 14-16)

23. We have supported and continue to support the inclusion of climate adaptation in the Zero Carbon Bill. This is an approach we have committed to as part of the development of Auckland’s Climate Action Plan and one taken as best practice by leading cities around the world. Simply put integrated solutions across both mitigation and adaptation can deliver smarter, better and multiple outcomes across well-beings.

24. Auckland Council broadly supports a number of proposed new functions to adapt to climate change. We support a national climate change risk assessment as necessary to better understand risk, provide a foundation for investment, allow for greater transparency and communication of risks, and help prioritise integrated and systematic actions across all sectors. As noted in the Discussion Document, future risk assessments would help stabilise the policy environment given a broad view of trends and continuity. Note that Auckland Council is currently undertaking a climate risk and vulnerability assessment for Auckland with social, environmental and economic lenses as we believe in its value in the decision-making process.

25. A national adaptation plan to identify actions, clarify roles, align with community resilience-building, encourage proactive planning and coordinate across government and sectors is crucial to our climate response as a nation. Again, Auckland Council is currently undertaking an integrated climate action plan that undertakes this task for the Auckland region. While we support development of a national adaptation plan now to address priority areas, we suggest in the long-term that the Commission and Government more fully integrate climate adaptation and mitigation so that they do not sit separately. Meanwhile, areas of obvious
opportunity for integration should be addressed, such as forestry and green and blue infrastructure.

26. **We support an adaptation reporting power and a requirement for mandatory climate risk reporting** so that organisations are more prepared to manage climate risk, that organisations’ efforts are coordinated more effectively, and that Government can more holistically design policies and approaches to encourage adaptation. We consider it likely that any additional costs associated with such adaptation reporting will likely accrue as benefits given avoidance or mitigation of climate risks in the longer-term.

27. Learning from the UK model (a noted case study in the Discussion Document) highlights how consistency and guidance must be applied in the implementation of the adaptation reporting power. This is essential to ensure that it provides sufficient information to Government for a clear understanding of the risks and vulnerabilities faced by New Zealand and for surety that these are being acted upon. Establishing clear guidance would require upfront resourcing from Government (in collaboration with the relevant sectors) but would deliver clearer outcomes.

28. Local Government in the UK does not currently fall into the remit of the adaptation reporting power leaving a significant gap in understanding of the true picture of risk. This decision was made due to perceived reporting burdens to Local Authorities. **We recommend that Central Government work closely with Local Government in establishing an approach to identifying and reporting on current adaptation practices.** The UK established a Local Adaptation Advisory Panel to support this and this could provide a potential model for New Zealand.

**Additional Considerations**

29. In addition to advising on emissions targets and budgets, the Commission should have a strong role in reporting on progress and there should be mechanisms in the Bill for that reporting to be publically available. Like the UK Committee on Climate Change does, the independent Commission would also hold the Government to account in ensuring budgets are met and advising where further progress or changes in approach may be necessary.

30. Related to the Zero Carbon Bill, Auckland Council **strongly suggests embedding climate change and emissions reduction in land use and planning policy** as part of a larger package to deliver co-benefits to New Zealanders. This is consistent with the recommendations previously made by the Productivity Commission in its 2017 Better Urban Planning Inquiry and aligns with Auckland Council submissions on the Productivity Commission’s inquiry to the transition to a low-emissions economy.\(^7\)

31. **We underscore the critical importance of a just and equitable zero carbon, climate-resilient transition.** This means prioritising actions and approaches that help reduce the burden on our most vulnerable populations and, thus, that mitigate, reduce or eliminate issues like energy insecurity/poverty, air quality impacts, poor quality housing and risks from climate impacts. We applaud the reintroduction of the four well-beings into the Local Government Act via the

Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill. Doing so will make it far clearer that local governments play a role beyond core services to maintain and restore a range of capitals (e.g., human, natural, social) and broader social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes. Likewise, we support NZ Treasury’s Living Standards Framework approach that considers the collective impact of policies, spending and interventions on intergenerational wellbeing.

32. Similarly, Auckland Council strongly supports partnering with tangata whenua in the development of a legislative framework around climate change. We strongly believe that this also applies at a local and regional level in our efforts described below to develop a Climate Action Plan for the Auckland region. A number of mechanisms are being used to ensure that mana whenua and mataawaka are involved in advising, process development and decision-making.

33. As previously stated, adaptation to climate change should be included as a critical element of the Zero Carbon Bill. Measures to mitigate climate change are interconnected with other societal goals and can provide multiple co-benefits which could be maximised by integrating with climate adaptation and resilience.

34. We reiterate that in order to deliver on national and regional targets, central and local governments need to work in partnership. Auckland is currently developing an integrated climate action plan and has agreed a set of collaborative work streams with Government through the Ministry for the Environment and Transition Hub. Our approach and main pillars of the work align very well with the Zero Carbon Bill approach – namely, 1) we are committed to integrating adaptation and mitigation, 2) we have established an Independent Advisory Group to check and challenge our work, 3) we will be reviewing our target with an aim to align with zero carbon by 2050, and 4) our plan intends to set targets and/or carbon budgets by sector to meet our target.

35. Thus, we strongly suggest building on our partnership and continuing down the path of closer collaboration and nested approaches in the planning and delivery of a zero carbon and climate resilient Auckland and New Zealand. To those ends, we also suggest that the legislative and institutional package have a clear remit to support the work of local government on climate mitigation to deliver real emissions reduction and climate resilience in local communities.
Appendix A: Additional Text from Auckland Transport

36. Auckland Transport is a Controlled Organisation of Auckland Council and is responsible for all of the region’s transport services (excluding state highways), from roads and footpaths, to cycling, parking and public transport. Our vision is ‘transport choices for a growing, vibrant Auckland’ and our mission is ‘working together to deliver safe, innovative and sustainable transport for a great city’.

37. As a transport agency we are well aware of the contribution of the transport sector to greenhouse gas emissions and the risks of the predicted impacts of climate change – including to our assets and operations. We are also well aware of the challenges in reducing transport emissions. In October 2016 our Board endorsed our first Sustainability Framework, in which we acknowledge the importance of low emission transport choices and the need for adaptation planning.

38. We strongly support the intent of the Zero Carbon Bill and the government’s work to transition New Zealand towards a zero carbon economy. To this end, we already have a number of pilots underway to increase our experience with carbon reduction initiatives. These include:
   - Piloting electric buses, in partnership with EECA, to support transitioning the whole fleet to low emissions consistent with Mayor Goff’s commitment to procuring only low emission buses by 2025
   - Installing public EV charging infrastructure in our carparks
   - Upgrading 90,000 streetlights with LED’s
   - Continued promotion of public transport, walking and cycling
   - Engagement as part of the Smarter Transport Pricing project
   - Developing a climate change adaptation plan.

39. Our view is that the creation of a Climate Change Commission with a responsibility for setting carbon budgets will be a useful and necessary framework for highlighting climate change issues and tracking New Zealand’s carbon reduction progress. We emphasise that key policy initiatives are needed in addition to the framework to achieve change in New Zealand’s overall emissions profile. For example, even with substantial new investment in public transport and walking and cycling, meeting transport emissions reduction targets depends on new policies, for instance and as proposed by the Productivity Commission, to incentivise the uptake of electric and other low emission vehicle types. We hope to see progress on these initiatives alongside the development and enactment of the Bill.

40. Given the transport sector makes up 20 percent of New Zealand’s emissions and nearly 40 percent of Auckland’s emissions, and overall transport emissions are increasing with population growth we would like to see specific expertise from the sector represented on the Climate Commission. We also suggest that the Commission consult widely with the sector in the course of testing the feasibility of emissions budgets or when providing advice on resilience and risk. We suggest strong stakeholder engagement in the process of setting carbon budgets to be much more effective in achieving change seen as inclusive and realistic by stakeholders.
Memo

24 July 2018

To: The Environment and Community Committee and Local Board chairs

From: Coral Grant, (AC Project Manager - PFAS)

Subject: NZDF Whenuapai investigation

Dear Committee members and Local Board chairs,

Beginning yesterday, the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) began contacting some landowners living near Whenuapai Air Base seeking permission to test ground and surface water on their properties for the presence of PFAS. Additionally, some landowners will be approached by NZDF to enable access to the coastal environment adjacent to their properties.

This is ahead of the NZ Defence Force testing of ground and surface water for PFAS compounds at some properties and the marine environment neighbouring Whenuapai Air Base that is due to commence within the next 1 – 2 weeks.

Please find attached a briefing from the New Zealand Defence Force

Key Points

- The NZDF testing programme follows the detection of PFAS at Whenuapai Air Base. An All of Government group led by MFE is overseeing the PFAS programme of work.

- Auckland Council is not involved in the testing. The council has been consulted and has assisted NZDF with their preliminary investigation with regional and locally specific information and knowledge of the area.

- Drinking water at the base, the adjacent school, the village centre on Brigham Creek Road and the Special Housing Area comes from the town supply and is not affected.

- Preliminary advice from NZDF’s consultants is that while some people may be using ground water at properties close to Whenuapai Air Base, the water is sourced from bores linked to an aquifer at a depth of between 200-300 metres which is separated from surface water by a thick layer of fine sediment that is expected to exclude PFAS. Testing will confirm this.

- The welfare of local residents is a priority for NZDF and for Auckland Council. An NZDF liaison team is providing assistance and support to those whose properties will be tested.

- Testing results are expected six to eight weeks after testing.

- Ministry of Health advice remains that there is no acute health risk from exposure to PFAS compounds. There is currently no consistent evidence that environmental exposures to PFOS and PFOA causes adverse human health effects.
More information

NZDF have a PFAS helpline (0800 668 766) that operates 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday. More information about the PFAS programme is also available on the Ministry of the Environment website - www.mfe.govt.nz/pfas.

For further information please contact:
Jennifer Rose – Auckland Council Community Liaison – PFAS,
021993647, jennifer.rose@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Regards,

Coral Grant
Auckland Council Project Manager- PFAS
Auckland Council Brief – NZDF Whenuapai PFAS Investigation July 2018

1. Background

a. PFAS is a group of chemical compounds previously considered benign but now regarded as potentially harmful. The PFAS issue is a legacy issue.

b. PFAS compounds have, for decades, been used in a wide variety of industrial and domestic materials, including stain or water resistant fabrics and non-stick cookware. As a result PFAS is now widespread in the environment and is ubiquitous in the blood of New Zealanders. At present we are primarily concerned with three PFAS compounds – perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS), perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorohexane sulfonic acid (PFHxS). These compounds are contained in older style fire fighting foams used on liquid fuel fires.

c. NZDF has been advised by our suppliers that they have not supplied any foam products containing PFOS or PFOA above trace levels to us since at least 2002.

d. The environmental effects of PFAS are not well understood but they are considered to be potentially harmful, on long term exposure (by ingestion), to human health. A precautionary approach is therefore being adopted worldwide.

e. Potential harm arises because PFAS is persistent and accumulates, so even very small amounts ingested routinely can, over time, build up in the human body to potentially harmful levels.

f. A recently published review by an Expert Panel for the Australian Government Department of Health concluded that “...There is mostly limited or no evidence for an association with human disease ...” and “… because the evidence is very weak and inconsistent in many respects, some degree of important health effects for individuals exposed to PFAS cannot be ruled out …”

g. So, even though the evidence of health effects isn’t clear, the best thing to do as a precaution is to minimise where people could possibly ingest PFAS.

h. At both Ohakea and Woodbourne our focus has been very clearly on identifying any locations at which people may be drinking water close to or above the Ministry of Health Interim Drinking Water Guideline.

i. Groundwater, surface water and soil on some NZDF sites contain small quantities of PFAS. Groundwater containing PFAS has been identified in private land and private water supply wells at Ohakea and Woodbourne. NZDF has installed water tanks for those whose drinking water has been impacted.
2. **Whenuapai Investigations**

   a. At RNZAF Base Auckland (Whenuapai) the main foams of concern haven’t been used since 2002, and we currently do not train with any foam at Whenuapai. Our studies have had to look back over 20 years to find that there was a history of foam usage in training and some spillage historically. So, we believe groundwater containing PFAS may be migrating from NZDF land at Whenuapai to adjacent lands and into the upper Waitemata Harbour.

   b. NZDF will soon commence investigation of PFAS in groundwater, surface water and marine sediments in a confined area surrounding Whenuapai.

   c. The scope and scale of the initial investigations have been discussed and agreed with Auckland Council. It is important that the testing we are doing is supporting Council and providing your experts the information they need. The initial investigation will involve up to 21 private landowners as opposed to 58 at Ohakea and 112 at Woodbourne.

   d. The indicative schedule for the investigation is:

      i. **Fri 13 Jul** - proposed liaison & sampling team reps meet and greet and ops centre brief - complete

      ii. **Mon 23 –Fri 27 Jul** - Liaison commences with a letter drop (hand delivered or posted to all stakeholders)

      iii. **Tues 24 Jul** - Liaison personnel ring stakeholders to arrange for a liaison meeting and/or to schedule sampling


      v. All sampling work is weather and tide dependent

3. **Water Supply**

   a. At Ohakea and Woodbourne, where investigations are further advanced, we have identified issues with groundwater used for household supply.

   b. At Whenuapai there is limited potential for impact on groundwater used for household supply. Preliminary advice from the reporting consultants indicates that, while there is some usage of groundwater in close proximity to WHP, the water is sourced from a depth below ground of 200-300m and below a thick layer of sediment that is expected to prevent surface water reaching the deep groundwater.

   c. Household water supply for the Air Base, the school and the village centre on Brigham Creek Road, and the special housing area, is the reticulated supply provided by Auckland Council and is sourced remotely.
Memorandum

30 July 2018

To: Environment and Community Committee

Cc: Auckland Council SeaChange Political Reference Group
   Cr Penny Hulse, Cr Alf Filipaina, Cr Chris Darby, Cr Bill Cashmore, Cr Wayne Walker, John Meeuwsen, Angela Fulljames, Beth Houlbrooke, Christina Bettany, Graeme Easte, Liane Ngamane
   Jim Quinn, Chief of Strategy

Subject: Hauraki Gulf Forum’s State of Our Gulf 2017 report – Analysis of Auckland Council programmes against findings in forum’s report

From: Nick Reid Senior Analyst, Natural Environment Strategy
      Dave Allen Manager, Natural Environment Strategy

Purpose

1. To provide a staff analysis of the findings of the Hauraki Gulf Forum’s State of our Gulf 2017 report (the report), against existing Auckland Council programmes.

Summary

- The Hauraki Gulf Forum’s 2017 State of our Gulf report describes the health of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park. The report broadly concludes that management frameworks and responses are not keeping pace with growth and change in the Hauraki Gulf. The report identifies 10 key issues affecting the health of the Hauraki Gulf. Several of these, for example water quality are within council’s responsibility.
- The analysis presented here considers the report’s environmental indicators against higher level strategies and against operational programmes.
- Auckland Council has programmes underway that address the report’s key issues and environmental indicators. In some cases, the council programmes are insufficient to address the relevant key issues identified in the report, and these are being dealt with by a range of approaches, including additional funding through the 2018 – 2028 Budget.

Context / Background

2. The State of our Gulf 2017 report prepared by independent consultants is the fifth state of the environment report released by the Hauraki Gulf Forum (the forum). The forum is required to report every 3 years on the health of the Hauraki Gulf Tikapa Moana / Te Moana-nui-a-Toi. A memo detailing the report’s findings was provided to this committee in March 2018 (ENV/2018/27).
3. The Auckland Council SeaChange political reference group has also requested a staff analysis of the forum’s report. At its meetings of February and June 2018, this group acknowledged the value of assessing the various strategies, plans and work programmes so an integrated picture of direction could be achieved. This is not achieved by looking at the forum’s report in isolation.

Discussion

4. Staff have completed an analysis of the report against Auckland Council programmes. This analysis comprises four parts:
   - Key priorities for the Hauraki Gulf (as assessed by reports to Planning and Environment and Community Committees in May and September 2017 (PLA/2017/50, CP2017/18665))
   - An assessment of council’s strategic approach against the report’s observations
   - An assessment of council’s work programmes against the report’s observations.
Auckland Council priorities for improving the health of the Hauraki Gulf

5. Previous Auckland Council work has identified key pressures for the Hauraki Gulf as: Water quality, Biodiversity and biosecurity, Population growth and urban development and Climate change.

Priority – Water quality

6. Water quality improvement is a priority for central and local government. Aucklanders also consider improvement of our waterways and beaches to be a high and urgent priority. The water programme proposed under the 2018-2028 Budget is expected to deliver improved water quality. Policies, objectives and rules under Auckland’s Unitary Plan also support better water outcomes. Effectiveness of these rules will be assessed as part of Auckland’s Unitary Plan Effectiveness Monitoring Strategy led by the Plans & Places department.

7. Sedimentation has been identified as one of the biggest pressures on water quality in the Hauraki Gulf. The report shows that modern sedimentation rates are still high with ecological effects reported for multiple estuaries including in the Auckland region. Based on an initial analysis of existing policies, guidelines, actions and conversations with staff from across the organisation, it is unclear whether sedimentation initiatives are effective, especially considering on-going population growth and its impacts on land use change. Further work is currently being done to evaluate what can be done to ensure that actions are effective over a longer timeframe.

Priority – Biodiversity and Biosecurity

8. The report discusses some successes in biodiversity management. Terrestrial biodiversity values have rebounded as a result of pest eradication, revegetation and translocation efforts on the Gulf’s islands and implementation of speed restrictions has brightened the outlook for Bryde’s whales.

9. Currently spatial coverage of marine biodiversity planning measures are limited, particularly in subtidal environments. The current use of Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the marine environment is largely based around intertidal areas. The 2018-2028 Budget will enable assessments of subtidal marine habitat (that can support identification of SEAs) and improved marine biosecurity programmes, as well as management of Kauri dieback and seabirds.

10. The Auckland Unitary Plan includes marine biosecurity provisions related to the level and cleaning of hull fouling on boats and linking of biosecurity considerations to the provision and management of aquaculture, marinas and other activities. Auckland Council currently has no marine pathway management plan, but has identified development of a pathway management approach to address the risks of marine pest species in its proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (RPMP) and marine biosecurity bid that forms part of council’s 2018-2028 Budget.

Priority – Population growth and urban development

11. The report identifies population growth and urban development as a key pressure on the Hauraki Gulf. However the indicator (number of primary land parcels) used to assess this pressure could be more detailed, given the scale and impact of urban development on the Hauraki Gulf.

12. A better understanding of the environmental impacts of Auckland’s urban development on the Hauraki Gulf is required. This should appropriately form part of Auckland’s Unitary Plan Effectiveness Monitoring Strategy led by the Plans & Places department.

Priority – Climate Change

13. The report does not contain climate change indicators, but considers it an important pressure on the Hauraki Gulf. Since the report’s completion, Auckland Council has commissioned and received a detailed report on climate change predictions and the impacts on Auckland. This report forms the evidence base for the development of the Auckland Climate Adaptation Plan.

---

1 Public Feedback - Water Quality Improvement Targeted Rate (2018-2028 Budget consultation)
(ACAP). Auckland Council has also recently made a submission to central government on the Zero Carbon Bill.

Assessment of Auckland Council’s high-level approach against the report

14. Between them, the Auckland Plan 2050, Auckland Unitary Plan 2016 and 2018-2028 Budget set Auckland Council’s strategic direction, regulatory framework and funding arrangements respectively. A summary of the report’s indicators and the approach taken to improve outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf in each of these documents is provided in Attachment 1. For all of the report’s indicators, except fishing and marine protection (as most tools are under other legislation), Auckland Council has strategy, regulation and funding in place, intended to improve the health of the Hauraki Gulf.

15. The Auckland Plan 2050 aims to significantly improve the health of natural environments, through protection, enhancement and leveraging the opportunity of growth for better environmental outcomes. The majority of indicators are covered under the Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome. Specific focus areas within this outcome (e.g. Focus Area 5: Adapt to a changing water future, and Focus Area 3: Account for past and future impacts of growth) will support addressing key issues identified in the report (see Attachment 1).

16. The Auckland Unitary Plan provides objectives and policies for managing environmental effects. The majority of key issues from the report are covered; however the effectiveness of these rules and approaches is yet to be widely established. For some key issues (e.g. maintenance and recovery of biodiversity) there are fewer links (see Attachment 1).

17. The 2018-2028 Budget has recognised that historic under-investment in the environment, particularly through infrastructure, impacted the Hauraki Gulf. Initiatives in this, like targeted rates for water quality and natural environment, are good responses to the key issues identified in the report (see Attachment 1).

Assessment of Council Plans, Policies, Strategies and Programmes against indicators

18. A range of Auckland Council plans, policies, strategies and programmes are addressing the key issues of the report (Attachment 2). These programmes provide the detailed approach for how Auckland Council will manage impacts (within its responsibility) on the Hauraki Gulf.

Next steps

19. In order to improve the health of the Hauraki Gulf, Auckland Council and Council Controlled Organisations will need to:
   - Implement the Auckland Plan 2050 and ensure focus areas are being addressed
   - Track the progress of 2018-2028 Budget programmes through environmental reporting, such as Auckland Council’s regular monitoring programmes
   - Use the report and other reference material to support programme updates as part of usual review cycle
   - Seek deliberate actions to ‘close the loop’ to ensure integrated and effective actions through planning, consenting, monitoring and compliance activities
   - Recognise the negative trends in the environment and address these through smarter approaches, like giving greater priority to environmental outcomes when considering infrastructure investments
   - Consider and support the aspirations of mana whenua and communities where environmental values are sought to be improved.
### Attachment 1: Summary of State of our Gulf 2017 environmental indicators and Auckland Plan 2050, Auckland Unitary Plan and 10-year Budget (2018-2028)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Indicator, State of our Gulf 2017 report</th>
<th>Auckland Plan 2050</th>
<th>Auckland Unitary Plan</th>
<th>10-year Budget (targeted rates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Water quality and integrated management (E1)  
- Other discharges of contaminants (E4)  
- On-site and small-scale wastewater treatment and disposal (E5)  
- Wastewater network management (E6)  
- Taking damming and diversion of water and Drilling (E7)  
- Stormwater - discharge and diversion (E8)  
- Stormwater quality - High contaminant generating carparks and high use roads (E9)  
- Stormwater Management Area - Flow 1 and Flow 2 - (E10)  
- Contaminated land (E30) | 10-year Budget Water Quality Improvement Targeted rate to:  
- Reduce wastewater overflows into the Waitematā Harbour from hundreds of events to six or less each year  
- Reduce stormwater volumes into the Manukau Harbour  
- Reduce contaminants such as litter, sediments, metals and oils in stormwater across the region, and in the South Kaipara Harbour  
- Improve water quality and creating healthy habitats for plants and animals in streams across the region  
- Establish a system for proactive monitoring of onsite wastewater treatment systems such as septic tanks |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Indicator, State of our Gulf 2017 report</th>
<th>Auckland Plan 2050</th>
<th>Auckland Unitary Plan</th>
<th>10-year Budget (targeted rates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sediment and Benthic Health</strong></td>
<td><em>Environment and Cultural Heritage: Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</em></td>
<td><em>- Water sensitive design, stock exclusion rules, riparian planting requirements</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Stormwater - discharge and diversion (E8)</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Stormwater quality - High contaminant generating carparks and high use roads (E9)</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Stormwater Management Area - Flow 1 and Flow 2 - (E10)</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Land disturbance – Regional (E11) (RMA Section 30 function)</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Agrichemicals and vertebrate toxic agents (E34)</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- General Coastal Marine Zone (F2) (Drainage, reclamation and declamation)</em></td>
<td>10-year Budget  Water Quality Improvement Targeted rate to:&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Reduce wastewater overflows into the Waitematā Harbour from hundreds of events to six or less each year</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Reduce contaminants such as litter, sediments, metals and oils in stormwater across the region, and in the South Kaipara Harbour</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mangroves</strong></td>
<td><em>Environment and Cultural Heritage: Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</em></td>
<td><em>- Policies around mangrove removal (F2 Coastal)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrients</strong></td>
<td><em>Environment and Cultural Heritage: Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</em></td>
<td><em>- Water sensitive design, stock exclusion rules, riparian planting requirements</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Water quality and integrated management (E1)</em></td>
<td>10-year Budget  Water Quality Improvement Targeted rate to:&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Reduce wastewater overflows into the Waitematā Harbour from hundreds of events to six or less each year</em>&lt;br&gt;  <em>- Reduce stormwater volumes into the Manukau Harbour</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Indicator, State of our Gulf 2017 report</td>
<td>Auckland Plan 2050</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan</td>
<td>10-year Budget (targeted rates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbial Contamination (pathogens)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rural production discharges (E35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve water quality and creating healthy habitats for plants and animals in streams across the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment and Cultural Heritage:</td>
<td>- Water sensitive design, stock exclusion rules, riparian planting requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</td>
<td>- Water quality and integrated management (E1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus area 5: Adapt to a changing water future</td>
<td>- Wastewater network management (E6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non indigenous marine species</td>
<td>Environment and Cultural Heritage:</td>
<td>- Controls on discharge of biofouling from vessel cleaning and passive discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</td>
<td>- General Coastal Marine Zone (F2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-year Budget Water Quality Improvement Targeted rate to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduce wastewater overflows into the Waiheka Harbour from hundreds of events to six or less each year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish a system for proactive monitoring of onsite waste water treatment systems such as septic tanks e.g. proposed funding for increased monitoring and compliance for inspectors of OSWWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful algae (pathogens and mass mortalities)</td>
<td>Environment and Cultural Heritage:</td>
<td>- Water quality and integrated management (E1) (E1.3 Providing for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Indicator, State of our Gulf 2017 report</td>
<td>Auckland Plan 2050</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan</td>
<td>10-year Budget (targeted rates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</td>
<td>stormwater management: providing for the management of gross stormwater pollutants, such as litter, in areas where the generation of these may be an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 1: Encourage all Aucklanders to be stewards of the environment and to make sustainable choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance and recovery of biodiversity</strong></td>
<td>Environment and Cultural Heritage: Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</td>
<td>10-year Budget  Water Quality Improvement Targeted rate to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide rehabilitation of urban and rural streams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improves the ecological health of the streams and reduces flow of contaminants into harbours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stabilises areas of high stream erosion, reducing sedimentation in the harbours and protecting property and infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal development</strong></td>
<td>Transport and Access: Direction 3: Maximise safety and environmental protection. Environment and Cultural Heritage: Direction 1: Ensure the environment is valued and cared for</td>
<td>- Auckland Unitary Plan provisions (Coastal Marine Area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 2: Summary of Auckland Council Plans, Policies, Strategies and Programmes against indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toxic Chemicals</th>
<th>NPS-Freshwater Management implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contaminant Load model and integrated watershed plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Swim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution response/Regulatory compliance</td>
<td>and Harbour Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Auckland Council’s pollution response team which responds to spills (oil and chemical). Harbour Master has responsibility for coordinating tier 1 and 2 spills and works closely with Maritime NZ for larger scale spill preparedness and response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consent compliance team inspecting industrial trade areas and new housing areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emptying of stormwater catchpits and ongoing maintenance of treatment devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Industrial Pollution Prevention Programmes being run by several local boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undertaking Whau water quality investigation to determine sources of heavy metals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use, upgrade and instalment of stormwater devices to trap contaminants (new and retrofitted to key areas) to reduce heavy metal contaminants in urban areas as part of infrastructure delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identification of network efficiencies and establishment of programmes focused on managing inflow and infiltration issues in both networks, minimising the ways in which stormwater and groundwater gets into wastewater networks through defective or broken pipes, surface runoff or incorrect pipe connections, and vice versa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trade Waste Bylaw review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Auckland Transport Water Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AT supports the installation of water sensitive devices as a way of managing stormwater where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project: Two stormwater filters were installed under Te Atatu Road to reduce road-based contaminants such as copper and zinc from entering streams and the harbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project: Upgrading Hurstmere Road in Takapuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- St Mary’s Bay Water quality improvement programme - tetra traps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programmes e.g.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (implemented by a variety of Auckland Council’s Local Boards e.g., Howick, Devonport / Takapuna area, and Silverdale).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Programmes
- Development of Auckland’s Waters Strategy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sediment and benthic health</th>
<th>NPS-Freshwater Management implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integrated watershed plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidelines e.g.:**
- Erosion and sediment control guide for land disturbing activities in the Auckland region (GD05)
- Technical Guidance for sediment and erosion control associated with forestry operations (linked to NPS-Plantation Forestry) (TP223)
- Water sensitive design guide for stormwater (GD04)

**Community and non-regulatory:**
- support to landowners (e.g. Managing Mud programme)
- Waterways Planning initiatives – Hoteo River Freshwater Improvement Fund

**Auckland Transport initiatives e.g.:**
- Regional Road sealing programme
- Road dust suppression trial Rodney
- Vegetation and table drains in rural areas
- Tetra traps
- Asset Management Plans
- Water related programmes (e.g. water cluster forum, clean water working group)

**Proposed work programmes**
- Development of Auckland’s Water Strategy
- Guidance central government on sedimentation (potential amendments to the NPSFM)
- Million Trees and Urban Forest Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrients</th>
<th>NPS-Freshwater Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development of Contaminant Load Model to predict contaminant loads in catchment and identify (effectiveness of) management interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integrated watershed plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Board Plans**
- Waterways Protection Fund (focused on targeted catchments) and Regional Environment and Heritage Fund (which can be used for regionally significant waterbodies)

**Non-regulatory support and advice to landowners:**
- Implementation of best practice farming practices within regional parks across Auckland
- The Te Muri Stock Exclusion study, which seeks to increase the understanding of rural land management practices, through an assessment of their costs and benefits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watercare projects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Upgrades Wastewater Treatment Plants (see also microbial contamination and toxic chemicals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Work Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Development of Auckland’s Waters Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential national guidance for stock exclusion measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Microbial contamination (pathogens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Onsite Waste Water Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Development of risk assessment model for onsite wastewater devices throughout Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Completing review of onsite wastewater treatment management in the Auckland region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintenance and upgrade of around 380 onsite wastewater systems across Auckland, ranging from septic tanks to advance secondary and tertiary treatment systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Investigation of proactive compliance regime for onsite wastewater systems for Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waitakere pump out scheme on-site wastewater systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation National Environmental Standards for Sources of Drinking Water and NZ Drinking Water Standards RIMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Monitoring of closed waterways and other waterways graded as having poor water quality to identify source and then associated works to reduce contribution. This work may include Inflow &amp; Infiltration works, cross connection works, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy Waters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Infiltration and ingress works to improve network performance. Current work examples include investigations at Takapuna, Mellons Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Watercare) projects e.g.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Central Interceptor Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Warkworth / Snells Beach upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Madills Farm reserve storage tank installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fred Thomas Drive wastewater pumping station and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wynyard Quarter wastewater pumping station and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Army Bay Treatment Plant upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- East Coast Bays link sewer upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wairau Wastewater Pumping station and rising main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Omaha Wastewater Treatment Plant - Glendowie Branch Sewer upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Western Isthmus Water Quality Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe Swim programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Various Local Board (Great Barrier/Waiheke) and community initiatives for monitoring and education of on-site wastewater management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangroves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Work Programmes**
- Central government’s development of a proposed National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-indigenous marine species</th>
<th>Treasure island programme (with Department of Conservation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council’s marine biosecurity program (e.g. hull checks, awareness, surveys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in the Top of the North marine biosecurity partnership (ToN partnership)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Work Programmes**
- Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (RPMP): marine pathway management to address threat of non-indigenous marine species
- National Craft Risk Management Strategy (July 2018)
- Ballast water management (MPI): Import Health Standard and implementation of the international Ballast Water Management Convention
- Aquaculture (MPI): NES marine aquaculture
- Potential development of a national marine pathway management plan (MPI)
- National Direction Bio2025 and related implementation work programme
- Auckland Transport Sustainability Framework

Recognises transport impacts due to poor management of ecological weeds and pests within road corridors (Auckland Design Manual and The Roads and Streets Framework)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marine litter</th>
<th>Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Street cleaning by Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approximately 3,000 Tetra traps have been installed in catch pits jointly by Auckland Council / Auckland Transport and the Local Boards mainly around the central isthmus area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informal internal marine litter working group
### Proposed Work Programmes

**Draft Auckland Waste Minimisation Plan 2018:**
- **Total regional waste:**
- Reduce total council- and private-sector-influenced waste to landfill by 30 per cent by 2027 (from the baseline of 832kg to 582 kg per capita per year)
- **Domestic waste:**
  - a. Reduce domestic kerbside refuse by 30 per cent by 2021 (from 160kg to 110kg per capita per year)
  - b. After 2021, reduce domestic kerbside refuse by a further 20 per cent by 2028 (from 110kg to 88kg per capita per year)
- **Council waste**
  - a. Reduce council’s own in-house office waste by 60 per cent per capita by 2024 (from a 2012 baseline)
  - b. Work across council to set a baseline for operational wastes and, by 2019, put in place targets for reduction.

**National marine litter beach monitoring programme MIE** (indicator national environmental reporting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance and recovery of biodiversity</th>
<th>Biodiversity Strategy 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Strategy 2012</td>
<td>Addresses indigenous biodiversity: our native species, their genetic diversity, and the habitats and ecosystems that support them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Pest Management Plan**
- Managing the pest spread to the Hauraki Gulf islands (through Auckland Council and DOC managed Pest Free Warrant system)

**Community empowerment (examples)**
- Auckland Council’s Waterway Protection Fund (WPF) and WaiCare group
- Landowners in the Leigh Harbour catchment
- Sandspit SOS community group
- Parks
- Community groups e.g. Whitebait Connection, Love your Bays project, Waiti Wildlink project, Volcano to Sea restoration project by NZ Landcare Trust, The Whangateau Harbour Care Group

**Development of a proposed National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity by central government**

**Auckland Transport Sustainability Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coastal development</th>
<th>Coastal Management Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Standards for Aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sets out the objectives and policies for providing development capacity under the Resource Management Act 1991, came into effect on 1 December 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment H

**Item 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mana Whenua:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Currently discussing with mana whenua the opportunity of and options around co-governance in relation to a proposed expansion of the Westhaven Marina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Design:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Provide advice on the establishment of a HGMP Design Panel using the existing urban design panels body of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Te Aranga Maori design principles used by Auckland Council and Council Controlled Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contribute to the development of blue design principles and include these in the Auckland Design Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Auckland Transport:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Stormwater Quality improvements as appropriate during transport projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ferry Strategy proposed to include design and operation of land based assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Community:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Auckland Council has appointed a Small Sites Ambassador on a pilot programme in the Flat Bush area in the Tāmaki watershed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Work Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ferry Strategy (proposed)</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ferry services and facilities are developed in a manner that avoids or minimises adverse effects on the coastal marine area and on public use of water space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Westhaven Marina</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Long Term Plan expansion at the northern tip of the marina is planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Redevelopment / reconfiguration of Piers within the marina space to increase charter boat base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: All elected members and Independent Māori Statutory Board members

CC: Gael Ogilvie – General Manager Environmental Services, Rod Sheridan – General Manager Community Facilities, Barry Potter – Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services, Mace Ward – General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation, Ian Maxwell – Director Community Services

Subject: Long-term management of myrtle rust

From: Phil Brown – Biosecurity Manager, Environmental Services
Simon Randall - Acting Head, Operational Management and Maintenance, Community Facilities

Purpose

1. This memorandum provides an update on the current state and long-term management of myrtle rust.

Summary

- The Ministry for Primary Industries-led attempt at the national eradication of myrtle rust has not been successful. There are now more than 100 sites impacted by myrtle rust in Auckland, and six instances on land managed by Auckland Council, as detailed in this memo.
- The management of myrtle rust is moving from eradication to long-term management to minimise the impacts of the disease.
- The Ministry for Primary Industries is currently developing advice for iwi, councils, private landowners and other interested parties around the management of myrtle rust.
- Staff from Environmental Services, Community Services and Community Facilities are scoping long-term management options, and are working to define the council’s roles as both a landowner and a regulator.
- A further update will be provided to elected members and Independent Māori Statutory Board members once the assessment of council’s role has been undertaken.

Context

2. Myrtle rust is a pathogenic fungi that affects a range of plants from the myrtle family (such as Pōhutukawa). It is airborne, but can also be spread through the movement of people and seedlings. It has spread to a number of continents, and arrived in New Zealand in 2017.

3. There has been one potentially successful eradication attempt on Lord Howe Island, but other attempts internationally have been unsuccessful. There are several strains of myrtle rust, and New Zealand has the more severe ‘pandemic’ variety which spreads more easily than other strains. Initially the Ministry for Primary Industries attempted eradication, but these efforts were declared unsuccessful earlier this year.

4. There are currently no effective treatments in New Zealand, with only preventative treatments available. Preventative treatments require ongoing applications at regular intervals and can have unintentional environmental impacts with repeated use. Treatments are therefore not ideal for widespread use, but can be used to protect significant trees.

5. Over 740 properties are known to be infected nationally with 108 properties reported as infected in Auckland. The council-managed sites where myrtle rust has been identified and removed are:
   - Wairua Reserve, Ōrākei Local Board
• Taylor Park, Albert-Eden Local Board
• Rewarewa Esplanade, Whau Local Board (on two occasions)
• Ōtara Creek Reserve, Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board
• street gardens near 279 Great South Road, Manurewa Local Board.

Discussion

6. The potential impacts of myrtle rust in New Zealand will not be fully understood until the disease has been present for another one to two years. Impacts are likely to increase as it becomes more widely spread and more common. At this stage, myrtle rust is known to impact both native and exotic myrtle species. Impacts vary from cosmetic to plant death depending on vulnerability of the species, local climate (especially rainfall and temperature), and plant health.

7. Impacts on common myrtle species may include:
   • possible extinction in the wild for ramarama, which is highly susceptible to myrtle rust and is also currently being impacted by a second (insect) pathogen
   • potential changes in abundance and distribution of pōhutukawa and rātā species and associated impacts on natural ecosystems and coastal areas
   • probable reduction of Agonis flexuosa (myrtle willow), Syzygium (monkey apple) and Callistemon (bottle brush) street trees and associated impacts on urban forest functionality (such as nectar sources)
   • mānuka, kānuka and feijoa appear to be relatively resistant.

8. A national long-term myrtle rust management plan is being developed. This will see councils and landowners becoming more responsible for managing the disease on their land. Auckland Council could have a role as a regulator to reduce the rate of spread through human activity.

9. Over time there are likely to be increased costs in managing street and amenity trees as many of these are myrtles. There may also be increased costs to council for managing other parts of its operations that involve myrtles, such as nursery and planting programmes.

Next steps

10. The Ministry for Primary Industries is convening a working group to develop advice for councils regarding the long-term management of the disease, which will guide Auckland Council’s long-term response. Auckland Council is part of this working group.

11. Council departments, including Environmental Services, Community Services and Community Facilities, are determining options for the council’s long-term management plan. This will address key issues such as the implications for the street tree programme, planting guidelines, reducing inoculum levels to protect semi-resistant species, and managing other impacts.

12. The council is also supporting national initiatives such as seed banking being undertaken by the Department of Conservation as an emergency response to ensure retention of genetic material, as well as monitoring of spread and impact on different species.

13. A further update will be provided to elected members and Independent Māori Statutory Board members once further assessment of the council’s role under a long-term management scenario as a regulator and land owner has been undertaken.
Memo

2 August 2018

To: Mayor Phil Goff, Councillors, Independent Maori Statutory Board Members, Executive Leadership Team

Cc: Jacques Victor, GM - Auckland Plan Strategy & Research

From: Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit (GPS)

Subject: Global Engagement Activity Update – August 2018 - Summary

This memo outlines the Council’s upcoming global engagement activity for August 2018. It also notes the outcomes of the previous month.

Action: for information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Activity – August 2018</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 July-4 Aug</td>
<td>Mayor Goff is currently visiting Tokyo and Fukuoka to attend the 12th Asian Pacific Cities Summit. He is also meeting with infrastructure firms interested in Auckland’s development as well as visiting sites relevant to transport orientated development. IMSB Chair David Taipari, Te Puni Kokiri CE Marty Rogers and ATEED CE Nick Hill are also in Japan for meetings, though this is not a Mayoral delegation.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Aug</td>
<td>Auckland Council best practice roundtable on Resilience with Layla M. Kilolo from Honolulu’s Department of Urban and Regional Planning.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 and 21 Aug</td>
<td>Auckland Council visit by student delegations from our Japanese partner cities Shinagawa, Kakogawa and Utsunomiya (Auckland high schools are responsible for hosting the exchanges).</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Aug</td>
<td>New Taipei City Deputy Mayor and Trade Mission will visit Auckland focusing on innovation and sustainability.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23 Aug</td>
<td>Official visit by President of Poland, HE Andrzej Duda including a State Function at Government House Auckland.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Aug</td>
<td>US Consul General, Katelyn Choe will meet with Chief of Strategy, Jim Quinn</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Activity – July 2018

The following is a list of key global activity facilitated by GPS and outcomes achieved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 July | GPS attended a briefing on the 'Pacific Reset' by MFAT Director Pacific Connections, Georgina Roberts and Unit Manager Trade & Economic, Pacific Regional Division, Tessa Te Mata, and NZTE Market Manager Australia Pacific, Scott James. | Auckland | • Increased understanding of the Pacific Reset, which includes a significant increase in funding ($714 million over the next four years) targeted towards: climate change; inclusive development and values issues.
• GPS is exploring how Auckland Council can align its contribution with the reset given the city’s unique role in the Pacific. |
<p>| 11 July | New Consul General of Japan Mr. Minoru Kikuchi called on Mayor Goff. | Auckland | • Discussed the strong Auckland-Japan relationship and opportunities around CPTPP and Mayor Goff’s visit to Japan. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11-24 July | Blockhouse Bay Intermediate School students participated in the 30th Asia Pacific Children’s Convention (APCC) – a 30-year-old initiative by our partner city Fukuoka, Japan. | Fukuoka  | • Auckland students connected with children across the Asia Pacific region to share and learn about their cultures.  
• Commemoration of the 30th anniversary of APCC. |
| 25-29 July | Representatives from China’s Ministry of Culture and Tourism visited Auckland to investigate potential sites for the establishment of a China Cultural Centre. | Auckland | • The delegation viewed two potential sites and will submit their preferred recommendation to Beijing.  
• The maintenance of friendly relationships with the Chinese diplomatic core in Auckland. |
| 25 July    | Beijing Sister City Youth Camp                                                                                                                                                                                      | Auckland | • Three members of Auckland Council’s Youth Advisory Panel have applied to participate in the 2018 Youth Camp in Beijing 21-27 October. |
| 27 July    | GPS met with the new Deputy Head of Mission for New Zealand to the United Arab Emirates Paul Ballantyne                                                                                                           | Auckland | • Discussed Auckland Plan 2050 and future opportunities of UAE interest in Auckland.  
• Discussed Auckland’s role in the $53 million NZ Government investment into the NZ Pavilion at the World Expo Dubai 2020. |
| 29 July-4 Aug | Mayor Goff’s visit to Tokyo and Fukuoka to attend the 12th Asian Pacific Cities Summit (APCS).                                                                                                                 | Japan    | • GPS worked with ATEED to facilitate and brief Mayor Goff on his visit which will involve transport and housing focused site visits, meeting with the Mayors of Fukuoka, Shinagawa and Utsunomiya; attending the APCS Summit and presenting on the challenges associated with rapid urbanisation. |
| 31 July    | Japan Utsunomiya High School Student delegation visit                                                                                                                                                              | Auckland | • Support for people-to-people connections with Japan.                                      |
| July-Aug   | Guangzhou International Award for Urban Innovation                                                                                                                                                                 | Auckland | • GPS is assisting Development Projects Office to submit Freyberg Place and the Ellen Melville Centre as a leading example of Auckland city’s inclusive urban design for the Guangzhou International Award for Urban Innovation.  
The entry, entitled Auckland, a city with community at its heart, raises Auckland’s international profile and connections with China. |
| July-Aug   | May 2018 Select LA Investment Summit/ Tripartite delegation to Los Angeles follow up                                                                                                                               | Auckland | • Deputy Mayor Cashmore reported to the Governing Body.  
An early outcome has been a US$20 Million investment agreement between NZ company HMI Technologies/Ohmio with the Heshan Industrial City Management Committee to establish an Ohmio manufacturing plant for Autonomous Vehicles, and an Artificial Intelligence Transport Research Centre in Heshan, China. |

**Next steps**

- GPS will provide an update on global activity each month.
- Requests for additional information or enquiries can be directed to Tao Chen, Advisor GPS;  
  [tao.chen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:tao.chen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) Mobile: 021 853 948).
6 August 2018

Lynn Usmani
Nestleby Grove Sanctuary

via email lynn@theaunties.co.nz

Dear Ms Usmani

Thank you for presenting your petition in relation to the use of 1080 in the Hunua Ranges to the June 2018 Environment and Community Committee of Auckland Council.

I have reviewed the petition and discussed the points raised with senior staff. The use of sodium fluoroacetate (1080) in Kohukohonui (the Hunua Ranges regional parklands of Hunua, Whakatipai and Waharau) was carefully considered by staff and elected members, against all other practicable options. The political approval for the aerial application of 1080 at Kohukohonui was made in October 2017 by Auckland Council’s Environment and Community Committee (Resolution number ENV/2017/138).

The following factors informed both the staff recommendation and political approval of the aerial application of 1080 in Kohukohonui this winter:

- protection of the significant ecological values of Kohukohonui and the physical size and terrain of the parklands
- that the first aerial application of sodium fluoroacetate in 2015 showed demonstrable results in reducing target pest densities (possums, rats and mustelids)
- that current monitoring is showing increasing animal pest densities which will threaten species and ecosystems within Kohukohonui if not controlled
- that while there is ongoing research and developments for alternative pest control tools, aerial 1080 currently remains the most effective method for landscape scale control over high value forested sites such as Kohukohonui
- that the park is currently free from Kauri dieback disease and increasing ground-based movements such as trapping, and bait lines, would pose a significant risk of introducing Kauri dieback disease into the park
- that the aerial application of 1080 would reduce the use of brodifacoum (a toxin known to accumulate in the environmental food chain)
- good support for the project from landowners in this area
- that any potential public health risk can be managed via operational controls such as buffer zones for the water reservoirs and the conditions imposed by the national guidelines for the aerial application of 1080 and the Auckland Regional Public Health Service.

I also note that sodium fluoroacetate (1080) is a biodegradable vertebrate toxin, that is classified by the Environmental Protection Authority as a hazardous substance. Consequently, it is subject to a range of controls under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996. I can assure you that our staff will be closely following all the relevant rules and guidelines for the use of 1080.
I can also assure you that Auckland Council is closely monitoring and indeed involved in the research and development in pest control technology. We are committed to assessing all available options for every site to ensure all options are considered for pest management.

Thank you again for your petition and for raising your concerns with Auckland Council.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Dean Kimpton
Chief Operating Officer

cc. Mayor Phil Goff, Environment and Community Committee