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Terms of Reference

The Hauraki Gulf Forum is established under the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 with the following purpose, functions, powers and membership.

**Purpose** (*Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, s 15*)

- Integrate the management and, where appropriate, to promote the conservation and management in a sustainable manner, of the natural, historic and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments, for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and communities of the Gulf and New Zealand
- Facilitate communication, cooperation, and coordination on matters relating to the statutory functions of the constituent parties in relation of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands and catchments and the forum
- Recognise the historic, traditional, cultural and spiritual relationship of tangata whenua with the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and where appropriate, its catchments

**Functions** (*Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, s 17*)

- Prepare a list of strategic issues, determine a priority for action on each issue, and regularly review that list
- Facilitate and encourage co-ordinated financial planning, where possible, by the constituent parties
- Obtain, share, and monitor information on the state of the natural and physical resources
- Receive reports on the completion and implementation of deeds of recognition
- Require and receive reports from constituent parties on the development and implementation of policies and strategies to address the issues identified under paragraph (a)
- Receive reports from the tangata whenua of the Hauraki Gulf on the development and implementation of iwi management or development plans
- Prepare and publish, once every 3 years, a report on the state of the environment in the Hauraki Gulf, including information on progress towards integrated management and responses to the issues identified in accordance with paragraph (a)
- Promote and advocate the integrated management and, where appropriate, the sustainable management of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments
- Encourage, share, co-ordinate where appropriate, and disseminate educational and promotional material
- Liaise with, and receive reports from, persons and groups having an interest in the Hauraki Gulf and business and community interests to promote an interest in the purposes of the forum
- Commission research into matters relating to the functions of the forum

When carrying out its functions, the forum must have particular regard to the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of tangata whenua with the natural, historic, and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments
Powers *(Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, s 18):*

- Consider issues related to its purpose
- Receive reports from constituent parties
- Make recommendations to constituent parties
- Advise any person who requests the forum’s advice
- Commission or undertake those activities that are necessary to achieve its purpose.

The forum must not:
(a) appear before a court or tribunal other than as a witness if called by a party to proceedings
(b) take part in a decision-making process under any enactment other than to advise when requested to do so.

Joint committee *(Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, s 16)*

“(2) The forum consists of the following representatives:
(a) 1 representative appointed by the Minister of Conservation:
(b) 1 representative appointed by the Minister of Fisheries:
(c) 1 representative appointed by the Minister of Maori Affairs:
(ca) 7 representatives appointed by the Auckland Council:
(d) 1 representative appointed by each of the following local authorities:
   (iv) Hauraki District Council:
   (vi) Matamata-Piako District Council:
   (ix) Thames-Coromandel District Council:
   (x) Waikato District Council:
   (xi) Waikato Regional Council:
(e) 6 representatives of the tangata whenua of the Hauraki Gulf and its islands appointed by the Minister, after consultation with the tangata whenua and the Minister of Maori Affairs.

(2A) The representatives appointed in accordance with subsection (2)(ca) must—
(a) be members of —
   (i) the Auckland Council; or
   (ii) a local board of the Auckland Council elected in accordance with the Local Electoral Act 2001 and
(b) include 1 member of each of the Great Barrier Island and Waiheke Island local board”
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Whakawātea
1  **Apologies**

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

2  **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.

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

3  **Confirmation of Minutes**

That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Monday, 14 May 2018, as a true and correct record.

4  **Public Forum**

4.1  **Public Forum - Kylie Sealy, Elizabeth Vaneveld and Andrew Melville**

**Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report**

1. Kylie Sealy, Elizabeth Vaneveld and Andrew Melville will make a presentation to the Forum regarding an Auckland University project to co-create ideas that encourage Aucklanders to care about and treasure the Hauraki Gulf. This project has received funding from G.I.F.T.

**Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s**

That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) receive the presentation from Kylie Sealy, Elizabeth Vaneveld and Andrew Melville regarding the project to co-create ideas to encourage Aucklanders to care about and treasure the Hauraki Gulf.
5 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.”
Minister of Conservation to address the Forum

File No.: CP2018/14453

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The Minister of Conservation is planning to attend the Forum meeting to address Forum Members.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:
a) thank the Minister of Conservation, Hon Eugenie Sage, for her attendance at the meeting.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Katina Conomos – Interim Executive Officer, Hauraki Gulf Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jacques Victor - GM Auckland Plan Strategy and Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairperson's Report

File No.: CP2018/14454

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. The Forum Chairperson, Mr. John Meeuwsen will address the Forum with a verbal report.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:
a) receive the Chairperson’s verbal report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Katina Conomos – Interim Executive Officer, Hauraki Gulf Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jacques Victor - GM Auckland Plan Strategy and Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Election of Deputy Chairperson

File No.: CP2018/14463

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To support the Forum to elect a new deputy chairperson of the Hauraki Gulf Forum.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. At the Forum meeting on 14 May 2018, Liane Ngamane resigned as deputy chairperson, and subsequently the Forum resolved to hold over the election of the deputy chairperson to the next meeting (HGF/2018/24).
3. This report proposes a process for election of a new deputy chairperson.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) elect a deputy chairperson by using the voting system that requires a candidate to receive the most votes in order to be elected.
b) agree the term of office for the appointment.

Horopaki / Context
4. Section 25 of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (the Act) provides for the Forum to elect its chairperson from amongst its members. Although not prescribed in legislation, the Forum has also chosen in the past to elect a deputy chairperson.
5. The Forum has previously used the voting system which requires a candidate to receive the most votes in order to be elected.
6. The suggested process for the election of a new deputy chairperson is:
   a) The chairperson calls for nominations for deputy chairperson.
   b) If there is only one nomination, the chairperson will declare that person the deputy chairperson.
   c) If there is more than one nomination, the chairperson will call for votes in respect of each candidate and declare the candidate with the most votes the deputy chairperson. If votes are tied, then the result is determined by lot.
   d) The Forum members must then pass a resolution specifying the term of office.
7. For reference, Chairperson John Meeuwsen has been appointed as chairperson for the remainder of the local authority electoral term (HGF/2018/22).
Election of Deputy Chairperson

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Katina Conomos – Interim Executive Officer, Hauraki Gulf Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jacques Victor - GM Auckland Plan Strategy and Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. This report presents strategic issues as required by s.17 of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 for the Forum’s consideration.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. A list of strategic issues is fundamental to how the Hauraki Gulf Forum functions; how it plans and prepares for Forum meetings and ultimately, how the Forum has a positive influence on the health and management of the Hauraki Gulf / Tikapa Moana / Te Moana-nui-a-toi, its islands and catchments.

3. In order to determine its list of strategic issues, Forum Members participated in a workshop on 14 May 2018, and subsequently, a draft set of strategic issues was prepared and circulated to Members in mid-July.

4. The proposed strategic issues are organised into three priority topics and associated strategic issues, as follows:

- To improve integrated management through collaborative planning, informed decision-making and credible action. This area of work will include a focus on engagement with central government, tangata whenua participation and improvements to Forum operations.

- To restore water quality values through addressing land use activities that degrade those values. This topic will see the Forum focusing on sedimentation, coastal development and urbanisation and water quality issues, such as nutrients and contaminants.

- To recognise critical marine values and ecosystems through advocating for protection, restoration and enhancement. This area of work will bring a focus on marine protected areas, biodiversity loss and reduction and marine contaminants.

5. Alongside a new set of strategic issues, changes are proposed to the constituent party reporting. It is proposed that consistent party reporting from here on be issue-specific, as determined by the Forum and/or the Chairperson and consistent with the strategic issues identified.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) receive the report.

b) adopt the strategic issues.

c) request the Executive Officer, Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson use the strategic issues document to inform the forward work programme and agenda for the Forum.
Horopaki / Context

6. Section 17 of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 describes the Functions of the Forum. These include:

(1) To promote sections 7 and 8, the Forum has the following functions in relation to the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments:

(a) to prepare a list of strategic issues, determine a priority for action on each issue, and regularly review that list:
(e) to require and receive reports from constituent parties on the development and implementation of policies and strategies to address the issues identified under paragraph
(g) to prepare and publish, once every 3 years, a report on the state of the environment in the Hauraki Gulf, including information on progress towards integrated management and responses to the issues identified in accordance with paragraph (a)

7. The current strategic issues framework was adopted by the Forum in 2012 and has been constant since then. In 2012, the strategic issues were identified in response to the state of the environment report, and were identified as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Regenerating areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Enhanced fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mana whenua expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Active land management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Knowledge utilisation (ecosystem-based)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. As required by s.17(1)(a), with the current set of strategic issues there is currently no clearly articulated priority for action on each issue. Furthermore, the interpretation of the strategic issues has been subject to broad interpretation.

9. Some Forum members have expressed concerns regarding the lack of clear action plan (linked to strategic issues) for the Forum’s work programme and have signaled that this be remedied.

10. Since the last set of strategic issues were developed by the Forum, the context has shifted, making a reasonably thorough review of the Forum’s strategic issues necessary.

11. Throughout the preparation of the 2017 State of the Environment Report, it was expected that the resulting report would subsequently inform a Forum discussion on the identification and prioritisation of strategic issues.

12. The fifth triennial state of the gulf report is the third consecutive report showing the health of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park to be in a state of decline, with that decline determined based on 11 environmental indicators (introduced in 2011), used to assess the state of the Gulf.

13. In the Chair and Deputy Chair Foreword, the 2017 State of the Gulf report draws attention to 10 selected key issues affecting the life-supporting capacity of the Hauraki Gulf / Tikapa Moana / Te Moana-nui-a-toi, its islands and catchments, as being:

- Water quality: stormwater, sediments, nutrients, heavy metals, microbiological pathogens, micro-plastics and rubbish.
- Fish stocks, fishing activity and aquaculture.
- Marine protected areas in the Gulf.
• Ocean sprawl.
• Biodiversity, habitat restoration and species recovery.
• Tāngata whenua and treaty settlements in the Hauraki Gulf / Tīkapa Moana / Te Moana-nui-a-toi.
• The Crown and the Forum.
• Integrated funding.
• The America’s Cup opportunities.

14. Since the last set of strategic issues were adopted, the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Spatial Plan, Sea Change Tai Timu Tai Pari has been finalised. Whilst not adopted by the Forum, the Forum was a key initiator and advocate for the development of the plan which has generated substantial community expectations.

15. To determine its list of strategic issues, Forum Members participated in a workshop on 14 May 2018, facilitated by independent facilitator, Helen Richie. Forum members discussed what is meant by strategic issues, and discussed that the strategic issues:
• should directly related to the legislation
• are something where the constituent parties can make a difference
• should not be too many or too complex, and should focus the work of the Forum, and
• can be opportunity or a concern.

16. A report from the Interim Executive Officer prepared for the workshop indicated that the next set of strategic issues could be improved by:
• being clearly defined
• being linked clearly to the Sections 7 and 8 of the Act
• being linked to the State of the Environment Report
• having a clear action schedule against each strategic issue
• being evidence based where practicable
• facilitate discussions towards improving integrated management
• having regular reporting, and
• being more regularly reviewed by the Forum.

17. During the workshop, Forum Members discussed that, to promote the sustainable management and conservation of the Gulf, the Forum must improve collaborative and integrated planning.

18. It was discussed that areas of focus for the Forum should include:
• Improving water quality, and related land management practices, and
• Protecting and valuing marine environments,
And that this work be underpinned by:

- Mātauranga Māori
- Supporting and inspiring communities
- Knowledge and measurement.

19. Members then requested that the Interim Executive Officer work with Technical Officers to develop this further into a set of strategic issues for the Forum’s consideration.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

20. A draft set of strategic issues was prepared and circulated to Members in mid-July.

21. The strategic issues are organised into three priority topics and associated strategic issues, as follows:

- To improve integrated management through collaborative planning, informed decision-making and credible action. This area of work will include a focus on engagement with central government, tangata whenua participation and improvements to Forum operations.
- To restore water quality values through addressing land use activities that degrade those values. This topic will see the Forum focus on sedimentation, coastal development and urbanisation and water quality issues, such as nutrients and contaminants.
- To recognise critical marine values and ecosystems through advocating for protection, restoration and enhancement. This area of work will focus on marine protected areas, biodiversity loss and reduction and marine contaminants.

22. Feedback has been received from some (but not all) consistent parties and overall has been very positive.

Constituent party reporting

23. The draft strategic issues also include an indication of Forum activities.

24. These activities largely involve requests for information from constituent parties, which should encourage discussion regarding integrated planning and management.

25. Historically, constituent parties have been given the opportunity to provide reports to each Forum meeting. The report template made provision for constituent party updates to be presented against each strategic issue, but this has been used inconsistently, and several constituent parties did not provide reports at all, and/or do not provide reports regularly.

26. With the setting of the new strategic issues, changes are proposed to the constituent party reporting.

27. Consistent party reporting from here forward is proposed to be issue-specific, guided by the activities outlined against each strategic issue.

28. This style of constituent party reporting should foster a spotlight on particular issues and promote better discussion regarding integrated planning and management. It is intended to give validity to the strategic issues and should support the Forum to advance its outcomes.

29. This approach does not preclude constituent parties reporting on other matters. If a constituent party has matters that it wishes to raise to the Forum, then these can be included as separate and specific agenda items, with the Chairperson’s approval.
Further improvement

30. Feedback from the Thames-Coromandel District Council included that it would be helpful to have an end statement (i.e. desired goal or outcome statement) for each of the strategic issues, and that the strategic issues paper should be more succinct.

31. The HGMP Act does not require the Forum to set outcome statements, however, the Forum should consider the merit of this suggestion and whether it would support the Forum’s purpose.

32. Sea Change Tai Timu Tai Pari outlines objectives across a range of themes, similar and in some cases identical to the proposed set of strategic issues.

33. It is suggested that, should the Forum desire goals or outcome statements against each strategic issue, alignment to the Sea Change Tai Timu Tai Pari objectives be considered as a starting point.

34. Wider feedback regarding the need to prescribe outcome statements against each of the strategic issues would be welcomed.

35. Forum Members may also wish to suggest further improvement items.

Putting the strategic issues into action

36. As noted earlier in this report, the draft strategic issues also include an indication of Forum activities, in particular, calling for reports and analysis from consistent parties on particular topics.

37. Once the Forum has considered and agreed its strategic issues, a forward work programme can be generated so that consistent parties have a timeframe to work toward for these reporting requirements.

Overall comments

38. The strategic issues as proposed will enable the Forum to better plans and prepare for Forum meetings. With the suggested Forum activities as a guide, the Forum should realise improvements in meaningful information sharing, identification of collaboration opportunities amongst constituent parties and increased integrated management.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Draft Strategic Issues</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Katina Conomos – Interim Executive Officer, Hauraki Gulf Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jacques Victor - GM Auckland Plan Strategy and Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HAURAKI GULF FORUM STRATEGIC ISSUES 2018

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

The Hauraki Gulf is recognised through the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (‘HGMPA’) as being a place of ‘national significance’. The HGMPA also provides for the establishment, purpose and functions of the Hauraki Gulf Forum (“Forum”). The purposes of the Forum are set out in section 15 of the Act as follows:

"15 Purposes of Forum

The Forum has the following purposes:

(a) to integrate the management and, where appropriate, to promote the conservation and management in a sustainable manner, of the natural, historic, and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments, for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and communities of the Gulf and New Zealand:

(b) to facilitate communication, co-operation, and co-ordination on matters relating to the statutory functions of the constituent parties in relation to the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments, and the Forum:

(c) to recognise the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of tangata whenua with the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and, where appropriate, its catchments."

Section 17 of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 also sets out the functions of the Forum requiring it to:

(a) prepare a list of strategic issues, determine a priority for action on each issue, and regularly review that list.

Under its current leadership it is proposed through this discussion paper that the Forum focus its future work programme around three priority topic areas and associated strategic issues. The Forum will pursue and progress these in a future focussed and integrated way, incorporating Mātauranga Māori and in accordance with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi consistent with the HGMP Act.

The three work priority topics and associated strategic issues to which the Forum will apply its focus are:

1. Improving integrated management through collaborative planning, informed decision-making and credible action.
2. Restoring water quality values through addressing land use activities that degrade those values.
3. Recognising those critical marine values and ecosystems through advocating for protection, restoration and enhancement.
1. IMPROVING INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT THROUGH COLLABORATIVE PLANNING, INFORMED DECISION-MAKING AND CREDIBLE ACTION

Enshrined in its purpose, the Forum is intended (s.15) to integrate the management and, where appropriate, to promote the conservation and management in a sustainable manner, of the natural, historic, and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments. Also, to facilitate communication, co-operation, and co-ordination amongst the constituent parties on matters relating to the responsibilities and statutory functions of each party.

There is also the duty to recognise the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of tangata whenua with the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and, where appropriate, its catchments. Areas for improvement include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic issue</th>
<th>Forum activities</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Central government engagement           | • Invite more oversight from the Minister of Conservation to gain more collaborative involvement in achieving the purposes of the HGMP Act by the Crown.  
• Establish regular meetings between the Hauraki Gulf Forum Chair and the Minister of Conservation and request that the Minister use her office as a conduit for appropriate engagement with central government agencies represented on, or relevant to, progressing the Hauraki Gulf Forum’s strategic issues.  
• Request Ministerial input to, and confirmation of, the strategic issues developed by the Forum.                                                                                                                                  | Short term          |
| Tangata whenua participation             | • Support the development of a set of Māori cultural indicators aligned to the Forum’s role and for the purposes of embedding meaningful input by iwi and hapū into the delivery and monitoring of the integrated management of the Hauraki Gulf.  
• Seek reports from constituent parties regarding how Māturanga Māori is currently imbedded in policy development, and if required, develop a means for tangata whenua to provide leadership and guidance to promote improved integrated management and protect the essence of the mauri of the Hauraki Gulf.  
• Better enable a means to facilitate a cohesive tangata whenua voice and position, as appropriate, on progressing the strategic issues.  
• Discuss with the Minister of Conservation, the potential for all three Ministers with Māori portfolios to play a leadership role in the Forum, to assist in addressing some issues, particularly those related to fishing, marine reserves and protected areas in Tikapa Moana/ Te Moana-nui-a-Toi. | Short to medium term|
| Forum operations                        | • Develop a clearly articulated and costed work programme based on the Forum’s strategic issues to facilitate improved integrated planning. Define the reporting expectations of constituent parties so that                                                                                                                                                                               | Immediate           |


they provide a clearer evolving view on the Forum’s strategic issues.

- As appropriate, through all available channels, and underpinned by relationship building efforts, the leadership of the Forum shall advocate for increased recognition of the state of the Hauraki Gulf, and promote its strategic issues and the work of the Forum.
- Identify the Technical Officers (TOs) in each constituent agency who will provide support to members of the Forum and, through them, work to integrate the planning and programmes of constituent agencies and other Crown agencies with responsibilities that affect the Gulf.
- As required, on a topic-by-topic basis, bring together the Technical Officers to effect collaboration and integrated planning for the Forum, and the work programme of the Forum.
- Explore the development of a financial reporting system that could be used by constituent parties to enable “coordinated financial planning by the constituent parties” in accordance with section 17 (1) (b) of the HGMP Act.
- Upon consideration of its forward work programme, reconsider the meeting frequency of the Hauraki Gulf Forum.

## 2. RESTORING WATER QUALITY VALUES THROUGH ADDRESSING LAND USE ACTIVITIES THAT DEGRADE THOSE VALUES

Water quality degradation is one of the most universally unmet costs associated with land use activities and discharges (terrestrial and marine) that affect the waters of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park and its catchments. The State of the Gulf report and Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan both identify water quality degradation as a key threat to improving the overall health, quality and mauri of the Gulf. The Hauraki Gulf Forum will focus on three strategic issues associated with improving water quality and related land management practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic issue</th>
<th>Forum activities</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedimentation</td>
<td>Facilitate coordinated constituent party reporting on how each is managing sedimentation within their jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Immediate to longer term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging that a whole of life cycle approach to policy is important to this issue, assess where constituent party policies and operations can be improved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through constituent party reporting, examine the limitations of the current regulatory tools and frameworks (locally, regionally and nationally) as they relate to the Gulf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure agencies’ monitoring and measuring of sedimentation is consistent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through constituent party reporting, facilitate consideration of the implications of climate change for the health of the Gulf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coastal development and urbanisation
- Work to ensure constituent party reporting on the cumulative impacts of coastal development, and current management practices is consistent and fit for purpose.
- Through constituent party reporting, examine what limitations there are to current regulatory tools and frameworks (locally, regionally and nationally) as they relate to the Gulf.
- Through constituent party reporting, examine the implications of climate change on coastal communities and consider whether current plans for mitigation and management are adequate.

### Water quality (nutrients and contaminants)
- Seek coordinated reports from constituent parties regarding current work programme associated with managing and controlling sources of nutrients and other urban generated contaminants (NB: these could be by subject area and/or holistically). Subjects to include stormwater contamination, inflow and infiltration, port and industrial activities, marinas, agriculture and landfill).
- Seek coordinated reports from constituent parties regarding issues and shortcomings associated with their current controls, and what is currently being done about these.
- Through constituent party reporting, examine what limitations there are in the current regulatory tools and frameworks (locally, regionally and nationally) as they relate to the Gulf.
- Through constituent party reporting, examine the implications of climate change on this particular issue.
- Identify and champion good policy and practice regarding contaminant and nutrient management.
- Through constituent party reporting, assess the implications of changing governance and operational arrangements in relation to the three waters as they relate to the Hauraki Gulf.

### 3. RECOGNISING THOSE CRITICAL MARINE VALUES AND ECOSYSTEMS THROUGH ADVOCATING FOR PROTECTION, RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT

The Hauraki Gulf and its islands are of national and global significance ecologically and have high biodiversity values. Section 8(a) of the HGMP Act sets out objectives for the management of the Gulf which includes the protection and enhancement of the life-supporting capacity of the environment of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments. Biodiversity and the interaction of ecological systems holistically are what creates the Gulf’s life-supporting capacity.
### Sustainability of the marine and bird life formerly abundant in the Gulf.
- Request regular reports from the Crown on work being done to establish marine protected areas and marine reserves.
- Work with Fisheries NZ to affect the phasing out of trawling, Danish seining and dredging in all parts of the Hauraki Gulf as soon as politically feasible.

### Biodiversity loss/reduction
- Seek regular coordinated constituent party reports on current work programmes to improve marine and terrestrial biodiversity in the Gulf. Relate these reports to New Zealand’s current biodiversity goals and commitments.
- Invite reports from other agencies and not-for-profits regarding their efforts to improve marine and terrestrial biodiversity.
- Through constituent party reporting, assess limitations of current efforts and identify areas where the Forum could fulfill a coordination and advocacy role.
- Work actively with Foundation North and other philanthropic agencies to identify areas for increased collaboration and funding to improve the state of the Gulf.
- Seek out positive efforts/stories of biodiversity recovery to celebrate.
- Advocate for and/or facilitate research into the implications and impacts of climate change on biodiversity (micro and macro).

### Marine contaminants
- Advocate for research into the risks associated with oil spillage from the RMS Niagara and for reduction of unacceptable risk by appropriate means.
- Through constituent party reporting, examine policy and regulatory frameworks in relation to marine litter, and identify current limitations and gaps.

### Mechanisms for the Forum to Progress Strategic Issues

The HGMP Act provides for the Hauraki Gulf Forum to be a “political peer group”, rather than a management agency. The intent is that the Forum should positively influence its constituent agencies as well as other organisation, sectors and interest groups involved with the Gulf. While not having regulatory powers, the action mechanisms available to the Forum include:

- Work with statutory organisations
- Writing in support
- Promoting the Forum’s viewpoint
- Making presentations to government decisions makers (local, regional and central)
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- Facilitating discussions
- Inviting and encouraging collaboration
- Co-ordinating implementation
- Pooling funds through constituent parties for projects.

The priority assigned to each strategic issue is expressed as immediate, short-term, medium-term and/or longer-term. Generally, the priority assigned reflects both the difficulty of the tasks and the Forum's extent of control over the tasks.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. This report is in response to a resolution from the 14 May 2018 Hauraki Gulf Forum seeking that Auckland Council provide a report to the next Forum meeting, regarding "the sediment pollution and associated environmental effects at the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve, and advise on controls on sediment". Attachment A contains a copy of the resolution.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Planning for development within the catchments that discharge into the Okura Estuary and Long Bay Okura Marine reserve has, as a material consideration, long taken account of effects on the marine environment.

3. Auckland Council is currently undertaking data collection for catchment wide hydrological modelling, which will be used primarily for assessing the long-term effects of urbanisation on the marine environment. It will also inform future decisions on development in the Okura and Weiti Catchments.

4. Current developments close to the Long Bay Okura Marine reserve, at Weiti and Long Bay, are rigorously monitored and are shown to be in general compliance with their respective Consent Conditions, including those related to sediment control.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) receive the report.

Horopaki / Context

Planning history and context

5. The catchments that flow into the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve are split into two main areas; Weiti and Long Bay/Okura. There is a long planning history in each of these areas. The following summarises that planning history and shows that most of the planning decisions in these areas have been made by the Environment Court.

Weiti

6. The genesis of Weiti’s current planning framework, defined for this purpose by the land bound in red in Figure 1, started under the former Rodney District Council (RDC). In 2011 RDC allowed for the clustering of up to 550 dwellings at Weiti into its District Plan provisions. RDC derived that figure by combining the number of dwellings that could have been developed as of right under a surrounding Rodney rural zone (Countryside Living Rural) in its 1993 District Plan (that being 400 dwellings), plus 150 dwellings that were already provided for under the RDC Special 8 Zone. It was considered at that time that clustering of 550 dwellings would have a lower impact at Weiti and on the surrounding receiving environment than the provision of 550 dwellings on countryside living lots spread across the whole of the Weiti land.
7. These provisions were carried over into the Auckland Unitary Plan being recommended by the Independent Hearings Panel and confirmed by Auckland Council via a Precinct Management Layer. The extent of this precinct is also shown in Figure 1, with the precinct being split into three sub-precincts (Weiti A and B being mainly for clustered residential development, and the balance of the site, Weiti Sub-precinct C, providing for conservation and forestry activities). The land owner (Weiti Development Limited Partnership) appealed this decision, but that appeal has now been withdrawn.

Figure 1 – Weiti land, and associated Unitary Plan zones and precincts
Long Bay/Okura

8. At Long Bay/Okura the relevant planning history goes back to 1996, when the Environment Court first considered the location of the Metropolitan Urban Limit (MUL) in that area following the lodging of appeals. The Environment Court in its 1996 decision stated that the MUL should follow the watershed/catchment boundary between Long Bay and Okura Catchments (i.e. the route of Vaughans Road, and shown as a dashed black line in Figure 2), meaning that south of this ridgeline (Long Bay) would be treated as urban for planning purposes and north of this (Okura) would be rural. The Court had this to say about the catchment:

“We have concluded that urbanisation of the part of the subject land in the Okura catchment [the land north of Vaughans Road in the former North Shore City Council] would necessarily have significant adverse effects on the environment of the Okura Estuary, and that the estuary, and its high quality waters and ecosystem, possesses life supporting capacity which deserves to be safeguarded… We have found that the landscape quality of the Okura Estuary and its margins is so high, and the likely visual effect of urbanisation of the part of the subject land within its visual catchment are such, as to indicate that in those respects it should not be urbanised”.

9. This outcome was upheld on appeal to the High Court in 1997.

10. In 2003, the Environment Court then considered the type of rural development appropriate for the Okura land. It concluded that this land should be covered by two rural zones, the western part (Rural 4(i) zone) having an average site size of 2ha, and the eastern part (Rural 4(ii) zone) having a minimum site area of 4ha. The Court also determined that there should be controls on the level of earthworks, and use of environmental enhancement measures, including fencing and planting of riparian strips, the revegetation of coastal margins, wetlands and erosion prone areas, and the provision of esplanade reserves.

11. In relation to Long Bay, North Shore City Council progressed with structure planning for that area, which the Environment Court in 1996 decided was within the MUL and therefore an urban area. The Environment Court in 1999 made an order that stipulated “Additional Principles for Long Bay Structure Plan” be included in the North Shore Proposed District Plan, along with the methods of implementation (the rules). The “Additional Principles” addressed matters such as:

- the protection of habitat values, water quality and the ecological values of the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve;
- utilising landscape and ecological surveys to determine the carrying capacity of the land to manage it in a sustainable way;
- protecting significant landscape and ecological values of the area.

12. This culminated in the completion of the Long Bay Structure Plan, which was incorporated into the North Shore City District Plan in 2006. These provisions guided development of Long Bay and were in essence carried over into the Auckland Unitary Plan in the form of the Long Bay Precinct Management Layer.

13. The Auckland Unitary Plan included provisions in line with the above at Weiti (paras 6-7), Long Bay (paras 11-12), and Okura (by maintaining the land surrounding Okura village as rural, outside the Rural Urban Boundary [RUB], with the same subdivision controls of 2ha and 4ha as the former North Shore City District Plan). The Auckland Unitary Plan was made Operative in Part in November 2016, excluding (amongst other things) the provisions relating to Okura, given that these are the subject of appeals as outlined below.
14. In relation to the provisions for the land to the east of Okura village, (shown in Figure 2), Okura Holdings Limited (a subsidiary of Todd Property Group), appealed the council’s decision on the provisions applying to the land, to the Environment Court, and sought to urbanise this land. Their proposal is to relocate the Unitary Plan’s RUB to include the land in urban Auckland, remove its rural zoning and give this land a mixture of ‘live’ zonings for urban residential development. This proposal from Okura Holdings Limited contains no maximum number of dwellings, with the yield to be confirmed through any subsequent Resource Consent process. Council considers up to approximately 1,900 dwellings could be provided under the plan provisions sought by Okura Holdings Ltd, should this land be urbanised.

Figure 2 – Extent of precinct in purple, as sought by Okura Holdings Ltd for urbanisation

15. This proposal was not supported by council, which defended its decision to maintain the RUB for Auckland along Vaughans Road at an Environment Court Hearing in September to November 2017. The Environment Court released its decision on 6 June 2018, dismissing the appeals, thereby retaining the Okura area outside of the RUB, and retaining Countryside Living zoning (with a 4ha site size additional subdivision control) over the land. A copy of this decision can be found in Attachment B.
16. Subsequently, Okura Holdings Limited has appealed this Environment Court decision to the High Court, on points of law. The council is currently in the process of defending the Environment Court decision in the High Court. A decision from the High Court is not expected until next year.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Ecological Health of Okura Estuary

17. Auckland Council, and previous councils, have been monitoring the health of the ecological communities on intertidal mud and sandflats within the Okura Estuary since 2000. For context, a further seven small east coast estuaries are also monitored. Monitoring is carried out twice per year and at four sites within each estuary. In Okura, council monitors ten sites in recognition of anticipated changes in land use in the catchment. This monitoring has shown changes in species sensitive to mud at all Okura sites and increased fine sediment at some sites.

18. Similar changes have been observed in the other east coast estuaries. In particular, increased fine sediment has been recorded at most sites in Waikopua and Turanga (near Whitford), and Mangemangeroa (near Botany), one or two sites in Puhoi, Orewa and Waiwera but not at Whangateau. In Okura, a trend consistent with sedimentation (individual species or sediment) was detected at every site and changes in community composition consistent with increasing mud content were detected at nearly half the sites. For Turanga more than one trend consistent with increased sedimentation was detected at all sites; in Orewa and Mangemangeroa more than one trend consistent with increased sedimentation was detected at three of the four sites. Turanga, Waiwera, Mangemangeroa and Whangateau also exhibited trends consistent with sedimentation in community level indicators at three of the four sites.

19. Overall, this suggests that there are concerning changes at Okura in terms of the number of sites exhibiting trends consistent with sedimentation. Changes observed in Turanga, Whangateau, Waiwera and Mangemangeroa are also of concern. The estuary showing the fewest changes of concern is Puhoi.

20. These findings are detailed in Auckland Council Technical Report 2017/003. It is important to note that while there were a large number of trends consistent with increased sedimentation, there were also trends that were not consistent with sedimentation, so it is a complex situation.

21. Pine forest adjacent to Okura Estuary was harvested between 2012 and 2014. Monitoring set up specifically to track the outcomes of this harvesting showed while suspended sediment yield increased because of harvesting activity, this increase was no longer apparent during the post-harvest and stabilisation period. A change in ecological community was also recorded at some sites and this did not return to pre-harvest community structure at some sites.

22. Data up to October 2017 has recently been analysed (in draft) for Okura and shows that changes in species sensitive to sediment have continued. The estuary was sampled in April 2018 after the recent publicised cockle mortality event and the processing of these samples has been prioritised, but the results are not yet available.
Cockle Mortality Event

23. A die off of large numbers of cockles in Okura Estuary was reported in April 2018. Samples were sent to the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) for testing and investigation. MPI’s role is to test for the presence of exotic diseases. In order to rule out an exotic disease they try to rule in other agents – however in the case of shellfish mortalities it is very often multifactorial, and it is almost impossible to pinpoint one single cause. While council’s long-term monitoring does show trends consistent with increased sedimentation, it is impossible to say that sediment is the cause of the cockles dying in this instance. Sediment may be one of many factors that are reducing the resilience of these shellfish.

24. There have been increased shellfish mortalities reported throughout the country this summer and recently there have been reports of cockles dying in Whangateau Estuary that are also being investigated by MPI. Cockles from Okura Estuary have also been retested by MPI. The results of both sampling times were unable to pinpoint a primary cause (see DoC report for more details).

25. A degree of environmental stress was identified, which could be due to several variables such as high sediment during a rainfall event, sustained high water temperatures or exposure to high temperatures during low tide. Without samples from other locations, there is no context for whether this degree of environmental stress is present in other estuaries.

Augmented monitoring

26. Due to the changes being seen in the ecology of the Okura Estuary, council is developing further receiving environment monitoring to complement what it already has in place. This will focus on monitoring the suspended sediment in selected streams draining to Okura and Weiti Bay. Water quality buoys deployed as part of the hydrodynamic modelling (referred to below) will provide continuous data on currents, waves, sediment deposition rate, and a number of other water quality parameters in the wider receiving environments.

Hydrodynamic (Sediment and Metals) Modelling

27. As rural land becomes urbanised, it is generally expected that sediment loads will decrease, and loadings of heavy metals, such as copper and zinc, will increase. Deposited sediments may become contaminated with metals, and effects may be expected to occur in the marine ecosystem. A range of urbanisation scenarios are possible within the catchments of the Okura and Weiti estuaries, and a sediment and metals modelling exercise is currently underway to better understand the likely impacts of these scenarios.

28. Currents, waves, sediment deposition rates, and a number of other water quality parameters are currently being measured where the Okura and Weiti estuaries discharge into Karepiro Bay. This data will be used to calibrate a hydrodynamic sediment transport model that includes the Okura and Weiti estuaries, and the entirety of the marine reserve.

29. The hydrodynamic model will provide a better understanding of the fate of sediment and metals discharged into the estuaries, including the extent to which the Okura and Weiti systems exchange contaminants, or receive contaminants from further afield. The hydrodynamic model will be used to model the risk profile of various catchment development scenarios, to inform any future plan changes and structure planning exercises. Initial results from the modelling exercise are expected in late 2018.

30. The hydrodynamic model is being developed primarily to assess the long-term effects of urbanisation, over many decades. However, the calibrated model may also be used to better understand the fate of sediment discharged during the earthworks phase of development, from any given point within the model’s boundaries. Ultimately the hydrodynamic modelling results will be able to inform future decisions on development in the Okura and Weiti Estuaries.
Resource Consent Compliance

31. Both the Long Bay development and Weiti development consents were granted by the Environment Court with conditions imposed around erosion and sediment control that followed best practice. The frequency of the monitoring of these consents to determine compliance is established using a risk-based approach.

32. At its peak, the Long Bay development had up to eight high risk projects that were monitored and scored during regular inspections. Currently there is only one high risk bulk earthworks site and there will be bulk earthworks associated with two further stages that have yet to start.

33. The Weiti development has two high risk projects that are both nearing completion.

34. The high-risk projects associated with both developments are monitored on a fortnightly basis throughout the duration of the project to ensure the scale and complexities are controlled to a high standard.

35. It is important to note that the conditions imposed on the consents are designed to perform during normal weather patterns. The controls in place are expected to retain up to 90% of the sediment when operating at their best, although during extreme weather events discharge of some sediment will occur.

36. This type of discharge is not exclusive to these two developments. There is an additional condition associated with both developments that requires council to be provided with an Adaptive Environmental Monitoring and Management Response Plan following a trigger event of significant rainfall (classified as 25mm or more in a 24-hour period). These plans are prepared by independent experts who visit the site to ensure that erosion and sediment controls are operating effectively. A combination of automated and manual sampling as well as visual inspection is used to identify potential issues following these trigger events.

37. Given the risk rating of these projects and the significance of the receiving environment, these two developments experience some of the highest levels of compliance monitoring in the Auckland region.

38. Compliance at these sites has been consistently high and the erosion and sediment controls in place at both these developments are achieving high levels of effectiveness. During council inspections of these sites, there has not been any significant non-compliance resulting in enforcement action against either developer. Some minor non-compliance has been identified over the duration of the work. These minor issues have been rectified quickly to ensure the potential of significant harm occurring is reduced.

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

39. The Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve is within the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Area. The Local Board supported council’s position to keep the land to the east of Okura village rural through the Unitary Plan process. The Local Board has also made statements in support of protecting the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve from adverse effects.
**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

40. The following were directly notified of the original Weiti subdivision (Karepiro - 150 lots) dated 26/08/07:
- Ngāti Whātua Nga Rima o Kaipara
- Ngāti Paoa Whanau Trust
- Te Kawarau ā Maki
- Manuhiri Omaha Kaitakitangi Ora
- Te Uri o Hau Settlement Trust
- Te Rūnganga o Te Tau
- Ngāti Pono Whanu Trust

41. Responses were received from Ngāti Whātua Nga Rima O Kaipara and Te Kawarau ā Maki. In relation to issues of sedimentation/impacts on the Marine Reserve, Ngāti Whātua Nga Rima O Kaipara raised concerns over the zoning, the location of lots, any development in the Karepiro Valley areas, and the diversion or modification of watercourses. Te Kawarau ā Maki objected to the subdivision, had concerns over the scale of the development, and wanted the most sustainable practices employed to protect the receiving environment.

42. From this it can be seen that iwi have concerns over environmental impacts from development within the Okura/Weiti catchments and wish to see the protection of the receiving environment and Marine Reserve.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

43. As discussed in the main body of this report, work is currently underway with the aim of completing initial results from a hydrodynamic model by the end of 2018. The hydrodynamic model is being developed primarily for the purpose of assessing the long-term effects of urbanisation, over many decades. However, the calibrated model may also be used to better understand the fate of sediment discharged during the earthworks phase of development, from any given point within the model’s boundaries.

44. In addition, Auckland Council’s Environment and Community Committee resolved at its 10 July meeting, following a public input presentation from the Long Bay Okura Great Parks Society, to request a report from staff. This report is to cover the regulatory and environmental issues relating to sediment in the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve, with options for improved management of sediment discharge to the Marine Reserve. It is to also comment on the wider regional implications of such. This report is programmed to go to the Environment and Community Committee on 14 August 2018.
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Extract from minutes of Hauraki Gulf Forum - 14 May 2018

4 Public Forum

4.1 Public Forum - Peter Townend, Deputy Convenor, Long Bay Okura Great Park Society

Peter Townend, Deputy Convenor, Long Bay Okura Great Park Society provided a presentation and tabled supporting documentation. Copies have been placed on the official minutes and are available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment. The presentation included a video, the link to which is as follows: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_taWMhw62k4&feature=youtu.be

Resolution number HGF/2018/17

MOVED by Mayor J Tregidga, seconded by Cr W Walker:

That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) receive the presentation from Peter Townend regarding the cockle and pipi die-off issues observed in Okura Marine Reserve and thank him and the members of Long Bay Okura Great Park Society for their attendance.

CARRIED

Note: It was agreed to consider the wording of the remaining recommendations for this item later in the meeting.

MOVED by Member J Meeuwsen, seconded by Mayor S Goudie:

That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

b) express strong concern regarding the sediment pollution at Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve.

c) request that Auckland Council and the Department of Conservation provide an immediate report to the Forum chairperson regarding the sediment pollution and associated environmental effects at the Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve and advise on the controls on sediment.

d) request that Auckland Council and the Department of Conservation provide a further report to the next Forum meeting.

e) request the Executive Officer to make recommendations on how the Forum can respond to concerns raised by the Long Bay Okura Great Park Society.

CARRIED
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. At the meeting of the Hauraki Gulf Forum on 14 May 2018, Mr Peter Townend gave a presentation about the Long Bay-Okura Marine Reserve and development works on an adjacent property. He specifically drew attention to a recent mass mortality event of cockles and other shellfish in the Marine Reserve.

2. In response, the Forum resolved to seek urgent reports from both the Department of Conservation and Auckland Council on this matter and requested both agencies to report more fully to the Forum’s next meeting.

3. This report presents the Department of Conservation’s response.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) receive the report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
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<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td>A0</td>
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</tr>
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</table>
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13 August 2018

Hauraki Gulf Forum

**Long Bay-Okura Marine Reserve sediment issues**

**Purpose of the report**

1. At meeting of the Hauraki Gulf Forum on 14 May 2018 Mr Peter Townend gave a presentation about the Long Bay-Okura Marine Reserve and development works on an adjacent property. He specifically drew attention to a recent mass mortality event of cockles and other shellfish in the Marine Reserve.

2. In response the Forum resolved to seek urgent reports from both the Department and Auckland Council on this matter, and requested both agencies to report more fully to the Forum’s next meeting.

3. This report from the Department is in response. Much of this information was contained in our interim report sent to the Chair on 28 May 2018. In our report we focus on those areas that the Department is statutorily responsible for, and have not sought to comment on matters that are the responsibility of Auckland Council, such as development consent conditions and consent compliance monitoring.

**Executive Summary**

4. The Department administers the Long Bay-Okura Marine Reserve. Concerns about sedimentation were first raised in mid-2017. In response the Department has investigated and clarified its responsibilities and those of Auckland Council. The Department is unable to stop discharges into a marine reserve from adjacent land if those discharges are properly consented or if there is reasonable excuse.

5. The Marine Reserve has been undergoing ecological change as a result of increased sedimentation for many years. It is not a result of development works on a single property over a relatively short time span. The Department is working with Auckland Council to identify how we can work together better, and to explore if there is an opportunity to put in place catchment-wide monitoring. The Department and Auckland Council are also exploring the development of a catchment-wide strategy to inform long-term land use changes, with the objective of minimising the effects of land use change and development on the Marine Reserve.

6. Testing to determine the causes of the recent shellfish mass mortality event in the Marine Reserve was inconclusive. Sedimentation is likely to have been one of a number of environmental stressors that played a role.
Recommendation

7. That the Hauraki Gulf Forum receive the report.

Context

8. The Department administers the 980ha Long Bay-Okura Marine Reserve, which was established in 1995 under the Marine Reserves Act.

9. The Department first became aware in mid-2017 of claims of high levels of sediment flowing from the Weiti Bay development site into the Marine Reserve during rainfall events, when Mr Townend raised his concerns with us and other parties. We investigated the issue to determine if there were matters of concern and what our role was, including site visits to the Weiti Bay development site.

10. Our investigations identified that the works on the Weiti Bay development site had been consented under the Resource Management Act 1991, and that Auckland Council was primarily responsible for monitoring compliance with consent conditions. The Department had submitted on the original application for consent. The consent process would have taken all relevant planning matters into consideration, including the provisions of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, the identification of the location as a significant ecological area, and effects on the Marine Reserve.

11. We identified that the water channel in the development site that had been blocked, as shown during Mr Townend’s presentation to the Forum, lay outside the gazetted boundaries of the Marine Reserve. Our understanding is that this waterway was likely to have been a man-made drainage channel.

12. We also identified that discharges into a marine reserve from adjacent land are lawful under the Marine Reserves Act when those discharges are properly consented. The Department only has the power to stop discharges into a marine reserve if we can prove those discharges are without lawful consent or without reasonable excuse (section 181 of the Marine Reserves Act refers).

13. In late March the Department was notified about the mass mortality event of cockles in the Marine Reserve. We supported the collection of specimens of dead shellfish from the Marine Reserve for scientific analysis.

Analysis and advice

14. Since becoming aware of these issues, the Department has continued to maintain regular contact with Auckland Council to ensure that both organisations have the same understanding about our respective roles, to share information, and to identify further opportunities to work together, building on our existing working relationships.

15. We reviewed both the short-term monitoring associated with the Weiti Bay development consent and the long-term monitoring being undertaken in the Marine Reserve. We identified that ideally, a more comprehensive monitoring programme should be in place and are seeking technical advice on what such a programme might comprise. We are also discussing with Auckland Council their monitoring programme (see report to the Forum from Auckland Council for details), what additional monitoring is desirable, and what that might entail.
16. As the Council has described in its report to the Forum, the Okura Estuary has been undergoing long-term change, as have many similarly sized estuaries on the east coast of the Auckland Region. These changes are not normally related to single causes but are more often the result of catchment-wide changes. Our view is that ideally a catchment-wide monitoring programme should be initiated to track the sources of sediment and other discharges properly, and to track changes in the Marine Reserve more comprehensively. Our objective would be to encourage Council to develop a catchment-wide strategy to inform long term land use changes in the catchment, and minimise the effects of development on waterways and the estuarine environment of the Marine Reserve.

17. The Department has reviewed the report commissioned by Mr Townend from the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) about the mass mortality event. Our understanding is that the investigation was inconclusive. MPI could not identify a specific cause for the event, and pointed to a mix of environmental stressors which could have made the shellfish more vulnerable to particular conditions at the time, such as a high level of sediment discharge in high rainfall events or unseasonably high temperatures.

18. Since the initial mortality event we have monitored shellfish health in the Marine Reserve. There has been no further mortality on a significant scale.

19. In conclusion we are concerned about the effect of sedimentation and other environmental stressors on the environmental health of the Marine Reserve. We will continue to work with Auckland Council and other partners on these matters.

Connie Norgate
Director Operations, Auckland (Acting)
Constituent Party Report - Sediment

File No.: CP2018/14393

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To support improved integrated planning and management, Forum members have been asked to contribute an issue-specific constituent party report on the topic of sedimentation.
2. This report compiles the reports received.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:
a) receive the report.
b) advise further questions to be reported upon in the short-term future, in respect of sedimentation.

Horopaki / Context
3. The Hauraki Gulf Forum is currently considering its strategic issues (see separate agenda item) one of which is sediment.
4. The 2017 State of the Gulf report noted the following in relation to sediment:
   - Sediment is a serious environmental contaminant that degrades coastal habitats and is toxic to many marine organisms (Airoldi 2003; Thrush et al. 2004).
   - The environmental significance of increasing sediment loads has led to it being ranked the third highest of 65 identified threats to marine habitats in New Zealand respectively (MacDiarmid et al. 2012).
   - Deposited sediments accumulate in sheltered estuaries or deep coastal areas where the energy from waves and currents is too weak to remobilise them. In estuaries, thick (> 2cm deep) deposits of land-derived sediment rapidly kill most animals buried beneath them (Norkko et al. 2002).
   - Thin deposits (1-7mm) also lead to a reduction in species' diversity and abundance, even in muddy areas where animals are expected to be adapted to high sediment loads (Berkenbusch et al. 2001).
   - Recovery tends to occur slowly after depositional events and can take in excess of a year (Norkko et al. 2002).
   - Sediments suspended in the water column also affect marine plants and animals by reducing water clarity, light levels, food quality and the feeding ability of animals.
   - Consequently, the condition and survival of marine species frequently declines as suspended sediment concentrations increase (e.g. Hewitt et al. 2001; Ellis et al. 2002; Nicholls et al. 2003; Morrison et al. 2009).

---

1 The threat posed by increasing sediment loads is ranked equal to the threat posed by bottom trawling. Ocean acidification and climate change were ranked greatest and second greatest threats.
5. SeaChange Tai Timu Tai Pari includes a theme on sediment, which states that the overall goal is to reduce sediment entering the coastal marine area to levels which support healthy marine habitats. This will, in turn, support more abundant marine life and fish stocks and provide greater opportunities for people and communities to enjoy the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park (page 130).

6. To support improved integrated planning and management, Forum members have been asked to contribute an issue-specific constituent party report on the topic of sediment.

7. It was suggested that constituent parties report on sediment if relevant, the following:
   a) How they will set and measure sediment load limits for the waters in their area.
   b) The key issues to be tackled to achieve reductions of sediment entering the coastal marine area and any targets that have been developed.
   c) Whether there are means available to stabilise sediment already in the marine environment and, if so, what is planned.
   d) What research and policy work is underway that is of relevant to sedimentation.
   e) Whether policy work includes examining the effectiveness of relevant legislation and/or regulatory tools in this context.
   f) However approximate, any information on the budget provisioning for work, staffing etc for activities relevant to sedimentation control may help to begin the process of exploring the development of a system for “coordinated financial planning by the constituent parties”.

8. Members were also urged to signal issues they want reported on in respect of sediment in the future.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

9. An issues-specific approach to constituent party reporting, with more time and planning, can provide more focus and promote integrated planning and management between constituent parties. It should also enable the Forum to identify where it should take an advocacy role, if required, and how else it can affect change.

10. On this occasion, members were given two weeks to provide a report. At the time of compiling the agenda, Thames-Coromandel District, Hauraki District and Auckland Council contributed reports, which are attached.

11. As one of the the key issues affecting the life-supporting capacity of the Hauraki Gulf / Tikapa Moana / Te Moana-nui-a-Toi, further reporting and analysis of this sediment is justified, in particular a focus on:
   a) The role that each constituent party has in relation to sedimentation.
   b) Work that is being undertaken nationally in relation to this issue.
   c) An assessment where constituent party policies and operations can be improved.
   d) Examining the effectiveness of relevant legislation and regulatory tools in this context.
# Thames-Coromandel District Council

## Hauraki Gulf Forum sedimentation control responses

**As at 8 August 2018**

- **How they will set and measure sediment load limits for the waters in their area.**
  
  This work is undertaken by WRC.

- **The key issues to be tackled to achieve reductions of sediment entering the coastal marine area and any targets that have been developed.**
  
  Sedimentation issues to be tackled include: land uses and developments, forestry, DOC estate debris, land clearance, coastal settlements and infrastructure, sewage discharge, infilling/reclamation, road building, pests in waterways such as koi carp and catfish.

- **Whether there are means available to stabilise sediment already in the marine environment and, if so, what is planned.**
  
  Dune planting - we have a number of active Beachcare Groups around the Coromandel Peninsula
  - Cooks Beach
  - Rings Beach, Kuaotunu and Otama
  - Whangapoua
  - Kennedy Bay
  - Wharekaho
  - Buffalo Beach, Whitianga
  - Tairua
  - Pauanui
  - Onemana
  - Whangamata
  - Whiritoa

---

**District Plan earthworks provisions**

The District Plan recognises that management of earthworks and soil disturbance is predominantly the responsibility of the WRC. The Proposed Plan manages the effects of earthworks on amenity, traffic, health and safety, visual, nuisance effects on adjacent properties (including sedimentation), building controls, effects on infrastructure, and reverse sensitivity effects. In addition the Plan manages the impacts of earthworks on outstanding natural features and historic heritage, landscapes, areas of high natural character and the Coastal Environment.

Section 9 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes Policy 1b f) provides for "Minimising earthworks as far as practicable."; Policy 1b g) provides for "Completing and/or revegetating and earthworks as soon as possible."

Each plan zone contains earthworks rules specific to the zone.

The Natural Character variation introduced a rule that provides for earthworks as a permitted activity for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.
District Plan Riparian Planting
Promoting and undertaking riparian planting.

Riparian Planting is provided for in the District Plan.

Section 16 Subdivision Policy 5a of the District Plan states that - "Planting and enhancement of wetlands and the margins of water bodies shall be encouraged through subdivision."

Objective 6 states that "Subdivision provides for the maintenance and enhancement of conservation values, ..." and Policy 6a g) seeks to "Protect the natural character and/or amenity values associated with a riparian area."

- **What research and policy work is underway that is of relevance to sedimentation.**
  TCDC are in the early stages of planning development of Shoreline Management Plans. As part of this we will investigate means available to stabilise sediment already in the marine environment. WRC will be a lead on this component of the plans.

  The impact of sedimentation was considered in the development of Council's Coastal Management Strategy; adopted in June 2018.

- **Whether policy work includes examining the effectiveness of relevant legislation and/or regulatory tools in this context.**
  Not applicable

- **However approximate, any information on the budget provisioning for work, staffing etc for activities relevant to sedimentation control may help to begin the process of exploring the development of a system for “coordinated financial planning by the constituent parties”**.
  The Forum is yet to agree that the development of a 'system for co-ordinated financial planning by the constituent parties' is an effective use of limited resources when clearly the issues are being addressed by the constituent parties. There is the danger of attempting to micro manage resulting in continued limited outcomes.

---

**Hauraki District Council**

**Hauraki Gulf Forum sedimentation control responses**

**As at 1 August 2018**

While the items [questions provided by the Chairperson] in relation to sediment controls and monitoring relate to Regional Council as a District Council we have earthwork guidelines in our District Plan which triggers the need for earthwork consents for proposed development. Conditions on proposed subdivisions include sediment controls like the provision of silt fencing and metal on vehicle entrance ways to avoid soil on to the road. Any earthwork controls are in line with WRC guidelines. These conditions are checked by our Development Engineer.

In relation to our engineering department any road maintenance; construction jobs like pipeline replacements will always include sediment controls within the contract of works; which is monitored.

In relation to collaborative planning any proposed subdivision over 1 ha requires a stormwater discharge consent from the WRC.
Auckland Council
As at 13 August 2018

Across Auckland Council and Council Controlled Organisations there are several extensive research, monitoring, enforcement and mitigation initiatives addressing the challenges and opportunities of sediment and sedimentation.

Auckland Council submitted a paper which outlines some of the current policies, trends and initiatives identified by the Council to address the environmental challenges presented by sediment and sedimentation.

This report is attached.
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1. Introduction
Nationally, sediment has been identified as one of the key pollutants of our freshwater and receiving
environments and continues to be a significant regional issue for Auckland with specific challenges
from urban development and climate change.

Sediment itself is composed of small fragments of organic and inorganic matter suspended in water,
but can also, through sedimentation, settle and form deposits on the beds of streams, rivers and
estuarine and coastal receiving environments.

Human modification of the landscape and ongoing land-use activities can increase sediment input
into those freshwaters and their receiving environments with the potential to significantly and
adversely impact their ecological values and mahinga kai. These impacts then have the potential to
adversely affect the social, health and wellbeing and economic values of those environments.

Sediment has been identified as one of the key issues affecting the life-supporting capacity of the
Hauraki Gulf / Tikapa Moana / Te Moana-nui-a-Toi, its islands and its catchments. Consequently,
active land management to minimise inputs of sediments is listed as one of proposed five priority
areas within the Hauraki Gulf Forum’s strategic framework for action and sediment is one of the
eleven key environmental indicators that have been used to assess the state of the Hauraki Gulf / Tikapa Moana / Te Moana-nui-a-Toi.

Across Auckland Council and Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) there are several extensive research, monitoring, enforcement and mitigation initiatives addressing the challenges and opportunities of sediment and sedimentation. These not only focus on water quality but also consider broader aspects of soil loss and impacts of climate change.

Within Auckland Council, a coordinated narrative is now under development which builds on these initiatives and activities and aims to incorporate Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Pākehā approaches to better understand how we can meet the on-going challenges and opportunities from sediment and sedimentation.

This paper outlines some of the current policies, trends and initiatives by Auckland Council to address the environmental challenges presented by sediment and sedimentation, highlighting some of the extensive work that is occurring across the region.

2. Auckland Plan 2050: opportunities for improving sediment outcomes
The Auckland Plan 2050 provides the basis for aligning the council’s implementation plans, regulatory plans, policy development, funding programmes and internal operations and investments, including that of the council-controlled organisations. It identifies three key challenges for the Auckland region and how to address them over the next 30 years:

- Population growth and its implications
- Sharing prosperity with all Aucklanders
- Reducing environmental degradation

Sediment touches directly on the first and third of these. With regard to Environmental Degradation, sediment is a specific issue contributing to a reduction in marine and freshwater quality and impacting on marine and freshwater ecosystems. Challenges relating to water quality and quantity in general, though not specifically mentioning sediment, are covered under Outcome 6 Environment and Cultural Heritage and the associated Directions and Focus Areas. This outcome pledges to preserve, protect and care for the natural environment as our shared cultural heritage for its intrinsic value and for the benefit of present and future generations. Specific challenges from sedimentation on marine environments are also included in supporting information Maunga to Moana.

The Auckland Plan 2050 will have high level targets, one of which will be related to the natural environment. In addition, measures are being developed around marine and freshwater quality through targeted rate expenditure (see Section 3).

3. Sediment-related Targeted Rate Expenditure
In 2018, after extensive public consultation, Auckland Council introduced a Water Quality Targeted Rate in order to fund its contribution to an acceleration of the water quality improvement programme. This programme constitutes an additional investment of $856 million across the Long

---

1 Hauraki Gulf Forum - State of our Gulf 2017
Term Plan period 2018 – 2028. A large portion of this will fund the upgrading of ageing stormwater infrastructure and the separation of stormwater and wastewater in the western isthmus. There are also programmes within the budget that will directly benefit sediment outcomes for Auckland, for example, the Contaminant Reduction Programme ($44.5 million*) will fund projects to reduce sediment into the Kaipara Harbour, as well as projects to reduce litter and road contaminants with stormwater treatment, including funding for the stormwater treatment for the Hurstmere Road upgrade. A further $20.4 million* has been set aside for the rehabilitation of urban and rural streams, in order to improve the ecological health of streams, enable urban development in areas such as Omaru creek in East Tamaki and stabilise areas of high stream erosion, reducing sedimentation in the harbours.

*uninflated 10 year total forecast - $395.2 million

4. Auckland’s Waters Strategy

Sediment will also be a key component of the Auckland’s Waters Strategy, which Auckland Council is developing between now and June 2019 to articulate the direction the Auckland Region needs to take to improving water outcomes, as set out in Auckland Plan 2050.

Whilst the Auckland’s Waters Strategy will not be a statutory document, it will be an important precursor to the changes in the Auckland Unitary Plan required by the National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management (NPS-FM), as well as many other council activities. With this in mind, the strategy will be developed using five broad themes that dovetail with council’s approach to the NPS-FM and the structure of our Watershed Plans (see Section 11).

Auckland’s Waters Strategy Themes are as follows:

- Water and Resource Use
- Water Quality and Recreation
- Water Quality and Ecosystem Health
- Water and Cultural Health, and,
- Water and Resilience.

5. Unitary Plan Provisions for land disturbing activities

The Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part) (AUP-OP) is the principal statutory planning document for Auckland giving effect to the Resource Management Act (1991). A requirement of the AUP-OP is to include a regional policy statement, and regional, coastal and district plans and provisions that give effect to that regional policy statement.

Under the Regional Policy Statement, sediment is specifically covered in sections B7 Natural Resources and B8 Coastal Environment; B7.4.2 in part sets policy for minimizing sediment runoff and B8.2.2 in part sets policy for including natural sediment flow in identification and evaluation of areas of outstanding character.

The Regional Policy Statement is given effect to through E11 and E12 for regional and district land disturbance activities respectively. Those activities encompass earthworks, ancillary farming earthworks and ancillary forestry earthworks. Land disturbing activities in the Regional Plan (E11)

---

2 Healthy Waters component $452m, Watercare component $404m, to be funded from water charges.
require undertaking in accordance with their respective best practices guidance, referred to within the AUP-OP. Land disturbing activities in the District Plan (E12) do not specify accordance with any best practices.

The forthcoming Enhancements Plan Change will include reference to the updated GD05 Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities. This guidance has been updated to include the “protection of receiving environments, including sensitive receiving environments” within the fundamental principles of erosion and sediment control. It also makes explicit reference to the impacts of climate change on weather patterns, and recommends that developers take into account changing weather patterns when planning earthworks.

Auckland is anticipated to grow significantly over the next 30 years, with a potential requirement for another 313,000 dwellings. Auckland’s urban footprint will expand to include significant redevelopment and intensification in areas that are already developed and newly established communities in the future urban areas (Auckland Development Strategy, 2018). This means a significant amount of new buildings and, consequently, a significant volume of earthworks to urbanise existing brownfield and greenfield land. The effectiveness of the AUP-OP provisions in minimising the impact of these earthworks on the receiving environments will be fundamental to meeting the challenge of the Auckland Plan 2050 to reduce environmental degradation.

The AUP-OP Water Review Project, led by Healthy Waters, is evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of water-related provisions in the AUP-OP as part of the NPS-FM implementation programme. In its first phase this project is examining, in detail, the plan rules and plan implementation process in relation to sediment. The results of this study will inform the plan change process for the NPS-FM, due to phased in from 2025. Aligned to this is the integrated AUP Monitoring Programme led by Plans & Places to fulfil the requirement of the RMA s35(2)(b), which will provide a high-level review on the Regional Policy Statement evaluation. The Strategic Approach to Sediment initiative, co-ordinated by Auckland Council’s Natural Environment Strategy Unit, outlined in Section 12, is undertaking a stocktake and gap analysis of how the 2001 Regional Plan: Sediment Control and District Plans objectives were integrated into the AUP-OP, which will dovetail into both of these projects.

6. Structure Planning

Structure Planning creates the opportunity in greenfield areas for integrated decision making on future land uses to plan for sustainable communities, by combining planning and infrastructure decisions. It includes constraints and opportunities studies, public and stakeholder engagement, planning for both infrastructure provision and its funding. This all informs land use planning and plan change preparation, and provides an opportunity to direct land development in a way that minimises potential sediment impacts on the region. A wide range of topics are covered within the development of a structure plan, as shown in the table below.

Table 1: Topics covered within the development of a structure plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity</th>
<th>Cultural Values Assessment</th>
<th>Stormwater &amp; Flood Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Integrated Transport Assessment</td>
<td>Business Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Habitat</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Design Statement</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboricultural</td>
<td>Wastewater Servicing Strategy</td>
<td>Historic Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical &amp; Coastal Erosion</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Open Space</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Character</td>
<td>Contamination</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Earthworks Consenting and Compliance

As rural land is urbanised, it is generally expected that sediment loads will decrease, and loadings of heavy metals, such as copper and zinc, will increase. Deposited sediments may become contaminated with metals, and effects may be expected to occur in the marine ecosystem. During the transition to urbanisation, earthworks have the potential to contribute significant amounts of sediment to waterways.

The potential adverse effects of land disturbance from residential and commercial subdivisions, forestry, quarries and cleanfills is managed through chapters E11 (regional) and E12 (district) of the AUP-OP. However, there are a number of challenges with both consenting and compliance of earthworks outlined below.

Consenting Challenges

The following challenges have been identified for the consenting process:

1. **Assessing environmental effects**: Sections E11 – Regional and E12 - District of the AUP-OP cover Controlled or Restricted Discretionary activities. When assessing Restricted Discretionary activities under E11, Council can consider the effects of sediment on water bodies, ecological health including that of the coastal marine areas, impacts on Significant Ecological Areas (SEA’s), effects on cultural and spiritual values of Mana Whenua including water quality and kaimoana gathering. When considering Controlled and Restricted Discretionary consents Council consider and assess the suitability of any erosion and sediment control measures, the extent of the catchment that is exposed, the staging of works, as well as the timing and duration and the term of consent.

2. **Suitability of any erosion and sediment control measures**: There is an assumption that compliance with GD05: Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region is sufficient to manage effects. But even with the use of best practice techniques, it is not possible to prevent all sediment from entering water bodies. It is important to note that the conditions imposed on consents are designed to perform during certain weather events. The controls in place in the form of sediment ponds, are expected to retain up to 90% of the sediment (when chemically treated) when operating at their best although during extreme weather events discharge of some sediment will occur.

The question of how much sediment is too much will also depend on the nature and sensitivity of the receiving environment. Some receiving environments are more sensitive than others, for example wetlands, high quality streams and marine reserves. Streams also vary in terms of typology, flow rates, water depth and type of stream bed, all of which affects the ability of a stream to manage sediment discharges.

3. **Poor quality of applications and, in particular, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP)**: These plans are often seen as an afterthought and poorly prepared. In many cases applicants defer to offering a condition rather than providing the necessary information up front. When an ESCP is provided, it often doesn’t follow best practice (GD05). This raises the question of who pays for the time taken to upskill the applicant’s specialist. There is also a natural tension between the applicant and council as applicants want to minimise costs associated with constructing erosion and sediment control devices. Applicants also often want to maximise the open area to be worked, but in order to minimise potential effects
council wants to control extent of the catchment which is exposed, staging of works, timing and duration and term of consent.

4. *Catchment wide and cumulative effects:* At present, there is a lack of data to assist in identify the tipping point within different catchments. This data would assist in discussions with applicants around extent of the catchment which is exposed, staging of works, timing and duration and term of consent.

5. *Climate Change:* This has the potential to bring increased frequency of weather events, an increase in their severity and changing seasonal patterns. GDOS has been amended to explicitly recognise the challenges that changing weather patterns will present for approaching erosion and sediment control.

**Compliance Challenges and Solutions for Earthworks**

A number of challenges have been identified for the compliance component of the resource consenting process. Sitting at the ‘end of the chain’, it can only enforce what is in the rules, regulations and plans, which means that the reviews mentioned above will play a big part in improving sediment outcomes going forward. The sediment challenge is compounded by the cumulative effect of thousands of small sites across Auckland, for which earthworks is a permitted activity within particular parameters, as well as the sediment impacts of strawberry growers, dairy farms and plantation forestry. With over 40,000 consents and 95,000 complaints across the Auckland region per year and a development and building mentality around wanting everything as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is also a matter of balancing competing priorities for compliance between, for example, sediment, sub-standard housing, heritage, Kauri dieback, trees and Mana Whenua concerns.

Notwithstanding the scale of the challenge, progressive improvements are being made in strengthening our compliance approach to achieve better sediment outcomes through initiatives such as up-skilling staff, compliance scoring and enforcement standardisation, the Earthworks Field Day (which will take place this year on 20th September in Milford) and focusing on the things that matter i.e. earthworks, which are high risk. The recent Targeted Initiatives/Doing Things Differently project which further developed the Howick Local Board focus on Small Sites in Flat Bush has provided robust evidence on how to achieve better compliance levels for sediment on small sites. The lessons learnt from this initiative are informing a more efficient approach to small sites compliance in targeted areas across the region.

**8. Consideration of sediment in Local Board Area Plans**

Seven of Auckland’s ten watersheds drain into the Hauraki Gulf, and 19 of Auckland’s 21 Local Board areas either fully or partially drain into the Hauraki Gulf, reflecting the important role played by local boards in minimising sediment input to the Hauraki Gulf. It is positive to note that all of Auckland’s Local Board Plans contain clear references to improved environmental outcomes. Although only two contain specific reference to sediment, all of the Local Board plans refer to aspirations for improving

---

3 Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Plan 2017: Challenge: “Sediment and contaminants from land use activities cause declining freshwater health” (p.32). Rodney Local Board Plan 2017: Outcome: There is minimal sediment and silt flowing into our waterways from new developments and earthworks.” (p. 27)
the quality of waterways and harbour(s) and include actions that support sediment management. Healthy Waters works closely with Local Boards to deliver projects focussed on improving water quality outcomes, for example the Small Sites Ambassador project in Flat Bush with Howick Local Board, which aimed to improve education and awareness of erosion and sediment control compliance issues on small sites.

Figure 1: Watershed by Local Board Area

9. **Sediment and rural land practices**

There has been relatively little change in the proportions of broad land cover types for Auckland over recent years when measured using the land cover data base. The urban area of Auckland has progressively increased over time with an 11% increase between 1996 and 2012. Around two thirds of Auckland’s projected population and dwelling growth over the next 30 years is anticipated to be within the existing urban area, with the remaining development in the future urban areas and a small proportion (around 6%) within rural areas. At present, pastoral land remains the most extensive type of land cover 236,000ha or 48% of the region.
Much of Auckland’s rural land is erosion prone and human activities on those areas by their very nature create sediment. Land cover and soil type influences the potential impact from sediment in the rural area.

Sediment sources in the rural area are primarily from periodic but relatively infrequent storm damage by landslides and sheetwash due to steep unvegetated slopes in the hill areas combined with poor soil types. Pastoral activities generate sediment as well through earthmoving activities, stock-treading damage and land and stream banks producing fine (colloidal) sediment from soils that can get into the waterways. Forest activities can also create periodic increases in sediment during harvesting and cutting of access roads. Run off from cultivated areas is also an issue adding sediment and associated nutrients to the waterways as well as removing important soil from the land.

In addition to managing consenting and compliance on resource consented activities, described in section 7, the Council and WaterCare are undertaking substantial work in investigating, and reducing sediment from rural activities, as shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Key Council initiatives addressing sediment in the rural environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Council Team</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Watershed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoteo River Geomorphology Study</td>
<td>Investigation of sediment sources based on the soil types and bank geomorphology</td>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Kaipara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoteo - Quantifying channel stability and restorations strategies.</td>
<td>Determining the root reinforcement and tensile strength of 10 riparian species common to the Auckland area.</td>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Kaipara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterway Protection Fund</td>
<td>Provides assistance to landowners fencing and planting riparian areas.</td>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Kaipara, Mahurangi, Papakura, Wairoa, Waitamata (Henderson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Water Forum</td>
<td>Involvement in Land and Water Forum, national</td>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Kaipara, Papakura, Wairoa, Franklin, Waitamata (Henderson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Action Group</td>
<td>Primary sector representatives working with council on specific issues</td>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Kaipara, Papakura, Wairoa, Franklin, Waitamata (Henderson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Advisory Panel</td>
<td>The Rural Advisory Panel was established to identify and communicate the interest and preferences of the rural-based industries and community of Auckland to the council</td>
<td>Healthy Waters</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Kaipara, Papakura, Wairoa, Franklin, Waitamata (Henderson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Restoration Sites</td>
<td>3 year contract to plant riparian areas on 3 Council reserves and maintain existing plantings.</td>
<td>Healthy Waters - Customer and Community</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Mahurangi, Hoteo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Waterway protection Local Board Project</td>
<td>Local Board Project targeting riparian planting and fencing in the Franklin Ward</td>
<td>Healthy Waters - Customer and Community</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Trends in research, monitoring and evaluation and Challenges Ahead

Increased inputs of fine terrestrial sediments resulting from human activities have adverse effects on freshwater and coastal ecosystems. This is due to decreased water clarity reducing productivity, increased sediment deposits smothering plants and animals and clogging feeding structures and a change in the bottom substrate, for example from a sandy to muddy habitat, which then affects the animals and plants that can live there.

Consequently, sediment was identified a key issue for Auckland and included in both Auckland Council’s State of Auckland (2009) where it was noted that that the “clear waters and sandy bottoms of many or our harbours and estuaries are being lost to increasing amounts of fine sediments that muddy our waters and smother sea life” and in subsequent State of the Hauraki Gulf reports 2017 and SeaChange – Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan (2017).

Auckland Council monitors sediment yield and fate through a number of programmes across the region, as described below.

**Sediment yield**

Event-based sediment monitoring is carried out at 12+ sites across the region, which represent different slopes, soil types, geology and rainfall conditions (see Figure 2). Stormflow conditions generate the bulk of sediment. Currently, there is an absence of suspended sediment yield (SSY) information from urbanising catchments. Therefore, new monitoring sites are being set up in current greenfield areas to track the changes in SSY during and following an urbanisation process.

**Figure 2: Location of event-based sediment monitoring**

The predominant sediment generating determinants are catchment slope, mean annual rainfall, land cover and lithology.
Table 3: Specific sediment yield (SSY t/km²/yr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Land cover</th>
<th>Record length</th>
<th>SSY t/km²/yr⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waipuhi</td>
<td>native</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangemangeroa</td>
<td>pasture</td>
<td>2012-present</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orewa</td>
<td>pasture</td>
<td>2009-present</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoteo at Gubbs</td>
<td>pasture</td>
<td>2010-present</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awanohi</td>
<td>native</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairoa</td>
<td>pasture</td>
<td>2010-present</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan</td>
<td>pasture</td>
<td>2001-present</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipara</td>
<td>pasture</td>
<td>2012-present</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaukapakapa</td>
<td>pasture</td>
<td>2010-present</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoteo at Waitangi</td>
<td>pasture</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihi</td>
<td>plantation forest</td>
<td>2008-2015</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hoe</td>
<td>native</td>
<td>2012-present</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hoyle et al, 2013

Water quality

Auckland Council has monitored marine water quality in the Auckland region every month since 1987. The monitoring network has grown to 32 sites, including the Manukau, Kaipara and Waitamata harbours, Mahurangi and Tamaki estuaries, and sites along the east coast. Results have shown decreasing trends in suspended sediment over 10 years, except at three sites in the Waitamata. However, many sites exceed threshold levels, mostly in the Waitamata. Average turbidity, another indicator of water clarity, is also above the threshold at many sites, including east coast sites.

Table 4: 10 year trend in sediment at marine water by harbour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harbour</th>
<th>Turbidity</th>
<th>Suspended sediment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Estuaries</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahurangi</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Estuary</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki Strait</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitamata</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: 10 year trend in sediment at selected individual sites in the Waitamata Harbour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waitamata Harbour Site</th>
<th>Turbidity</th>
<th>Suspended sediment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighams Estuary</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitopunu Creek</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimarie Road</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Tonnes of suspended sediment yield per square kilometre of catchment per year
Muddiness of marine sediments

Figure 5 shows the percent of mud in sediment cores taken from around Auckland with the percent of mud categories relating to ecological effects thresholds, the greater the percentage of mud the greater the ecological impact. It can be seen that the muddiest areas are in the upper estuaries and tidal arms where there is less flushing and this is greatest adjacent to the older urban catchments.
Figure 5: Percent of mud in intertidal sediment in Auckland

Marine ecology

The marine ecology programme monitors changes in the numbers and types of plants and animals found in coastal ecosystems to detect changes in ecosystem health. Monitored species form a significant component of our regional biodiversity and provide an important food source for birds, fish, and people. They also provide additional ecosystem services, including clean water, carbon sequestration and primary productivity. Monitoring intertidal mud and sandflats started in the Manukau Harbour in 1987 and has expanded to cover the Kaipara, Waitematā and Mahurangi harbours as well as eight smaller east coast estuaries. Cores of sediment are collected at each site and all animals found are identified, measured and counted. The Benthic Health Indicator is a reporting tool for classifying sites based on the number of animals present and their responses to heavy metal concentrations and the level of mud.

In the map below (Figure 6) the historical impacts of urbanisation can clearly be seen with low health scores concentrated in tidal creeks and upper arms where flushing is reduced. All locations, even those away from urban areas have sites where ecological health is compromised. Patterns of
ecological health have remained relatively constant. Where there have been changes it is generally declines and related to increased muddiness.

Figure 6: Combined Benthic Health Score 2016

Land-based contaminant load (sources) and coastal (fate) modelling

WANSY is a tool for modelling sediment loads across the rural parts of the region. The acronym stands for Waikato, Auckland, Northland Sediment Yield model (identifying that measured suspended sediment data from these regions has been used to calibrate (or adjust) the model outputs). This is an empirical model derived from the parent CLUES (Catchment Land Use and Environmental Sustainability) model. Specifically, it can be used to predict annual or average annual sediment loads for a particular rural watershed across the Auckland region.

The Contaminant Load Model (CLM) is a tool for modelling stormwater derived contaminants across the mixed urban and mixed use (urban and rural) parts of the region. The model is very simple in principle - the area of a particular land use (source) within the area being studied (the catchment) is multiplied by the quantity of contaminants discharged from that land use (source yield) to provide an annual load from that source. The loads from each source within the catchment are then added together to provide an annual contaminant load for the catchment of interest. Source yields from the different source areas are provided for Total Suspended Solids (TSS), zinc (Zn), copper (Cu) and Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH). This is a simple empirical model.
To assist in predicting the future contaminant levels in Auckland’s receiving environments to the extent that will be required under the NPS-FM, a dynamic Contaminant Load Model (CLM) is being developed by Auckland Council to characterise the load of sediment, copper and zinc coming off the land as defined by the various land uses undertaken within a catchment. This will provide inputs as loads to a coastal hydrodynamic model. Focussing initially on the Long Bay Marine Reserve, this coastal modelling is supported by the deployment of water quality buoys that provide finer resolution continuous data on currents, waves, sediment deposition rates and a number of other water quality parameters. This data will be used to model sediment transportation throughout the Okura and Weiti Estuaries, Karepiro Bay and the entirety of the Long Bay-Okura Marine Reserve. This modelling will provide a better understanding of the fate of sediment and the urban-derived metals copper and zinc being discharged into the coastal receiving environment. The combination of the land-based model and this hydrodynamic model will help to understand the movement and sources of contaminants from these catchments.

The hydrodynamic model is being developed primarily for the purpose of assessing the long-term effects of different land use scenarios of the catchment. However, the calibrated hydrodynamic model may also be used to better understand the fate of sediment discharged during the earthworks phase of development from any given point within the coastal model’s boundaries, and this approach can be applied to other receiving environments in the Auckland area. This model is due to be completed at the end of the calendar year.

Challenges and Approaches

There are some key challenges in monitoring sediment yield, fate and impact and in understanding the outcomes of land use decisions and the effectiveness of policies and mitigations, not least of which is keeping pace with scale of land use change as Auckland expands. Because the receiving environments of Auckland are so different, a regional approach to monitoring is required rather than transferring results from one monitored location to another.

Key questions that we are looking to address through monitoring and research are to understand:

- the impact of cumulative effects of multiple land use changes through time and space;
- stronger linkage between source and sink to enable cause and effect to be determined; and
- the effectiveness of policies and mitigations in reducing sediment and the effectiveness of restoration efforts.

These are big questions that are being grappled with nationally and internationally as well. We are collaborating with many researchers including through the national science challenges and MBIE-funded research and working collectively with other councils. We are taking an integrated approach to catchment monitoring to capture the link between land and sea.

11. Integrated Watershed Planning: ‘mountain to sea – ki uta ki tai’

A watershed is the area of land which contributes all of the natural run-off to a particular water body, such as a lake, river, estuary or harbour or coastline.

In preparation for the implementation of the NPS-FM, Healthy Waters is developing integrated watershed plans as a smarter, bolder and more integrated approach to delivering water outcomes.
for all Aucklanders into the future. The ultimate purpose of an integrated watershed plan is to identify future work programmes and potential new regulatory requirements to improve water outcomes holistically from “ridge to reef”.

To engage with Mana Whenua and stakeholders in developing this integrated management approach, Healthy Waters is creating ‘Watershed Story Maps’, a GIS map-based tool, which is currently available on Knowledge Auckland (see link below). Healthy Waters has specifically chosen a GIS map-based tool as this allows increased interaction with stakeholders, as well as ease of updates as new information and feedback is received. A first pilot of the mapping tool was issued in November 2017 and depicts water quality values (Ecosystem Health / Recreation), environmental monitoring data / freshwater accounting, sources of contaminants / pressures as well as current projects and initiatives. These story maps bring together a considerable amount of information about sediment at a watershed level, examples are shown in Figure 7.

After feedback on the first pilot as well as update information being received, considerable work is currently being carried out to upgrade the Story Maps. Whilst they will still focus on key requirements of NPS-FM, the story maps will also expand on Ecosystem Health value to include stream health / lake health, they will also bring in Resource Use and other values, provide updated information on accounting and other monitoring, incorporate Contaminant Load Model results and update the section on Projects and Initiatives to reflect the wide range of additional activity in this area following the additional money available for water quality projects through the targeted rate.

The pilot watershed current state story maps can be found at: http://www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz/publication/?mid=1734&DocumentType=1&

The updated story boards will be available by the end of 2018, with further updates programmed for early 2019.

**Figure 7**: Example pages about sediment from the ecosystem health pages of the Watershed Story Maps
12. Next steps: A Strategic Approach to Sediment

Earlier this year, the Natural Environment Strategy Unit (NES) began to examine how erosion and sediment is managed across the Auckland region through the Strategic Approach to Sediment initiative. This project is looking widely across the council group at all available mechanisms and interventions to improve sediment management across the region in order to fulfil ambitions set out within the Auckland Plan 2050.

Following a series of 1:1 interviews, and a two-hour workshop in April 2018 involving 40 staff with a responsibility for sediment and sedimentation issues across the strategic, operational and regulatory divisions of council, six work areas were identified as requiring further attention:

1. **Better Information**: this work area will identify the gaps in our knowledge and understanding, and how we address those through use of data, research and intelligence. It will build on work already undertaken through the Wai Ora – Healthy Waterways Programme, Water Outcomes SharePoint and other activities such as RIMU’s Research Programme and Knowledge Auckland.

2. **Monitoring and Evaluation**: this work area will define what council needs to monitor and how that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of policies and interventions. This can be difficult as there is no consistent or effective approach to monitoring sediment loss and cumulative impacts of permitted activity.

3. **Building Capacity**: this work area will identify what skills and resources are needed for council family to make informed decisions and to implement and enforce policies.

4. **Influencing Strategy and Policy**: this work area is examining the gaps and opportunities for improving the management of sediment in regional plans and policies across Council family and partners, and where council can influence government policies. It will dovetail into the AUP-OP Water Review Project, led by Healthy Waters and the AUP Monitoring Programme led by Plans & Places.

5. **Interventions**: this work area will examine current interventions and investigate how key learnings from those can be supported or built upon to improve compliance.

6. **Communication and Engagement**: this work area will look at how and with what messages we engage Council family, Mana Whenua, partners and wider stakeholders.

Focus for immediate action is on developing a co-ordinated narrative, including a better understanding on naturally-occurring sediment, and improving consideration of positive sediment outcomes in existing strategic and operational processes.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval of the 2017-2018 Annual Report for presentation to the Minister of Conservation.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) approve the 2017-2018 Annual Report, subject to any feedback received at the meeting.

Horopaki / Context
2. The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 requires the Hauraki Gulf Forum to present an annual report on the exercise of its powers, the carrying out of its functions and progress towards achieving its purposes to the House of Representatives, through the Minister of Conservation, on or before 31 August each year.

3. The Annual Report has been prepared by the Interim Executive Officer, in consultation with the Chairperson, to fulfil those requirements.

4. The Annual Report will be circulated separately. Feedback regarding the Annual Report is invited from Forum Members prior to or during the meeting.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Katina Conomos – Interim Executive Officer, Hauraki Gulf Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jacques Victor - GM Auckland Plan Strategy and Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Officer Report

File No.: CP2018/14401

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To provide an update from the Hauraki Gulf Forum’s Interim Executive Officer.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. This report is prepared by the Hauraki Gulf Forum’s Interim Executive Officer to update Forum members on the delivery of the annual work program, follow up actions from previous meetings, and other matters of relevance since the last meeting.

3. This report is seeking delegation for the preparation of a submission (if required) to the Environmental Protection Agency in relation to the Coastal Resources Management Ltd. consent application for dumping of dredged material, and also seeking delegation to support Auckland Council with the recruitment of a permanent Executive Officer.

4. This report also presents the final position for the year end 2017/2018 and makes several proposals for the 2018/2019 budget.

5. This report also seeks engagement from members regarding the preparation of the 2019 Hauraki Gulf Marine Park poster.

6. The Forum may also wish to use this report to provide further instruction regarding its work programme, or any particular matters requiring further attention from the Executive Officer.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:

a) receive the Hauraki Gulf Forum Interim Executive Officer’s report.

b) nominate a working party (if desired) to work alongside the Executive Officer, Chairperson and other stakeholders to scope the theme of the 2019 Hauraki Gulf Marine Park poster.

c) delegate approval of the Hauraki Gulf Forum’s submission to the Environmental Protection Agency concerning the Coastal Resources Management Ltd. consent application, to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson, on the proviso that the Forum is invited to participate in this submission process.

d) note the 2017-2018 year-end financial position.

e) agree to increase the 2018-2019 Forum budget by $5,000 to provide a small budget for Chairperson and Executive Officer related expenses (predominantly travel) funded in accordance with the Forum’s previously agreed funding formula.

f) agree to reduce the 2018-2019 Auckland Council contribution by $21,914 and allocate $21,914 from the accumulated surplus to the 2018-2019 budget.

g) note that invoices for the 2018-2019 constituent party contributions will now be issued.

h) delegate the chairperson and deputy chairperson to support Auckland Council recruit an Executive Officer for the Hauraki Gulf Forum.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Seminar / Holdaway Awards

7. The 2018 Seminar will be held in the Events Centre at the Auckland War Memorial Museum on Wednesday, 5 September.

8. The Seminar programme is included as an attachment to this report.

9. Please let me know if you wish to attend so that I can arrange a ticket for you.

10. Your support to promote the event is still very much appreciated and encouraged, particularly through your social network channels.

11. The Forum has delegated the adjudication of the Holdaway Award to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson, and the recipient(s) will be announced at the Seminar. I am in discussion with Sarah Cornelius (daughter of Jim and Ann Holdaway) to arrange for her to attend and present the award.

2019 Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Poster Series

12. Work must now commence to scope and prepare the 2019 Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Poster, the distribution of which coincides with SeaWeek in March each year.

13. I have contacted the primary stakeholders involved (NZME, Young Ocean Explorers, the illustrator and graphic designer) to advise that I will call a meeting soon to discuss the scope for the next poster.

14. I am seeking a working party to work alongside the Executive Officer, and the Chairperson and other stakeholders to scope the theme for the 2019 Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Poster series.

Other Press

15. Over the last two months there has been a number of good-quality press material in relation to the Gulf, from the perspective of concern for the health of the Gulf. I would particularly highlight:


17. From 4 August 2018, NewsHub article and video in which a number of stakeholders are interviewed [https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/shows/2018/08/the-shocking-decline-of-the-hauraki-gulf.html](https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/shows/2018/08/the-shocking-decline-of-the-hauraki-gulf.html)

18. From 19 June 2018, RNZ Kathryn Ryan’s interview with Andrew Jeffs from Auckland University speaking regarding the project to restore the mussel beds in the Hauraki Gulf. NB: Andrew Jeffs is one of the Seminar speakers. [https://www.radionz.co.nz/national/programmes/ninetonoon/audio/2018649916/restoring-the-hauraki-gulf-with-mussels](https://www.radionz.co.nz/national/programmes/ninetonoon/audio/2018649916/restoring-the-hauraki-gulf-with-mussels)

Hauraki Gulf Forum Facebook

19. I have been contacted by Christopher Dempsey, who set up and has been operating a Hauraki Gulf Forum Facebook page for several years.

20. I believe that it is more appropriate that the Executive Officer manages the Hauraki Gulf Forum Facebook page, and given that Christopher wants to hand the Facebook page over I have arranged for myself to become the administrator of this page for the time being.
21. Christopher’s efforts have been very well intended and I have thanked him for his contribution.

22. I intend to develop some operational guidelines for use of the Facebook page to provide a frame of reference for how the Facebook account should be used.

**Coastal Resources Ltd dumping consent**

23. On 5 June 2018, Coastal Resources Limited (CRL) lodged an application for a 35-year marine dumping consent to dump up to 250,000m³ of dredged material from source sites within Auckland and Waikato.

24. The dump site is at the existing consented Northern Disposal Area site, which is located 25 km east of Great Barrier Island, as shown on the following map (sourced from the public notice).

25. If approved, the consent will replace CRL’s current consent, which expires in 2032 and under which up to 50,000m³ of dredged material, from existing or proposed marinas in Auckland and Waikato, can be dumped annually.

26. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the consenting authority and the consent application will be decided by the Decision-Making Committee (DMC) appointed by the EPA.

27. At the invitation of the EPA, Chairperson Meeuwsen and I gave an ‘informal and induction’ presentation to the Decision-Making Committee. The purpose of the presentation was to brief the DMC on the role and purpose of the Hauraki Gulf Forum, as well as advise what information the Forum has access to. An overview of the 2017 State of the Environment report was provided verbally, and copies of the report have been provided.
28. S.18(3)(b) of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act states the Forum must not take part in a decision-making process under any enactment other than to advise when requested to do so.

29. The DMC have expressed their interest for the Forum to formally provide information as part of the submission process. The EPA Manager and I are in discussion regarding the legality of this.

30. Submissions close on 10 September 2018. I am therefore recommending that delegation be given to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson to approve a submission to the EPA CRL consent, if the Forum is invited to do so.

31. Further information about the application and process can be found here: https://www.epa.govt.nz/public-consultations/open-consultations/coastal-resources-limited/

**Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve – Sedimentation issue**

32. At the Forum’s 14 May meeting, upon receiving a presentation from the Long Bay Okura Great Park Society, the Forum expressed strong concern regarding the sediment pollution at Long Bay Okura Marine Reserve (HGF/2018/18).

33. The Forum also requested that the Executive Officer make recommendations on how the Forum can respond to concerns raised by the Long Bay Okura Great Park Society.

34. The Long Bay Okura Great Park Society have, in and of themselves, been very proactive in raising their concerns.

35. The Society presented to the Auckland Council’s Environment and Community Committee on 10 July 2018 and generated national press interest.


38. The Society will present again to the Auckland Council’s Environment and Community Committee on 14 August 2018. Forum Members have been invited to attend in support, in their capacity as Hauraki Gulf Forum members.

39. The Forum can continue to express concern and apply pressure to constituent parties. It can (and is) maintaining contact with the Long Bay Okura Great Park Society to maintain awareness of the situation and extend support to the Society’s awareness raising and challenge efforts. Otherwise, there is little more that the Forum can do within its current legislative frameworks to respond to the concerns raised by the Long Bay Okura Great Park Society.

40. The issue at Long Bay Okura Park Marine Reserve has again highlighted attention to the issue of sedimentation, a matter which the Forum is considering as one of its Strategic Issues (see separate agenda item).

**Environmental Defence Society Conference**

41. Chairperson Meeuwsen and I attended the Environmental Defence Society Conference in Auckland on 2 and 3 August 2018.
42. Four Ministers were speaking at the event and given the extent of reform packages being proposed by the current Government I felt that it was important for the Forum to hear what was being said. The Ministers who presented were the Minister for the Environment David Parker, Minister of Fisheries Stuart Nash, Minister of Conservation Eugenie Sage, and the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Transport Phil Twyford. The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, Hon. Simon Upton also presented.

43. Key points from some of the Ministerial presentations included:

- The Minister of Fisheries supports cameras onboard boats but wants to sort out the dumping and discarding regime prior. He also supports a move to eco-system-based management by 2020, or in the very least, ensuring that conversation regarding eco-system-based management has begun.
- The Housing Minister’s priorities include infrastructure financing, transport pricing and reforming the planning system to encourage, not restrict growth.
- The Minister of Conservation indicated a priority was to protect marine biodiversity with a focus on reducing bycatch of mammals and seabirds. She indicated that work is being undertaken on a cabinet paper in relation to Sea Change. In relation to marine protection activities, protection of the Kermadec’s are the priority.

44. The Conference also provided valuable networking opportunities for both the Chairperson and myself.

45. The Auckland War Memorial Museum are now interested to meet and discuss their forward research programme.

46. One of the conference speakers, Catherine Iorns from Victoria University School of Law is interested to point her students to topics of study and has inquired whether there are legal challenges of interest in and around the Gulf. Catherine’s area of interest is using human rights law to protect New Zealand’s natural environment. For those interested to learn more about Catherine, a link to a recent TED talk can be found here: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xWKMavfi9i8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xWKMavfi9i8)

47. New Zealand Geographic presented on their virtual reality (VR) project, whereby 20 VR experiences are being prepared to connect New Zealanders with their environment and inspire social change. There are two sites within the Hauraki Gulf included in this VR project, which should be launched before the end of this year. A preview can be viewed here: [https://www.nzgeo.com/video/nzvr-trailer/](https://www.nzgeo.com/video/nzvr-trailer/)

**Bryde’s Whale Ship Strike Collaborative Group**

48. Ports of Auckland Ltd report that ship speeds are reasonably stable, with the monthly average for Port vessels in the Hauraki Gulf being 10.15 in Q2 (slightly above the target of 10 knots). The Ports of Auckland report is attached as Attachment B.

49. At the time of writing the report from the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) has not yet been received and it will be stipulated separately. In my last report, I reported that IFAW only had funding available to support daily monitoring until end of June 2018. The funding is raised philanthropically and costs IFAW approximately $7,000 (AUD) per annum. For the time being, IFAW have been continuing to fund the daily monitoring.
50. In previous reports, both Tim Higham and I have advised that the Black Petrel Working Group was investigating whether the range of initiatives already in place to help protect black petrels at sea (being seabird smart training, liaison role, seabird management plans, observer programme and electronic monitoring trials) could provide the basis for an assurance scheme to increase transparency and recognition of seabird smart fishing. The assurance scheme concept had been developed to a trial-ready phase.

51. However, in late June the seafood industry representatives who sit on the Black Petrel Working Group advised that for several reasons they were not intending to commit to the assurance scheme proposal as it had been outlined. However, they did point out strongly that the decision not to progress with the assurance scheme was not a reflection of the industry’s commitment to Black Petrels, and their preference was for the Black Petrel Working Group to assess progress to date on the Pledge (from 2014) and update the current implementation plan for the Working Group.

52. The Black Petrel Working Group met on 1 August 2018, hosted by Minister of Fisheries and an assessment of progress against the Pledge was undertaken and a structured discussion about the forward work programme was had.

53. The Black Petrel Working Group is coordinated by the Southern Seabirds Solutions Trust. The Trust have called for funding from the Working Group members to continue to fund their support.

54. In the past, the Forum has provided financial support to the Trust. After liaison with the Chairperson, I have again offered a small amount of financial assistance, but this time made this conditional on evidence of financial support being provided by other Working Group members.

55. The Working Group brings together industry (Leigh Fisheries, Fisheries Inshore NZ, Sanford Ltd, Moana New Zealand), with DoC and Ministry of Fisheries, and NGOs including Forrest and Bird and WWF. I see value in the continuation of the Working Group as a platform for information sharing, collaboration and an avenue through which concerns can be raised and industry views sought. In this mix, the Forum can also play an important advocacy role to Government.

56. In terms of the birds, members may also be interested to view this blog series which is charting the journey of 14 tagged fledgling young black petrels from New Zealand to South America: [https://www.catchfishnotbirds.nz/news/](https://www.catchfishnotbirds.nz/news/)

57. The next issue of the *Gulf Journal* and its associated e-newsletter is being compiled for publication this month.

58. The Forum has made previous resolutions regarding the review of standing orders, governance statement and delegation policy, which arose from a number of procedural meeting issues that the Forum was experiencing in 2017.

59. At the last meeting I suggested that staff would like to work with the newly elected Forum Chair and Deputy Chair regarding these items on the work programme between now and the next meeting. This work has not yet occurred but will remain on the work programme for action following the adoption of the Strategic Issues, which has been the priority.
Hauraki Gulf Forum Budget 2017-2018

60. The final performance against budget for 2017-2018 can now be presented and is included as Attachment C.

61. The Auckland Council contribution has been treated differently to other constituent party contributions whereby it is not invoiced as per the agreed funding formula but instead the costs associated with the employment of the Executive Officer, as incurred by Auckland Council, have been considered to be the Auckland Council contribution. This practice has occurred for many years and (as itemised separately as ‘Auckland Council contribution’ in the revenue line).

62. The Forum resolved (HGF/2018/28) to change the practice of the Auckland Council contribution being treated separately, and from 2018/2019 the Auckland Council contribution will be treated the same as other constituent party contributions, as an invoiced and capped contribution.

63. The total cost of the State of the Environment report is higher than previously reported but still slightly under the $150,000 budgeted.

64. In 2017-2018 the Auckland Council contributed $21,914 in additional funds to cover the contracted interim Executive Officer.

65. As reported in May 2018, for 2017-2018 revenue from constituent party contributions is shown $31,000 lower than forecast, due to an invoicing error regarding the treatment of GST.

66. The combination of these two factors has meant that expenditure for the year is higher than was originally forecast in budget, but this has been offset (in part) by the Auckland Council.

67. As at end of June 2018, the Forum has an accumulated surplus of $101,540.

Hauraki Gulf Forum Budget 2018-2019

68. In May 2018, the Forum adopted an interim budget and agreed to revisit the budget following the setting of the Forum’s strategic issues and more detailed work programme.

69. Invoices for the 2018-2019 have not yet been sent but will be sent following the 20 August meeting.

70. I wish to make recommendations in relation to the 2018-2019 budget:

71. I recommend increasing the Forum budget by $5,000 to provide a small budget for Chairperson and Executive Officer related expenses (predominantly travel). An example of why this is necessary is that recently, the Chairperson travelled to meet with constituent parties throughout the Waikato. Chairperson Meeuwsen has indicated this is something he intends to do from time to time.

72. In 2017-2018 Auckland Council contributed an additional $21,914 to cover the contracted interim Executive Officer. Given that the Forum has a current surplus, I recommend that we reduce the Auckland Council’s 2018-2019 contribution by $21,914, and cover that ‘shortfall’ from the accumulated surplus.

73. The budget as presented below if fully committed, so should the Forum wish to commission additional work (for example, analysis or investigation arising from the Strategic Issues), this would need to be in addition to the budget below.
### Executive Officer Recruitment

74. In May 2018, a paper was presented to the Forum which noted that the Forum, at that time, was in a transitory and evolutionary phase with the resignation of the Forum Chairperson and the Forum being in the process of setting its Strategic Issues.

75. At that time, it was recommended continuing with the temporary (contractor) coverage of the Executive Officer role.

76. The Forum has since made good progress with its Strategic Issues and has a clearer pathway forward for its future work.

77. As the workload for the Executive Officer is now starting to demand more, it will be more economical to have a permanent person in the role, rather than a contractor.

78. The Administering Authority Agreement (separate item on the agenda) sets out broadly the responsibilities and expectations of the Executive Officer.

79. Staff are now recommending that recruitment commence for a permanent Executive Officer and seek delegation to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson to support Auckland Council recruit an Executive Officer for the Hauraki Gulf Forum.
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<td>B</td>
<td>Ports of Auckland report</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
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<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONFIRMED SPEAKER LIST
2018 Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Seminar
Wednesday 5th September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>Mihi and Welcome – Ngati Whatua representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30</td>
<td><strong>SESSION 1: Place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction by Chair, Hauraki Gulf Forum: John Meeuwsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.35</td>
<td><strong>Voices on the page</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paula Morris, Ngati Wai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.55</td>
<td><strong>The sound of the stream</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike O’Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15</td>
<td><strong>Lessons from the past</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vincent O’Malley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.35</td>
<td><strong>MORNING TEA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05</td>
<td><strong>SESSION 2: Challenge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairperson to be confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>Marine conservation – challenges in the Gulf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Trniski, head of natural sciences – Auckland Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td><strong>Soundscape of the Gulf</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Radford, University of Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>Disappearing from view, the spotted shag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Lovegrove, Auckland Council biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>SESSION 3: Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaired by Moana Tamaariki-Pohe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Surfing, Sailing, Diving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Songstress Jamie McDell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>Snap of the sails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoturoa Barclay-Kerr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Pathway to the stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dark Sky Advisory Group tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Starry Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodheavens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Bird Dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Brunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>AFTERNOON TEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>SESSION 4: Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairperson John Meeuwsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Changing landscape of Rotoroa Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jo Ritchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2017 Holdaway Award - presenter Sarah Cornelius (tbc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Closing remarks – John Meeuwsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>FINISH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average quarterly speed remained on target, at 10.05 knots in Q1 and 10.15 in Q2 of 2018.

Monthly averages for the first six months of 2018 ranged from 10.21 knots in February to 9.9 knots in June. Overall, speeds are very stable close to the 10 knot mark.
## Hauraki Gulf Forum Financial Report
### as at end of June 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Actual to end of June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of the Environment report (assume 3 x annual contributions of $50,000)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$144,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications (Annual report, web site, seminar, award and education initiatives)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$52,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of response to issues (including whale strike and seabird capture)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating model changes</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive support</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$148,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>$375,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$360,840</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Actual to end of June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Party contributions (2017/18)</td>
<td>$151,806</td>
<td>$131,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council contribution (2017/18)</td>
<td>$123,194</td>
<td>$148,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship (2 x $10,000 towards the Gulf Posters project)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue in advance for State of the Environment report</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$375,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$399,929</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Forecast revenue less expenditure**: $- $39,990
- **Accumulated surplus balance as at end of June 2018**: $101,540

All costs are presented exclusive of GST
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present a Service Level Agreement between the Hauraki Gulf Forum (the Forum) and the Auckland Council as the Administering Authority for adoption.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act requires that one of the constituent parties be appointed as the Administering Authority for the Forum.
3. The Auckland Council currently fulfils the Administering Authority role.
4. A draft Service Level Agreement that sets out the arrangements between the Forum and the Administering Authority was presented to the Forum at the meeting on 14 May for consideration. The Service Level Agreement is now being presented for adoption.
5. The new Agreement presents what the Auckland Council, as the Administering Authority provides by way of support to the Forum, and also sets out what the obligations are of the Forum in this relationship.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Hauraki Gulf Forum:
   a) receive the Hauraki Gulf Forum Administering Authority Arrangements report.
   b) adopt the Service Level Agreement between the Hauraki Gulf Forum and Auckland Council as the Administering Authority.

Horopaki / Context
6. Section 28 of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act (the Act) establishes that one of the constituent parties must be appointed as the Administering Authority for the Forum. The Administering Authority must administer and service the Forum and ensure as far as practicable that the functions, powers, and duties set out in Part 2 of the Act are carried out.
7. The Auckland Council currently fulfils the Administering Authority role, having assumed the functions of the previously appointed Auckland Regional Council, in the reorganisation of local government in Auckland.
8. In June 2005, the then Auckland Regional Council and the Hauraki Gulf Forum entered into a Performance Agreement to formalise the accountability between the Hauraki Gulf Forum and the Administering Authority. This is the last such agreement. Consequently, there is currently inadequate documentation regarding the agreement between the Forum and the Auckland Council in its role of Administering Authority.
9. In practice, this means that the range of services the Auckland Council should provide the Forum is unclear, the level of funding required is not transparent and roles and responsibilities are blurred.
10. The purpose of an Agreement is to make the service obligations of the Administering Authority clear for all concerned as well as to provide appropriate accountability between the Forum and its Administering Authority.

11. In relation to costs, the Act provides for the Forum to agree costs associated with the administration and servicing of the Forum as well as costs associated with undertaking the Forum’s powers.

12. Section 19 of the Act outlines that
   (1) The administrative and servicing functions of the Forum and the costs of those functions must be agreed from time to time by the Forum.
   (2) Unless the constituent parties agree otherwise, the costs agreed under subsection (1) must be divided equally among the constituent parties and each constituent party must pay 1 share of the costs.
   (3) Administrative and servicing costs are not payable by constituent parties who are tangata whenua representatives.

13. Historically, the Auckland Council has not been presenting the full costs associated with supporting the Forum and has in practice been absorbing the costs associated with democracy services, financial and communications support.

14. This practice is historical, and whilst not deliberate, it means that the full costs associated with servicing the Forum are not transparent, and it means that the burden of costs is inequitable.

15. At its meeting on 14 May 2018, the Forum resolved to fund the full costs associated with the Administrative Authority support as part of its forward budget, on the proviso that these costs are presented and agreed as part of the Forum’s forward budget (HGF/2018/28).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

16. The Agreement presents what the Auckland Council, as the Administering Authority, will provide by way of support to the Forum, and also sets out what the obligations are of the Forum in this relationship.

17. The Agreement describes the services associated with meeting administration and governance, as well as communications and finance. It also provides a service description of the services provided by the executive officer.

18. The Agreement has been prepared based on what services the Forum currently receives from the Auckland Council, as well as a small number of services that haven’t been consistently provided to the Forum previously but should be (such as financial reporting).

19. Section 28(1) of the Act states that the Administering authority should be appointed for a minimum of three years. Ideally, this appointment should be considered at the beginning of each electoral term, when the Forum meets for the first time in that term.

20. The Service Level Agreement has a term of three years from adoption, with an option to renew for a further three years.

21. This Agreement does not stipulate key performance indicators for the services provided by the Administering Authority, instead, the Agreement places the requirement on the Forum chair to undertake a review of effectiveness every three years. Development of key performance indicators could be an area for improvement in future if desired.

22. This Agreement, along with a refreshed Governance Statement (or similar) should guide the operational mechanics of the Forum (HGF/2017/32).
23. If when setting its strategic direction (through the setting of Strategic Issues), the Forum determines it requires additional or different support, the Service Level Agreement can be renegotiated and adjusted. Having clarity and agreement on the current level of services that the Forum receives provides a good platform from which to have that conversation if required.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
24. The costs associated with the Administering Authority function are articulated and agreed as part of the Forum’s forward budget.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Service Level Agreement</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<th>Authorisers</th>
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<td>Jacques Victor - GM Auckland Plan Strategy and Research</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Phil Wilson - Governance Director</td>
</tr>
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SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT

Between

Auckland Council (the Administering Authority)

And

Hauraki Gulf Forum (the Forum)

Background

Section 28 of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (the Act) establishes that one of the constituent parties must be appointed as the administering authority for the Hauraki Gulf Forum (the Forum). The administering authority must administer and service the Forum and ensure as far as practicable that the functions, powers, and duties set out in Part 2 of the Act are carried out.

For administrative purposes, the Forum is to then be treated as a committee of the administering authority (s.28(5)).

In May 2000, the Auckland Regional Council was established as the administering authority at the Forum and provided a coordinating officer by way of support to the Forum. The administering authority was transferred from the Auckland Regional Council to the Auckland Council in November 2010 and since that time support has been provided through a General Manager / Executive Officer role.

The purpose of this agreement is to formalise accountability between the Hauraki Gulf Forum and the administering authority (as per section 28 of the Act). This Agreement provides clarity regarding the range of support required to support the Forum, including democracy and meeting services, management services, financial services and communication services. The extent of these services should be agreed between the Forum and the administering authority, during approval of the annual work programme and budget.

Section 27 of the Act requires that the Auckland Council must store the Forum’s records and make them available when the Forum requires.
The Administering Authority will:

1. Provide democracy services for Hauraki Gulf Forum meetings and workshops, including:
   a. Preparation of a schedule of Forum meeting dates, and agenda deadlines, prior to the commencement of each calendar year.
   b. Developing with the Chair, a meeting forward work programme (to be tabled at every meeting) to support the members of the Forum to direct the nature and the purpose of their meetings for the year.
   c. Providing for meetings with the Chair and relevant support staff/providers ahead of Forum meetings to ensure meetings are effective and productive.
   d. Preparation and distribution of the agenda as directed by the Chair
   e. Provision of secretarial and democracy support to the Chair and the Forum meetings to ensure that resolutions are run effectively, and decisions are recorded correctly.
   g. Providing governance advice regarding conduct of Forum meetings and develop or review any policy or standard of the Forum that supports effective interaction between the members of the Forum and also any interaction with the public at a meeting.
   h. Arranging an effective and safe meeting venue for Hauraki Gulf Forum meetings and workshops.
   i. Arranging any catering services required by the Chair.

2. Provide general management support, including:
   a. Being the first point of contact for Forum inquiries and work closely with the democracy services provider, the financial services provider, and the communications service provider to ensure meetings cover the relevant matters
   b. Supporting the Chair and the Forum to develop an annual staff work programme, a meeting forward work programme and an annual budget, for approval at Forum meeting.
   c. Keeping the Chair updated of any variances to the annual budget and report half yearly to the Forum on actual and forecast expenditure.
   d. Leading, coordinating and project managing the successful delivery of agreed Forum projects.
   e. Managing contracts/contractors to support the delivery for the Forum's work programme.
   f. Supporting the Forum to deliver its statutory reporting obligations, including the Annual Report and State of the Environment report.
   g. Coordinating constituent party reporting in a manner that supports the Forum to co-ordinate activity and budget across jurisdictional boundaries.
   h. Meeting with constituent party bodies at least once annually to inform them of the work of the Forum
   i. Coordinating the Technical Officers Group meetings, including scheduling, hosting, preparing agendas and minutes as required.
   j. Providing technical and governance advice and input to the Forum, Forum members, consistent party representatives, stakeholders and the general public.
3. Provide financial management support, including:
   a. Administering the member contributions.
   b. Producing financial reports as required, but not less than biannually.
   c. When directed, seeking funding contributions from other funding agencies and
      administering these funds in a transparent manner.
   d. In conjunction with the Forum Chair, set internal policies for the oversight and
      management of the Hauraki Gulf Forum revenue and expenditure.

4. Provide communications management support, including:
   a. Development of press releases to support the effective work of the Forum.
   b. Management and use of any logo or proprietary material developed by the forum.
   c. Co-ordination with other agencies (including individual Forum constituent parties)
      on the public release of documents or media announcements including the use of
      their logos.

5. Provide adequate records to the Auckland Council to enable the Auckland Council to meet
   its records requirements as set out in Section 27 of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act.

The Hauraki Gulf Forum members agree that:

6. On an annual basis at a Hauraki Gulf Forum meeting, the Forum will formally agree the work
   programme and associated budget for the following financial year including:
   a. The quantum of membership contribution payable for the following financial year.
   b. The costs of administrative and servicing functions of the Forum, to be supplied by
      the Administrative Authority in accordance with this agreement.

7. On an annual basis when formally agreeing the budget for the following financial year, consider
   appropriate allocation of any accumulated funds.

8. A review of the effectiveness of the Administering Authority support will be undertaken at
   least every three years as directed by the Chair.

Agreement term

9. The term of this agreement is from date of resolution and will expire on date of resolution
   plus three years (as per section 28(1) of the Act, a minimum of three years), with an option
   to renew for a further three years.

10. The Forum acknowledge that the administering authority is employing staff to fulfil the
    administering authority functions, and therefore, should there be an intention not to renew
    this decision will take into account the employment arrangements of the Auckland Council.

Date adopted