

**REPORT of JOINT HEARING COMMITTEE
On the DRAFT PORIRUA HARBOUR and CATCHMENT STRATEGY and ACTION PLAN
31 October 2011**

OVERVIEW

There were a total of 23 written submissions and 6 of these were heard in support of their submissions. Submissions were presented by:

- Jeremy Collyns (Horokiri landowner)
- Sylvia Jenkins (Friends of Maara Roa Inc)
- Paul Petitt (Paremata Boating Club)
- Dr John McKoy (Pauatahanui Inlet Community Trust)
- Grant Baker, Lindsay Gow & Wendy Barry (Porirua Harbour and Catchment Community Trust)
- Dr Paul Blaschke (Consultant ecologist)

Seventeen submissions expressed support for the Strategy. There were no opposing submissions.

Five submissions had single- issue concerns. One submission was purely informational.

Most submissions raised matters they wanted considered as improvements to incorporate into the main Strategy and Action Plan document and the separate supplementary Detailed Action Plan (referred to in this report as the 'DAP') associated with the main document.

OVERWHELMING SUPPORT

The majority of written and supporting verbal submissions (17) were strongly in support of the strategy. Samples of comments include the following:

At last I feel we can see strong action combined with vision by people prepared to tackle the protection and restoration of this regional asset.

I support any initiative that improves the environment we use now and in the future.

...wholehearted support for the concept, aims and objectives of the Strategy

... a key mechanism for improving the Porirua Harbour water and sediment quality

Overall we are greatly impressed by this document and particularly the outcomes planned

We are delighted at the progress that has been made to date and with the evident determination of the territorial authorities and others to protect the harbour.

...the strategy is well structured and balanced and forms an excellent basis for guiding future action...

It is a vital reference for monitoring progress.

Strongly endorses and supports the...Plan.

...a unique and timely means for setting both the framework and priorities for environmentally sustainable harbour and catchment management, development and restoration.

... will add greatly to improving the condition of a nationally significant estuary with valued vegetation and threatened species.

...commend you on your leadership and commitment, to running an interagency approach that has engaged extensively with stakeholders and the public.

The framework is easy to follow... is solution-focused and uses best available information to support management decisions

It is excellent to see catchment restoration, conservation and enhancement as a priority as this is at the core of a healthy harbour system.

...excellent... good prospects for reversing the trends of degradation observed in recent decades.

ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

A number of constructive comments and suggested or requested improvements were submitted. The rest of this report summarises those matters, provides recommendations and an explanation for each recommendation.

1. Strengthen 'Education & Awareness' provisions

An effective Education and Awareness programme was repeatedly seen as one of the key actions towards successful implementation of the Strategy and achieving its key objectives of sediment reduction. A variety of suggestions and requests were made to strengthen the education provisions of the Strategy and ensure their implementation. These included.

- a. Inclusion of specific education initiatives such as:
 - Sub-catchment stream adoption programmes for primary schools
 - Monitoring and research programmes for secondary and tertiary institutions
 - Targeted training for businesses, home owners and developers
 - Community planting programmes
 - Workshops for recreational users
 - Regular catchment newsletters
- b. Education initiatives coordination.
- c. Development of a detailed education and awareness action plan or strategy.
- d. Use of "artistic" avenues to promote the Strategy and Strategy values.

Recommendations:

- That the wording of Action Plan item SB9 be amended to read, “*Plan and implement a public and business-specific education programme.*” (Amended wording underlined).
- That the specified education initiatives suggested by submissions be included in the amended SB9 item of the DAP as potential actions to be considered in an education programme.

Explanation:

The Committee considered that the amendments strengthen and better express the education intent of the Strategy and submission suggestions.

2. Establish a ‘catchment ranger/education officer’ position.

Submissions considered that a dedicated officer to undertake an educative, monitoring and enforcement role within the Porirua Harbour catchment is critical to facilitate education and compliance activities and achievement of strategy objectives.

Submissions requested that Action Plan item SC3 be re-prioritised and “immediate priority” be given to resourcing and establishment of either a full time catchment ranger or an education officer.

Recommendations:

- Action Plan item SC3 be amended to read, “*Establish and resource a full-time ‘catchment ranger/education officer’.*”
- Action plan item SC3 be re-prioritised and advanced from ‘long-term opportunity’ to ‘Immediate priority – to activate over the next three years’.

Explanation:

The Committee agrees that such an educative/compliance position would significantly facilitate implementation of the Strategy and that joint councils consider how best to facilitate dedicated staffing resources to educational and compliance activities specifically within the Porirua Harbour catchment.

3. Clarify how the management principle of ‘Integrated management’ (No1, p7) will be facilitated.

Submissions wanted inclusion of information regarding the following:

- a. How a multi-agency approach will be facilitated
- b. How decision-making affecting harbour and catchment resources will be coordinated
- c. Clearer indication of general mechanisms for achieving coordination in planning, operations, monitoring and review.

Recommendations:

- Amend on P7 of the Strategy, 'The Management Principles', bullet point 2 under '(1) Integrated management...' by replacing "Facilitate a" with "*Maintain and, where appropriate, improve the current*" multi-agency... approach.
- Amend the 'Agency involvement' section on p13 by inserting a paragraph after the second, bullet-pointed paragraph, to read the following:

"The existing information sharing and coordination inter-agency groups – Porirua Harbour Interagency Advisory Group (PHIAG) and Porirua Harbour Science Group – and the key stakeholder (three councils and the Runanga) executive oversight group – the Strategy Reference Team – will be maintained to facilitate coordination of Strategy implementation."

Explanation:

The Committee believes that the amendment clarifies that existing coordination groups who were signatories to a Memorandum of Understanding supporting and participation in the development of the Strategy will continue.

4. Clarify how the management principle of 'Community involvement' (Strategy, p7, No.5) will be facilitated.

Improvement was sought to clarify bullet point 2 under 'Effective community... involvement' regarding how this management principle will be applied.

Recommendation:

No change.

Explanation:

The point concerned is simply a principle that will be applied. The Committee considered the later section on 'Community and business involvement' on page 13 provides adequate explanation.

5. Better expression of current levels of sedimentation

A submission requested "sharper and more specific" comment on the current rates of sedimentation on p8.

Recommendation:

No change

Explanation:

The Committee understood that the actual current rates of sedimentation within Porirua Harbour are unknown, as stated by paragraph 2 under 'Excessive sedimentation rates' on

page 8. Current sedimentation rates will be the subject of planned research over the 2011/12 summer. Improvements to data given in the Strategy will be incorporated in the three year review. Research findings, including improved understandings and data, will be appropriately shared and made publicly available.

6. Improved sediment/land management controls

Various submissions requested improved erosion and sediment control and enforcement. Specific requests included the following:

- Urgency be given to stream edge restoration
- Increased 'teeth' for erosion and sediment control guidelines
- Recognition of the impact of the proposed National Environmental Standard (NES) on Plantation Forestry
- Coordinated hunting programme for wild pig and goat (to also protect vegetation)
- Recognition and better control of sediment problems from rural-residential building platforms

Recommendations:

- No change (with the following exception)
- Recognise the potential individual and cumulative impact of rural-residential building platforms through specific mention in existing provisions in DAP action item SB4 – 'Review rural land management guidelines' – with the addition of "*rural-residential*" to recognised sources and "*building platforms*" to specifically listed land uses.

Explanation:

The Committee considers that existing provisions and intentions within the Strategy are appropriate and realistic.

There is a range of actions underway (e.g. action SA5 - plan changes to increase earthworks control) or planned (e.g. actions SB5 and SB6 – prepare and implement a whole-of-catchment re-vegetation plan) which will work on the issues of riparian restoration, and refining the use and application of sediment and erosion control guidelines.

The Committee also considers that existing provisions can accommodate the kind of directive that is likely from an NES on Plantation Forestry, while pest management control is covered by a Regional Pest Management Strategy. Improvement in these provisions is considered beyond the scope of the Harbour Strategy.

7. Improved management of regional parks within the Porirua Harbour catchment.

Submissions recognise the significant contribution that Whitireia, Battle Hill and, particularly, Belmont regional parks make to the health of the harbour and streams flowing from or through the parks. The following additional actions are sought:

- A review of priority and provision for implementing the Belmont Regional Park Sustainable Land Use Plan as per Action Plan item EA14
- Prioritize work on protection fencing, pest control and other enhancements to native forest covenants in Belmont Regional Park.

Recommendations:

- Amend Action EA14 wording to, *"Implementing the Greater Wellington Parks NETWORK Plan and the individual regional park operational plan."*
- Delete EA10, EB5 and EB6 referring to Belmont and Whitireia park management plans.
- Renumber the Actions in the Action Plan & DAP accordingly.

Explanation:

The Committee understands that proposed sustainable land use plans for Belmont, Battle Hill and Whitireia parks have now been incorporated into and replaced by individual parks' operational plans and that concerns regarding fencing, pest control and forest covenants are covered by these operational plans.

The recommended rewording and deletions reflect and accommodate the plan provision changes.

8. Lack of a Cannons Creek Lakes Management Plan

Submissions were made regarding a number of items relating to the existence of a Cannons Creek Lakes Management Plan (EA8).

Recommendations:

- Amend Strategy Action EA8 wording to, *"Preparing and implementing a Porirua Reserves Management Plan"* and the appropriate changes to the EA8 item in the DAP.

Explanation:

The Committee understands that any planning for the Cannons Creek Lakes Reserve will now be incorporated into a proposed Porirua Reserves Management Plan which is currently in preparation and scheduled for release and public consultation early in 2012.

9. Recognition of "dredging" within the Strategy.

A number of submissions had solitary queries around dredging, covering the following:

- "Why no mention of dredging?"
- That dredging be added as a fourth key objective of the Strategy.
- Elimination of the "mud flats" as the only way to allow greater flushing of the harbour.
- Addition of a "paramount objective of action to reverse sedimentation and restore tidal flows".

- Information on the “possible dangers of dredging” is included in the Strategy.

Recommendations:

- No change to the Strategy except as below.
- Add the following words below the current last paragraph of the 'Excessive sedimentation rates' section on p8.

"Dredging could be a tool for managing sediments (such as mud, sand, and gravel) in Porirua Harbour and may assist with improved harbour flushing, navigability or beach replenishment.

However, dredging provides a number of challenges, including its impacts on ecology and coastal processes, costs, resource consents, supporting research, and what to do with contaminated sediments.

The Strategy and Action Plan recognises that sand and mud flats are natural features of estuaries, but that excessive sedimentation rates are a problem for Porirua Harbour."

Explanation:

The Hearing Committee considered that dredging is adequately mentioned explicitly or implicitly as a potential management tool within the Strategy in the following places:

- Page 10, Table 1: third bullet point under ‘Reduce sedimentation rates’, “localised management of sandbanks”. Dredging would be the most obvious option for achieving this.
- Page 11, Table 2: In the right hand ‘Comments’ column under ‘Reduce sedimentation rates’, paragraph 2 specifically states that the joint councils are funding current research into the feasibility and effectiveness of localised dredging.
- Page 12 under ‘Current activities’, bullet point 4 implies the possibility of dredging when referring to improving harbour flushing capacity
- Page 14: Bullet point 2 under ‘Vision’ sets improved harbour flushing as a goal of ‘Reduce rates of sedimentation’ and in the context of other references within the Strategy, dredging is one option, and actively being investigated.
- Page 14 under the ‘Current Activity’ column, ‘Research’ section, item SA22 states that harbour sediment management needs and options are being investigated. The descriptors for SA22 in the DAP (p13) specifically refer to the potential for “targeted dredging” as the focus for these investigations.
- Page 15, item SC2 indicates a medium term priority to “Develop and implement a harbour sediment management programme”. The descriptor for SC2 in the DAP (p16) specifically refers to a “targeted dredging programme”.
- Page 21 describing the vision for a future Porirua Harbour: In the context of references to harbour sediment management and dredging throughout the Strategy (and DAP), the second paragraph, “An improved flushing regime is achieved” could in part be assisted by well-researched, localised dredging.

The Committee also considered that dredging was not an “objective” but rather an option for sediment management. Dredging is a possible tool, not an outcome.

The Committee further considered that sand and mud flats are a natural and essential feature of most estuaries, including Porirua Harbour. Their elimination would be both unnatural, impractical and have a severe impact on harbour ecology. Excessive harbour sediment (including mud) is, however, an issue. Scientific advice provides a consistent message: that the sources of excessive sediment must be dealt with as a priority to facilitate any successful and sustainable harbour restoration. Localised dredging is being investigated (Action Plan item SA22) to explore flushing and navigability (see next item (10) below) improvements. Man-made structures, such as bridges, will also have an impact on harbour flushing and Action SC7 (Investigation of harbour structures) signals intended research of medium priority to investigate this.

Sedimentation is a natural phenomenon in estuaries and cannot be reversed, only reduced. Hence the key objective, “Reduce sedimentation rates”. Tidal flows remain strong and functional, but diminished in parts of the harbour. Reduction in tidal prism and flows are another natural aspect of estuaries, but it is their accelerated loss in Porirua Harbour that is concerning. Action items SA19 (harbour modelling), SA20 (bathymetric survey), SA22 (Sediment management investigation), SB12 (Ongoing surveys) and SC7 (harbour structures investigations) are a prioritised series of actions to better understand and identify possible options to maintain the tidal prism and flows. There is also multiple current and planned actions to reduce sediment inputs to the harbour.

The Committee considered that the recommended addition of succinct information on dredging will provide some understanding of the complex issues involved. It may also assure concerned public that the Strategy and its advisors are fully aware of these complexities as options are being explored for managing harbour sediments.

10. Maintain or improve navigability

Submission was made about the needs of small boats in respect of access and navigability and boating safety within Pauatahanui Inlet. The Inlet is a training ground for a significant number of small sailing boats skippered by youth. A submission set out the requirements for safe small boat activity as the following:

- Navigability across sand flats and channels in Browns Bay
- Sufficiently wide channels at low tide to allow beating to windward
- Navigable water south of Grays Road, requiring a minimum 1 metres depth at low tide
- A very localised and limited channel dredging programme.

Recommendations:

- No change to strategy

Explanation:

The Committee considered that a number of Strategy actions (particularly SA19 [harbour modelling], SA22 [Harbour sediment investigations], and SB12 [regular bathymetric surveys]) will assist assessment of harbour sediment management options directly affecting small boat activities.

The Committee accepts that PCC and GWRC will continue to liaise with harbour users, particularly small boat users, on the requirements, research and practical options for maintaining or, where possible, improving navigability consistent with identified needs.

The Committee noted that the submitters who commented and presented to the Hearing Committee on this issue considered that it was “more urgent” to reduce sediment input to the harbour and that as well as benefits to navigability, dredging also has adverse impacts that required considered and careful management.

11. Community involvement in Strategy review process

A number of submissions expressed concerns that the Strategy review process on p20 is unclear about community involvement in the 3-yearly Strategy review process.

Recommendation:

Amend the ‘Monitoring, reporting and review’ section on p20 with the addition to paragraph four, “... and public and agency consultation.”

Explanation:

Public and agency involvement in the review process was envisaged by the Strategy. However, the Committee considered that the current strategy wording was not explicit and that this recommended additional wording and the additional recommended provisions of item 23 below (relating to improved governance provisions) would help clarify the matter.

12. Recognition of northern (Aotea) tidal lagoons

A request was made that the lagoons between State highway 1 and Papakowhai be considered in any harbour restoration.

Recommendation:

No change.

Explanation:

Lagoon restoration will be considered as part of ‘Ecological Restoration’ actions EB2 and EB3 (p19) regarding the preparation and implementation of an estuary re-vegetation plan.

13. Recognition and protection of threatened bird species

A submission from the Ornithological Society of New Zealand (OSNZ) highlighted the significance of Pauatahanui Inlet to New Zealand and international wetland bird species and sought better recognition of this within the Strategy.

Recommendation:

That the descriptive section on Porirua Harbour (p2) be amended by adding the following wording to paragraph 4:

“Pauatahanui Inlet is a nationally significant location for wetland bird species: Eighteen (51%) out of 35 wetland bird species recorded in Pauatahanui Inlet have conservation threat rankings of ‘Threatened’ and ‘At Risk’.”

Explanation:

The Committee considered this is important factual information that will enhance the Strategy and is worthy of inclusion. The recommended wording was supplied in the OSNZ submission.

14. Preparation of a health warning plan

Regional Public Health (RPH) submitted that a risk communication plan be developed involving PCC, GWRC and RPH to address the provision of public health information on shellfish gathering.

Recommendations:

- Add a new action to the ‘Education’ section of the ‘Immediate Priority’ column on p17 to read, *“Develop a health risk communications plan for Porirua Harbour”* and identify RPH, PCC & GW as lead agencies and a consequent amendment to the DAP.

Explanation:

The Committee considered that a health risk communication plan was an important and necessary additional action for inclusion within the Strategy.

15. Improved enforcement

Submissions requested strengthening of enforcement provisions.

Recommendation:

No change

Explanation:

The Committee considered that there was adequate provision in the Strategy.

16. Improve Strategy targets

Some submissions had concerns about the long time frames or ambitious targets on pp10-11. This included the submission that long time frame targets were demotivating for the public, and that shorter or more interim targets should be considered.

Recommendation:

No change

Explanation:

The Committee considered that each current target within the Strategy had been carefully considered and arrived at by a panel of New Zealand and local scientific experts and resource planners in the light of the best available information. All targets will be continually reviewed, and formally revised as part of the 3-yearly Strategy review. The current targets are considered as realistic, while also being aspirational.

The Committee also considered that the education programmes, (SB9 and SB10) as discussed in Item 1 of this report, will be a critical factor in engaging and recruiting public support and identifying more palatable 'bite-sized' projects to meet the long-term targets.

17. Prioritising actions

Submissions expressed concerns that with many different current and future priority actions listed in the Action Plan that there was a danger of promoting less effective or limited effect actions and therefore some additional prioritising should take place.

Recommendation:

No change

Explanation:

The Committee considered that most of the current and proposed Strategy actions had already undergone some 'vetting' process against prioritising criteria, often involving other objectives than solely improving the condition of Porirua Harbour and waterways. Re-prioritising would be complex and difficult.

There are a number of existing review avenues. All actions will be formally reconsidered with the 3-yearly Strategy review process, but there is further opportunity to review and change the priority of actions through Annual Plan reporting and the Long Term Plan review process of the respective councils. The Porirua Harbour Inter-agency Advisory Group (PHIAG), Harbour Strategy Team and the Harbour Science Group will also have an on-going responsibility to review the cost/effectiveness of many actions and programmes.

The Committee accepted that those who developed the Strategy recognised that the Strategy was never going to be 'perfect' and that it would need 'tuning' as experience with

the Strategy and actions, new information and new technology would help to refine many elements, including actions and targets.

18. Amending “future outcomes” (p21)

A submission was made that the “goals” or “future outcomes” described on p21 were “an excellent list of what is sought to be achieved” by the Strategy and should be shifted to the front of the Strategy. A submission was also made that these “goals” should be used for reviewing action priorities.

An addition to the outcomes was requested to recognise the enjoyment of the harbour by the regional community.

Recommendations:

- No change to the position of the “future outcomes” statement on page 21
- Amend the heading of this section to read, *“What Porirua Harbour will be like in the future.”*
- Add another paragraph to the outcomes on p21, with the wording, *“Porirua Harbour is used and enjoyed by an increasing proportion of the Wellington region community.”*

Explanation:

The Committee considered that page 21 of the Strategy was a visioning statement outlining a series of hoped for outcomes to be achieved through the Strategy's implementation. These outcomes would be realised through achieving the three key objectives: Reduce sedimentation, reduce pollutants, and restore ecological health. The Committee considered that it is these key objectives that are the deliberate and necessary ‘yardstick’ by which actions need to be measured.

The Committee also considered that the location of the ‘outcomes’ (on p21) at the end of the Strategy is a deliberate design element of the document. One of the most recurring public comments received about the Draft Strategy is that people “loved the story”. The attractive design and readable content of the Strategy takes the reader on a journey from the past, to the present and then the future. The position of the outcomes at the end of the Strategy is the conclusion of the Strategy story but the future of the harbour.

The Committee considered that the omission of the words “we hope” from the heading removes the seeming ‘goal’ rather than outcome intent of p21.

The Committee further considered that 'regional enjoyment' was a significant benefit of Porirua Harbour that warranted recognition in the Strategy.

19. Explicit reference to the Transmission Gully Motorway

A number of submissions noted that there was little direct mention of the Transmission Gully Motorway (TGM) project within the Strategy, yet it was the single largest project likely to impact

the harbour and streams of the harbour. Therefore TGM had the ability to “undo” the work of the Strategy. One submitter described TGM as the “elephant in the whare”.

Submissions expressed a number of concerns about the planning for and impact of TGM, including the need for an independent body to input to the project and monitor performance and report back to the community. The basis for suggested wording of an additional action was provided by submitter and ecologist, Paul Blaschke.

Recommendation:

- Add an action to the ‘Projects’ section of the ‘Immediate Priority’ column under the ‘Reduce rates of sedimentation’ section on p15 with the following wording:

“To investigate the need for a plan for catchment waterway and land management plan related to any major infrastructure projects.”

- Add a consequent new action to the DAP, in which the action descriptor includes,

“To investigate and plan for catchment waterway and land management in conjunction with other Strategy and Action Plan actions, to minimise the input of sediments and pollutants to the Porirua Harbour from any major infrastructure projects.”

Explanation:

The Committee considered that one of the intents of the Strategy was to ‘future proof’ it and not be dominated by any one project such as TGM. There are number of other planned and potentially major infrastructure projects that could affect the values of Porirua Harbour and the intent of the Strategy, and that likewise could be specified in the Strategy. The existing intent and content of the Strategy and the network of supporting agencies, including (in this instance) the New Zealand Transport Agency, were considered adequate. The wording from submitter Dr Paul Blaschke was adapted by the Committee as recognising and providing for independent investigation and mitigation of potential major infrastructure development impacts on the harbour and waterways.

20. Clarify Strategy relationship to other planning documents

A request was made that the Strategy clarifies the relationship between the Strategy and the City Centre Revitalisation Plan and the respective Strategy partners' Long Term Plans (LTP).

Recommendation:

Add the following wording to the Strategy and Action Plan section on pp6-7 of the Strategy:

“The intent of the Strategy will be appropriately reflected in the respective councils' planning documents, such as their Long Term Plans. The councils will also be guided by and will have regard to the Strategy when considering specific actions and programmes for inclusion within their respective Long Term Plans.”

Explanation:

The Committee considered this was an important clarification for inclusion in the Strategy.

21. Addition of stream litter management

An addition was requested for a stream litter management programme complementary to or consistent with action plan item PA14.

Recommendation:

No change.

Explanation:

The Committee considered that the Strategy action PB5 on page 17 provided for a “Review of harbour and catchment litter management programmes”, including the development of a stream litter management programme.

22. Re-prioritising of specific actions

A number of actions were requested to be advanced to a higher and more immediate priority, including the following:

- EC1 – Aquatic and marine species protection plan
- EC2 – Estuary interpretation network
- Acceleration of ecological restoration initiatives

Recommendation:

No change

Explanation:

The Committee noted that a number of ‘Medium Priority’ actions were dependent on the completion or advancement of prior work. Their medium term priority status did not necessarily reflect these actions as having 'lesser' value. For example, the aquatic and marine species plan (EC1) is dependent on EB7 – a fish survey - which is hoped will commence over the 2011/12 summer. There currently is no survey data upon which a protection plan can be based. Equally, the establishment of an interpretation network will be part of an education plan (SB9), and the advancement of specific ecological initiatives will be dependent on EB2 – Preparation of an estuary re-vegetation plan - which in turn will be dependent on EA19 – a feasibility assessment for seagrass restoration – which is currently underway.

23. Improved governance provisions

Submissions expressed concern about the governance structures to oversee and ensure implementation, monitoring and review of the Strategy once finalised.

Recommendation:

- No change to the Strategy.
- The Committee recommends, however, that councils request they receive an annual report outlining progress made on the Porirua Harbour Strategy programmes in the past year and those to be advanced in the coming year to tie in with the financial year and annual reporting processes.
- The Committee also recommends that for the 2015 LTP reviews, councils consider running a consultation process in 2014 similar to that used for the development and adoption of the current strategy, and that a joint hearing committee be appointed at that time to receive and consider submissions.

Explanation:

The Committee recognised that the four key stakeholders (the three councils and the Runanga) have clearly established their commitment to the Strategy as its key sponsors and signatories. The Porirua Harbour Inter-agency Advisory Group (PHIAG) and the Porirua Harbour Science Group will both be maintained and supported by the councils. The Harbour Strategy Coordinator position is also intended to be maintained and, with the finalisation of the Strategy, will increasingly turn to a focus on ensuring Strategy implementation. The Strategy Reference Team of senior officers from councils and the Runanga will likewise continue to support the Coordinator and oversee Strategy implementation.

The Committee recognised the commitment within the Strategy and within the organisations supporting the Strategy and its implementation. However, the Committee also recognised that the governance provisions required clarification and strengthening and that at this time this could most effectively be achieved by the councils requesting an annual joint report setting out the previous year's achievements and forward programme related to implementing the Porirua Harbour Strategy.

The respective councils' Long Term Plan processes and provisions and the three-yearly review of the Strategy and Action Plan also provide another opportunity for project monitoring and revision and provide public accountability.

The Committee also considers that the additional wording recommended in item 3 above (clarifying ongoing facilitation of coordination of Strategy implementation) to be added to the description of 'Integrated management' on p7 and the additional paragraph under 'Agency involvement' on p13 further clarifies oversight of the Strategy programme.

24. Improve clarity of miscellaneous wording

A number of suggestions were made to improve the clarity, consistency and meaning of various parts of the strategy documents:

- a. Split into two the first bullet point on p7 under “Broad priorities”
- b. Amend key Objective 3 ‘Ecological restoration’ to commence with a verb, consistent with the other two key objectives
- c. Explain how education makes a contribution to harbour recovery on p12.

Recommendations:

Adopt all suggestions

- Split the first bullet point under 'Broad priorities' on p7
- Restate key objective 3 'Ecological restoration' to read '*Restore ecological health*' and amend accordingly throughout the strategy documents (pp10, 11, 12, 18 and in DAP pp1 & 27)
- Insert a brief explanation under 'Education and awareness programmes' on p12 stating that, "*Education activities contribute to improved understanding, value formation and behaviour change.*"

Explanation:

The Committee considered that these changes improved the clarity and internal consistency of the Strategy.

25. Clarify community environmental programmes

The Committee noted that the GWRC 'Take Care' programme specifically referred to in SA12 was being phased out. The Committee also understood that GWRC was committed to other community environmental care programmes.

Recommendation:

Remove the words 'Take Care' from action item SA12.

Explanation:

The Committee considered that the amendment of SA12 to "*Maintaining community environmental care programmes*" (i.e. omitting the words "the Take Care") better reflects the programmes that are currently being led by GWRC and any future developments in them.

26. Specific amendments to the Detailed Action Plan supplement.

Numerous additions and amendments were requested to actions in the DAP as follows:

- Include details for key implementation targets for currently unspecific target times and dates for completing many actions.

Recommendation: No Change.

Explanation: All target dates will be refined wherever possible.

- Create electronic links between related actions within the online version of the DAP.

Recommendation: No change to hard copy.

Explanation: PCC will follow up and seek implementation of links on the electronic final DAP where practical.

- Establish targets for 'quick-win' activities and actions.

Recommendation: No change

Explanation: The Committee considered that cost-effective 'quick-win' opportunities would be continually sought by agencies, inter-agency and community groups in applying the Strategy. It would be important however for agencies and groups to clearly publicise where quick wins had or were being achieved.

- Continued review of DAP actions to check whether they are "worth doing or worth continuing."

Recommendation: No change.

Explanation: The Committee considered that on-going informal and 3-yearly formal review of the Strategy has been signalled within the Strategy documents. This was considered to adequately address the call for 'action review'.

- Further information on how "unbudgeted" items and "un-estimated" items will be either budgeted or estimated.

Recommendation: No change.

Explanation: The Committee considered that identifying 'harbour components' of broader programmes not specifically designated to Porirua Harbour was complex and difficult. The use of the terms 'unbudgeted' and 'un-estimated' within the cost descriptor of the DAP reflected that difficulty. No attempt to identify cost components is intended at this stage by the respective agencies, but will be entered in the DAP should additional information become available.

- Linkage of 'PC4 & PC8' regarding transport corridor contaminants to 'EB2 & EB3' regarding an estuary replanting plan, as a way of establishing riparian planting and pollution 'sinks' along road and rail transport corridors.

Recommendation: Enter the appropriate linkage in the respective DAP items.

Explanation: The Committee recognised the potential synergies between these actions and that the appropriate linkages are easily made within the individual items in the DAP.

- Remove any duplication of items PA19 ("Implementing two-yearly sediment quality survey and other harbour monitoring") and EA18 ("Undertaking regular surveys of estuary sediment communities and habitat").

Recommendation: No change.

Explanation: The Committee understood that these were separate programmes surveying different harbour resources and therefore that no change was necessary.

- Confirm or clarify the description under "What do we expect to achieve?" of SB1 ("Align planning documents with the Harbour and Catchment and Action Plan").

Recommendation: No change.

Explanation: The Committee understood that the current description was correct.

- Addition to the current activity item on 'education of business and community' of "drain to stream" (sump plate) programme.

Recommendation: Add a "Drain to harbour/stream" programme to PA17 ("Reviewed and improved the street sump maintenance programme").

Explanation: The Committee noted that a 'Drain to harbour/stream' programme had commenced roll out in the Porirua CBD with possibility for roll out to other target locations once its effectiveness was reviewed.

The merits of a 'Drains to stream' programme should be considered within the action SB9 (a public and business-specific education programme) to prepare a cost-effective education programme. The Committee did not consider that a separate, stand-alone 'Drains to stream' programme would be effective.

- PHACCT seeks recognition and addition to the 'Assisted by' detail of multiple actions.

Recommendation: Officers liaise with PHACCT to accomplish recognition in appropriate actions.

Explanation: The Committee considered that recognition of PHACCT in "Assisted by" sections of the DAP is appropriate in only some of the identified actions.

JOINT COMMITTEE HEARING PANEL 2011

Porirua Harbour and Catchment Strategy and Action Plan

CHAIR – Rawiri Faulkner (Representative for Te Runanga O Toa Rangatira)

Signature: Date:

Cllr Barbara Donaldson (Representative for Greater Wellington Regional Council)

Signature:Date:

Cllr Ngaire Best (Representative for Wellington City Council)

Signature:Date:

Cllr Liz Kelly (Representative for Porirua City Council)

Signature:Date: