

CLIFTON TO TANGOIO COASTAL HAZARDS STRATEGY 2120

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN CELL ASSESSMENT PANEL WORKSHOP 7

HELD AT THE HB REGIONAL COUNCIL, DALTON ST, NAPIER,
AT 9.00 A.M. ON THURSDAY 15 JUNE 2017

PRESENT

Panel Members:

Martin Bates, Tom Evers-Swindell, Mike Harris, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi (late apology), Paul Hursthouse, Peter Kay, Brent McNamara, Bruce Meredith, Keith Newman, Aki Paipper, Jagwinder Pannu, Duncan Powell, Maurice Smith, David Wells, Mark Mahoney, Jamie Thompson.

Observers:

Mark Clews, Larry Dallimore, Graeme Hansen, Rod Heaps, Trudy Kilkolly, Bruce Lochhead, Dean Moriarty, Tom Belford, Ann Redstone, Gary Clode.

Facilitation Team:

Peter Beaven (Chair), Simon Bendall, Stephen Daysh, Monique Thomsen (Minutes), Aramanu Ropiha (Kaitiaki o te Roopu)

Technical Advisors:

Jonathan Clarke (Tonkin & Taylor), Emma Ryan, Paula Blackett, Mike Allis, (The Edge Team), Shane Cronin (Auckland University)

APOLOGIES

Jan Seaman, Connie Norgate, Waylyn Tahuri-Whaipakanga

WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING MATTERS

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting acknowledging the members from the Edge team and Tonkin & Taylor.

The Chairman had advised at the last workshop Des Ratima had resigned from the panel as Kaumatua. Aramanu Ropiha has agreed to be the Kaitiaki o te Roopu for both Northern and Southern Panels. The Chairman welcomed Aramanu.

Aramanu Ropiha opened the meeting with a karakia.

The Chairman also advised he would need to step out for approximately one hour mid-morning to meet with the Minister of Science and Innovation who Edge were meeting to discuss their work programme.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of Workshop 6 (25 May 2017) had been pre-circulated.

Motion

That the Minutes of Workshop 6 (25 May 2017) be confirmed as a true and correct record.

The motion was moved (Duncan Powell), seconded (Peter Kay) and carried.

There were matters arising;

Maurice Smith queried if the survey recently undertaken by the Edge team was available to the panels. Emma Ryan advised the report was in draft and would be available to circulate in approximately 2 weeks. It was noted that there were 324 responders to the survey undertaken in the wider community (Napier/Hastings region).

Action: Emma to circulate a copy of the report on the survey to the panel once available.

Aramanu Ropiha advised the panel that the process for finalising the Report on Cultural Values Assessment had changed. There would now not be a hui-a-hapu, the report would instead be peer reviewed by hapū representatives nominated by the mana whenua reps on the Panels/Joint Committee and adopted before being finalised for circulation to the panels before workshop 8.

Simon Bendall provided an update on each of the current action items.

AGENDA REVIEW / WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Simon Bendall provided an overview of the workshop which includes presentations by Tonkin & Taylor, a MCDA trial exercise, looking at and finalising the criteria ahead of workshop 8.

PRESENTATION: T&T AND EDGE – OPTION SCREENING AND RECOMMENDED OPTIONS SHORT LIST & RECOMMENDED PATHWAYS FOR EACH PRIORITY UNIT

Jonathan Clarke (Tonkin & Taylor) and Mike Allis (NIWA/the Edge) provided a powerpoint presentation on Option Refinement and Pathway Development. Due to a large number of options in each unit the technical team had been asked by the Panel to reduce the number of pathways for MCDA scoring and to remove the options that have limited benefit or are considered impracticable from a technical perspective. It was noted that the nominal timeframes were identified as; short = 1-20 years, medium = 20-50 years, long = 50-100 years. The presentation was split into two parts as follows:

Part One – Option Screening; Jon and Mike discussed each of the 18 options that had originally been developed by the panels and noted reasons those options were either included, discarded or grouped with another option for going into the scoring.

The panels discussed the options. Tom raised his concerns around the option that represented the railway irons along the beach in Te Awanga. His concerns were around the implications of removing those irons if the option was removed noting that those irons have been in place for 45 years. Jon noted that anything in place now would not need to be removed in the short term but if still in place it could be better maintained. It was agreed to include the vertical permeable sill (which is the technical term for this type of structure) into beach maintenance as a grouped option. There were concerns raised for Haumoana where panel members noted that the stopbank/groyne area has deteriorated, gravel comes up onto the road, and this is a very vulnerable area. Control structure options in this area had not been removed but grouped. There was also some discussion on ground water table which is not being looked at currently due to limited data and science available. There is a current project being run by GNS which is looking at some of this work, so in future revisions of the Strategy it can be included.

The Panel resolved to accept the recommendations for the screening of options.

Motion

To adopt shortlisted options as recommended by Tonkin & Taylor and Edge.
Tom / Martin (Carried)

Part Two –Pathway Development

Handouts provided [pathways for each priority unit]

Simon provided an overview of the handouts and Jon had on screen the maps showing the hazards in the priority units.

Mark Mahoney questioned the maps and specifically the inundation coming 600m inland noting that 3.5 m was the highest you could get. He said he had raised this query with Craig Goodier last year. In response it was noted that the reports undertaken by Tonkin & Taylor had been peer reviewed by Dr Paul Kench and the engineers at HBRC and there was confidence the mapping information was accurate based on current information and knowledge.

Action: Mark to forward his email sent to Craig to the HB Coast email account for TAG & T&T to respond to.

Clifton

Jon showed the inundation and erosion areas for Clifton on the HB Hazard maps.

The panel discussed the 6 recommended pathways identified for Clifton. The sea wall already in place was noted as being similar to pathway 5. There was a request around having a key to identify what the colours represented for each pathway. In response to a query about the socio-economic analysis that Maven undertook in their SROI work it was explained that the Real Options Analysis (ROA) that Dr Adolf Stroombergen would undertake between workshop 8 and 9 would look at the costs of removing houses and relocation of properties etc. It was also noted that there is a Funding Module group established working alongside the panels and they were looking into funding mechanisms for the strategy as a whole including the recommended pathways. Any preferred pathway option would still potentially require changes to planning documents, resource consents, an assessment around avoiding, remedying or mitigation of effects, and the detailed design needed to refine the preferred pathways. It was requested that a note be added to pathway 1 – wall, creating value adjacent, and that the discussion on economic analysis.

The panel approved the 6 recommended pathways identified for Clifton, with the amendments to the pathway sheets to be undertaken as noted by Jon and Simon.

Te Awanga

Jon showed inundation and erosion for Te Awanga on the HB Hazard maps.

The panel discussed the 6 recommended pathways identified for Te Awanga, One of the issues raised related to the protection and knock on effects of inundation on the Tukituki river mouth and how to defend this, and it was agreed to add this matter into the notes of pathway 1 for clarification.

The panel also discussed the area in between Te Awanga and Haumoana and if there was room for a lagoon as an option to ameliorate the inundation flooding effects. However, it was noted that the wetland area would not provide protection to homes as there was not enough space to be effective for this, although there could potentially some environmental benefits from such as approach. It was agreed this area was best to leave in its natural state and if the road flooded that was acceptable.

The panel approved the 6 recommended pathways identified for Te Awanga.

Haumoana

Jon showed inundation and erosion for Haumoana on the HB Hazard maps.

The panel discussed the 6 recommended pathways identified for Haumoana. It was noted that pathway 1 was a staged Managed Retreat approach and matters discussed included the effectiveness of renourishment for the 21 houses currently at risk. If shingle was placed in front of the 21 houses and where that shingle would be sourced from. It was noted that this was a high-level pathway and that the economic analysis would need to broadly assess all of the economic implications of a managed retreat scenario, but at this stage it would not get down to too fine a detail. It was noted that pathway 4 required the word 'Structures' to be added to the short-term title to read 'Renourishment & Control Structures',

Keith raised the point that focusing just on the 21 houses (H21) was too narrow. His view was this was about the Cape View Corner, the whole area not just H21. The panel agreed that this whole Cape View Corner area was very vulnerable and to refer to the area as Cape View Corner and not focus specifically on H21. The panel requested some clarification on pathway 6 due to the Sea Wall being shown as an option for all three short to long term timeframes, given the Sea Wall was required in front of the at risk H21 but was not required in the short term for Haumoana in the short term. Jon noted that in this pathway the construction of the seawall would likely be staged over time. Descriptions in regards to the Cape View Corner are to be added to the note sections, with different colours to be used for the staging process for the seawall establishment for this pathway. The pathway should also identify mitigation of any seawall effects to the north which would need to be factored in, and clarification that any sea wall should be a rock revetment. There was also discussion on whether groynes would be an effective means of protecting the Cape View corner and other properties, and it was noted that any groynes would also require ongoing renourishment and maintenance.

Action: Jon/Keith to supply revision to T&T to cover options.

In pathway 4 & 5 it was noted that stop banks would need to be raised and lagoons engineered to reduce inundation risk. The panel discussed lagoons and flood gates and queried if the flood gates had been discounted, and it was agreed that the notes needed refining as flood gates by the river still had to be considered.

The panel approved the 6 recommended pathways identified for Haumoana.

Clive

Jon showed inundation and erosion for Clive on the HB Hazard maps.

The panel discussed the 4 recommended pathways identified for Clive, and it was noted that inundation was the biggest risk in this area. Bruce queried why planting had been discarded as an option, noting at the Workshop 3 site visit the panels discussed that in the past the beach/crest was covered with boxthorn; and when this was removed erosion accelerated. It was agreed that it would be helpful if some form of planting could be re-established and that planting would be added into the Status Quo option in pathway 1. It was also noted that planting is a useful additional action for many pathways and this can be recorded as an additional recommendation from the Panel.

The panel approved the 4 recommended pathways identified for Clive.

The panel also discussed the mouth of the Ngaruroro River and the impacts and effects of putting in a permanent mouth to train the river, the impacts of the 2 existing groynes, accretion build up back to Clive as a benefit of not extracting from the coast at Awatoto.

Action: TAG to chase up the questions and answers from the EIT Supplementary session.

OCTOPUS ISLAND: TRIAL MCDA

Stephen Daysh provided an overview of the Octopus Island trial MCDA exercise. The purpose of the exercise was to give the Panels the opportunity to try MCDA out as a process on a

hypothetical renewable energy options exercise for a Pacific Island, to see how it works in practice before applying it at Workshop 8.

The panel read through the case study before they broke out into 6 small groups to undertake the MCDA exercise. The groups reported back to the panel. Stephen summed up the commentary and noted this exercise was a good chance for the panels to understand how the MCDA process worked.

The Chair introduced Shane Cronin of the University of Auckland who is a part of the National Science Challenge - Resilience to Nature's Challenge. Shane introduced himself to the panel and advised he had met with Hon Paul Goldsmith, Minister of Science and Innovation this morning on a site visit to key coastal erosion/hazards sites.

PRESENTATION: LOOKING AHEAD TO WORKSHOP 8

Simon Bendall outlined the process looking ahead to the next workshop scheduled for 6 July 2017 which covered; refining how MCDA would be applied by the panels; finalising the criteria; and weighting the criteria.

He noted that TAG have held 3 test MCDA sessions to refine the application of MCDA to this process before it was applied by the panels. This was important, to respond to the particular matters raised by the panels as they have advanced their work, and to ensure the process was manageable.

The panel discussed the key issues that were identified by TAG as part of this review process, being; the high number of options short listed; how to deal with combination options; and how to deal with the 100 year timeframe. The solutions agreed for these issues is as follows:

Issue 1 - High number of options

Solution: T&T + Edge option screening process

Solution: Technical Criteria "pre-scored"

Issue 2 – Combination Options

Solution: Present options as "whole of unit" concept plans

Solution: Provide for supporting actions to identified / recommended

Issue 3 – Time

Solution: Apply MCDA to options expressed as simplified pathways: Short Term - Medium Term - Long Term

Simon outlined the process for Workshop 8, in which the scoring will be completed and the highest scoring pathway (in the absence of consideration of cost) is identified for each priority unit. Simon advised that the Real Options Analysis work by Dr Adolf Stroombergen would take place in between Workshop 8 and 9, and in Workshop 9 the pathways are refined in response to Dr Stroombergen's economic analysis.

CONFIRMING MCDA CRITERIA AND ASSIGNING WEIGHTINGS

Simon discussed the MCDA criteria and noted that through the MCDA test sessions, TAG had identified some further recommended refinements to MCDA Criteria and that minor wording changes were proposed to assist with interpretation and scoring. The panel agreed to the refinements of technical assessment criteria 3 and 4. The panel also agreed that all the criteria tabled were now final for the MCDA evaluation process.

To assign the MCDA criteria with a weighting the criteria must be 'weighted' on a scale of 1 to 3 being; 1 = important, 2 = very important and 3 = critical. Stephen and Simon provided an

overview on weighting the criteria, the panel discussed and challenged each other and ultimately applied a weighting number for each criteria.

An agreed weighting for the 'Risk Transfer' criterion was not able to be negotiated and therefore the panel went to a vote over whether a weighting of 1 or 2 should be applied for this criterion.

The panel voted to weight the 'Risk transfer' criterion a 1, by 11 votes to 4.

Panel members who voted for 1 = important; Bruce Meredith, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi, Aki Paipper, Jamie Thompson, Brent McNamara, Paul Hursthouse, Martin Bates, Tom Evers-Swindell, Peter Kay, Dave Wells and Jagwinder Pannu.

Panel members who voted for 2 = very important; Mike Harris, Maurice Smith, Keith Newman, Duncan Powell.

Note: Mark Mahoney had left the meeting before the panel voted, and Waylyn Tahuri-Whaipakanga and Connie Norgate were absent from the meeting and did not vote.

EDGE EVALUATION SHEET

Evaluation sheets were handed out, with a reminder that the survey was also available for on-line completion.

CLOSING

Aramanu Ropiha closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 4.56 p.m.

AGREED ACTIONS:

Task	Meeting / Agenda Item	Actions	Resp.	Status/Comment
1.	Workshop 6, CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	Circulate a compiled list of questions and answers from the technical panel from the supplementary workshop.	Monique	Compiled list of questions with answers from the technical panel will be circulated once compiled.
2.	Workshop 6, REPORT ON CULTURAL VALUES ASSESSMENT	Arrange for hui-a-hapu at Matahiwi and Tangoio Maraes.	TAG	Arrange a hui-a-hapu – has been superceded.
3.	Workshop 6, REPORT ON CULTURAL VALUES ASSESSMENT	Schedule a wananga for panel members following further discussion with hapu	TAG	Completed.