



# Ūawa Catchment Working Group

Meeting notes and actions

Hui 2 – 24 July 2024

Held at Tolaga Bay Fire Station at 09:30 AM

<b>Chair</b>	Anne McGuire (stand-in for Pat Seymour until Pat returns in August 2024)
<b>Working Group members present</b>	Victor Walker, Kel Blackman, Richard Powell, Andre Van Haandel, Phil Hope, Mere Tamanui, Horiata Raihania
<b>GDC Staff and consultants</b>	Janic Slupski, Ariel Yann le Chew, Dean Evans Lois Easton, Adele Dawson
<b>Apologies</b>	Karauria Ratapu, Shaun Mitchel, Tim Jefferd, Tiahn Hooper, Desmond McGrannachan

## Agenda

Session 1 – Freshwater	
<b>1. Karakia and housekeeping</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous minutes and action</li> <li>Terms of Reference</li> <li>Remuneration, invoicing</li> </ul>	9.30 – 9.45
<b>2. Recap process</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Freshwater catchment plan – process and output</li> <li>Forestry plan change – process and output</li> </ul>	9.45 – 10.05
<b>3. Alignment with Uawanui Project</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of project</li> <li>Alignment with the Uawa Catchment Plan</li> </ul>	10.05 – 10.35
<b>4. Long Term Vision</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intro, alignment with the Uawanui Project</li> </ul>	10.35 – 10.50
<b>5. Freshwater values</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are they, where are they</li> <li>Values identification exercise</li> </ul>	10.50 – 11.20
<b>6. Environmental outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are they</li> </ul>	11.20 – 11.35
<b>7. Freshwater Management Units</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief introduction</li> </ul>	11.35 – 11.50
<b>8. Wrap up</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summary of session</li> <li>Next steps</li> <li>Thoughts, questions</li> </ul>	11.50 – 12.00
<b>Lunch</b>	12.00 – 12.30
Session 2 – Forestry	
<b>9. Recap</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic and recent context</li> </ul>	12.30 – 13.45

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of key forestry issues</li> <li>• Uawa-specific examples of forestry challenges</li> <li>• Discussion</li> </ul>	
<b>10. Forestry outcomes for Uawa catchment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calibrating against the Uawanui project</li> <li>• Aligning with freshwater outcomes</li> </ul>	13.45 – 14.15
<b>11. Scope of forestry plan change programme</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forestry plan change components</li> <li>• Delivery and timeframes for rollout</li> </ul>	14.15 – 14.45
<b>12. Responding to key forestry issues – options development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catchment Forestry Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rationale</li> <li>○ Approach</li> <li>○ Discussion</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	14.45 – 15.15
<b>13. Wrap up</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of process</li> <li>• Summary of discussion</li> <li>• Next steps</li> <li>• Thoughts, questions</li> </ul>	15.15 – 15.30
<b>14. Closing karakia</b>	15.30

### Supporting documentation

- Terms of Reference

## Summary of actions

Future Action *Refer to Parked List for summary	Current task
---	--------------

### Tasks to be actioned

<b>Notes:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Each task is allocated a unique identifier e.g. T2 for ease of reference</i></li> <li>• <i>The numbering continues from previous meeting minutes</i></li> </ul>			
Task	Actions	Responsible	Due
<b>U-T2</b>	Share the summary document on the Pamoia Forest Quadruple Bottom Line assessment with the Group	GDC	Actioned 13 August
<b>U-T3</b>	Share the summary document on Uawa Catchment's water quality and water quantity monitoring data	GDC	Circulated as part of Hui 1 Agenda pack
<b>U-T4</b>	Share copy of the Riverbank Restoration document	Mere/Victor	Actioned 31 July

## Minutes

### Welcome and housekeeping

1. The hui commenced with a karakia at 9:41 AM. The Chair welcomed the Group and introduced two new staff joining the hui.
2. The Group discussed the feedback emailed by a member of the Group the day before the hui, where the feedback included comments on the draft Hui 1 minutes and the draft Terms of Reference.
3. In summary, the email noted:

- 3.1. The two members who worked in the forestry sector are not representatives of the sector and so should be reflected as such in the draft Hui 1 minutes and Terms of Reference – however the two members can contribute their personal work experience to group discussions. If the Group would want a representative of the forestry sector, either member have indicated their willingness to be replaced by said representative.
  - 3.1.1. Staff, the Chair and the rest of the Group collectively agreed that these two members are the right people for this forum. If an industrial expert is needed at any point of the scheduled hui, the Group can invite the expert onto the meeting for advice – but not as member of the Group. This is to ensure that local voice and local context remains the drivers and input into the catchment planning process.
- 3.2. Minutes (and any other documents) should be circulated to the Group at least a week before the upcoming hui, as stated in the Terms of Reference.
- 3.3. That engagement outside this forum should also include, in addition to tangata whenua and community, the farming and the forestry sectors.
- 3.4. The Terms of Reference noted that members are not to act on national interest – however national interest could still be relevant should the Group seek funding for options such as to retire land or remove ETS liabilities.
  - 3.4.1. The member noted also that outcomes from this forum will have impacts on the region and the nation.
  - 3.4.2. Staff explained that Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) are aware of the need for change in regulations due to Tairāwhiti's unique geology and landscape, not just recently post-Cyclone Gabrielle, but also post-Cyclone Bola which led to the Erosion Control Funding Programme (ECFP).
- 3.5. The information on Plan Change 1 in Appendix 1 of the Terms of Reference assumed that Council has already decided that coupe harvesting is part of the plan change, rather than part of this Group's discussion. The member asked for this to be amended.
  - 3.5.1. The member sought clarification on the statistically robust survey mentioned in the Terms of Reference. Staff explained that the survey informs the economic model (also known as the Quadruple Bottom Line assessment), which incorporates four wellbeings (environment, economic, social, cultural) to understand the benefits and costs of options on each wellbeing.
  - 3.5.2. Staff agreed to share the summary document on the Pamoia Forest Quadruple Bottom Line assessment with the Group.
- 3.6. Clarity on the 'Media' section in Appendix 2 of the Terms of Reference.
  - 3.6.1. The Chair and other members clarified that members of the Group can discuss with relevant parties (e.g. fellow colleagues or managers at work), but not to the media. Public statements or responses to media enquiries will need to be first collectively agreed by the Group and made through the Chair.
4. Other points raised through the discussion (to be included in the amendments) are:
  - 4.1. Comment about taking into account iwi environmental plans and iwi environmental management plans in the development of the catchment plan were not captured in the draft Hui 1 minutes and in clause 3.3 of the Terms of Reference.
  - 4.2. Comment about including site specific assessment for the Catchment Forestry Plan was not captured in the draft Hui 1 minutes.

- 4.3. The rights of mana whenua over water need to be acknowledged. How much water was allocated and who it was allocated to – these will inform policy development.
- 4.4. Iwi and hapū need to have access to their experts. While iwi have the role of reviewing and signing off consents, iwi also need the independence to review and develop policies.
5. Staff responded that the draft Hui 1 minutes and Terms of Reference will be amended following this hui. The Group should email any further feedback or amendments to staff before the agenda pack for the next hui is circulated.
6. The Chair closed this discussion by stating that the Group will revisit to move the amended drafts Hui 1 minutes and Terms of Reference at Hui 3.
7. Staff asked the Group if they had issues or queries regarding payment, they should reach out to staff at the first instance.

### **Session 1: Freshwater**

8. Staff introduced the agenda for the day, with the freshwater session focusing on values. Staff gave a brief recap of Hui 1, where this catchment planning process looks to integrate freshwater and land use together, developing a regulatory framework for freshwater while ensuring local context is the key driver.
9. Staff showed and explained a diagram, designed by Kāhu Environmental, that illustrated the freshwater planning process. The first half of the circle is setting long term vision, freshwater management units, values and environmental outcomes. Vision and values will be the focus over Hui 3 and 4. The second half of the circle focus on attributes (things that we measure), setting targets (e.g. ammonia and e.coli) and limits (e.g. water allocation), and action plans that feed into wider catchment plan. Monitoring will be key to assess if action plans (i.e. non-regulatory projects) have or have not achieve the environmental outcomes set in the catchment.
10. In response to the question on if water is abstracted from the river in the catchment, staff explained that conversation on water quantity (and water quality) will be discussed throughout the series of scheduled hui. Groundwater studies in the Ūawa flats were unable to find freshwater for the flats. Land use need to be considered in the freshwater process in order to align with aspirations and outcomes identified through the process.
11. Staff clarified the deliverables for the forestry component, which are two plan changes – the first focuses on forestry harvest, and the second looks at the wider Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan (TRMP) and the Land Overlay 3B. The Working Group will drive a lot of what will happen in the first forestry plan change, with more details covered in the forestry session later in the day.
12. Staff identified that there are common elements found in the Uawanui Project document that this freshwater planning process can align with. Five broad spatial areas have been identified – Community, Steepland upper catchment, Coastline and coastal hills, Ūawa flats and Ūawa good hill country.
13. Members of the Group involved in the Uawanui Project explained that the Project is about their whakapapa, where the central element of having a vision as mana whenua and iwi but shared with the wider community. The values recorded in the document were written with the words of the people who participated in the engagement process.
14. A member involved in the Uawanui Project noted that, while the Project highlighted the views of the iwi, the Project is a community-shared project. However the iwi in Ūawa also have an environmental management plan, though the plan is still in groundwork stage of

obtaining information out of the whanau and writing them down. The Resource Management Act highlighted the importance of iwi/hapū environmental management plan, however further discussion for iwi is needed on how the iwi/hapū environmental management plan can be implemented into the catchment plan.

15. Staff outlined a series of key components that form a long term vision for the catchment. The Group collectively agreed that the information on page 13 of the Uawanui Project should be used in subsequent discussions on long term vision in the freshwater planning process. The information on page 13 has been extracted and located in **Appendix 1**.
16. In response to a question on if Council have baseline monitoring data of the environment, staff explained that Council does have a summary document which records the current state of the catchment. In summary this catchment have sediment and E.coli issues, and no issues with nutrients. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) 2020 requires that baseline state is set according to the state in 2017. If there were no baseline data found in 2017 for any attribute, Council is required to still make decisions based on the best available data.
17. The summary document recording the current state of the catchment was circulated at Hui 1 (i.e. the Ūawa Catchment Background Document).
18. The Group discussed what their long term vision for the catchment will look like, comments:
  - 18.1. With gully mapping and landslide susceptibility and morphometric connectivity data, the vision is seeing land identified through the mapping as unsuitable for other land uses to be covered in permanent forestry cover/woody vegetation. The definition of permanent in this context where the only status is to retain the whenua and prevent the volume of sediment coming down. This will also align with the vision in the Project.
    - 18.1.1. There was discussion if the permanent woody vegetation cover can include high value species that can be selective felled for carving.
    - 18.1.2. While the decision on selecting the right trees for carving is a matter of tikanga for tangata whenua, a member stated it is not cost effective for selective felling – because these areas are fragile.
  - 18.2. The Chair noted looking back to 1769 to the spring where Cook drew water from and the spring that Tu Paia bathed in – those springs are still there and still producing to date. Considering the impacts of the blueberry farm and what it did to the town water supply, the spring there is also still there and strong since one generation ago, though acknowledging that the impact of farming on spring hasn't been as prolific as seen now. The long-term vision should be beyond 100 years.
  - 18.3. Rangatahi have been involved through the Jobs 4 Nature funding programme, where their vision is to see Waihirere still standing even in the future.
  - 18.4. Conversation on long term vision need to include Waka Kotahi, where land was acquired for State Highway. With Council and our community having such conversation about vision, Crown agency need to be involved and take responsibility for their actions, such as culverts dug for the bridges – have they considered impact of sediment.
    - 18.4.1. Another member agreed, adding that compliance monitoring is needed to understand the extent of impacts of, for example, digging drains for main roading infrastructure that change the landscape.

19. Staff highlighted that the freshwater planning process is iterative, where the Group will revisit and update/amend throughout this forum until we end up with a long term vision that is specifically for the Ūawa catchment.
  - 19.1. Staff spoke to the member representing Te Ākau o Tokomaru that Council seeks to have korero with the iwi in Tokomaru Bay, before binding the korero together.
20. A member brought out a copy of the Uawanui A Ruamatua Riverbank Restoration guide. The member agreed to share copies of the document with the wider group.
21. A member shared findings of an independent scientist from a Council-facilitated forestry workshop on 23 July 2024, where the scientist mentioned that plantation pine (provided it's permanent) is better than just native vegetation cover. The member suggested to leave pine (unable to be harvested) as permanent retirement from future harvest, given that pine can live for up to 100 years.
  - 21.1. When asked if the member was referring to immediately leaving the pines on the slopes now, or harvesting those pines now but just not planting the next rotation of pines, the member responded that decision will be made case-by-case.
22. Staff explained that Council have started trialling transitioning into permanent vegetation, with the trial held at Pamoā Forest. Another staff informed the Group that Council will be forming a transition group in a couple of weeks, where the transition group will discuss past studies and research, considering a list of questions to be asked on various scenarios. Like age classes, slope, pest species – to get an output that is a guide to highlight decision.
23. Staff highlighted that leaving an area alone for regrowth will not necessarily see native repopulating that area. Considerations of leaving pine to protect native vegetation until the natives are fully grown/stable, as well as seed source. Pamoā Forest was able to see native regrowing due to native bush surrounding the forestry area. On very steep land, where soil have been lost from first rotation, transitioning is expected to occur at second rotation. Species to be considered – probably not totara, but maybe a restorative plant like tutu.
24. In response to Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) liabilities, staff noted that Council have spoken to MPI about ETS in the context of our region. Staff commented that Council will be more effective in receiving government funding if a plan, with the agreement of our community, is brought to the discussion table.
25. Staff outlined the freshwater values as listed in the NPS-FM 2020, informing the Group that values specific and relevant to this catchment can be added. For example, for the Mōtū Catchment, wayfaring and seasonal navigation is relevant to that catchment and so added into the catchment plan.
26. The Group spent the next 20 minutes discussing and noting down their values and vision for the catchment, followed by a report back. Transcribed feedback from the group discussion is located in **Appendix 2**.
27. Discussions outside of transcribed feedback during the report back are noted as follows:
  - 27.1. A member explained that fire fighting vehicle is an expensive kit with the amount of rain the region receives – so have identified having access to firefighting water from a forestry perspective. The member also noted accommodating fish passage and ensuring these important sites are protected.
  - 27.2. The forestry workshop (as mentioned in paragraph 21) had a discussion on what was the level of acceptable/tolerable woody debris coming out of forestry blocks and entering waterways. A member explained that when foresters remove unsound trees,

the state of the trees often meant that these trees end up breaking into millions of pieces during removal. Following Cyclone Bola, foresters were allowed to plant trees right down to the edge and into water, however current practices are moving to get these trees out of those areas.

27.2.1. The Group agreed that there's always been wood on beaches, however the volume of debris have significantly increased since major harvesting started in 2012. Understanding natural volume of woody debris may be determined from a study on the volume of woody debris at less impacted beaches. A member responded that normal was able to walk across awa and able to see the channel, what was seen as a kid.

27.2.2. Sediment, on the other hand, was much better understood compared to woody debris. NIWA has completed coastal mapping of the sediment discharges off Waipaoa and Waiapu through using underwater camera. A member noted that, forestry business operators would want to minimise sediment for their infrastructure.

27.2.3. There's a need for each person, regardless of background, to have a mindset of improving environmental health. Members shared their observations of contractors doing bad practice, contractors not understanding the importance of caring for the environment until Council staff pointed out the taonga species in the streams thought to be devoid of life, and members of the public allowing horses to graze down rebo.

28. A member shared that, at Tolaga South, forestry paid to have woody debris put behind dunes, with topsoil covered and native vegetation restored.

29. The Group had a lunch break at 12:19 PM. At Hui 3, the Group will discuss environmental outcomes.

## **Session 2: Forestry**

30. The Group reconvened after lunch at 12:55 PM.

31. Staff recapped the historic context, where the region's vulnerability to erosion is not a recent issue and traced back to the region's geography. The region is made up of marine and cretaceous tertiary geology, sitting on tectonic plate boundary. Historical land clearance has given the region a legacy of erosion, affecting us to date.

32. While initially soil conservation was the original focus on planting forestry on vulnerable land, economics is now a major driver for forestry in the region. Combining the region's geology and large-scale harvesting, Tairāwhiti have a relatively higher level of harvest residues when compared to other regions.

33. Members working in the forestry sector shared that, through their resource consents, they are required to pile the wood because they don't have a wood residue facility in region. Natural event material has been left on slope because not required (by councils) for clean-up.

33.1. The resource consent condition in Tairāwhiti is no burning on slope – which staff explained was to avoid destabilising these slopes. Huge fire material is needed to burn off slopes. Most companies have started burning on skids.

33.2. A member asked if chipping is done on site. Staff responded that there is a forestry company who does chip on site. A member shared that, in a report released by GDC lawyer, chipping is not the solution to damage downstream. There's the consideration of cost and quantity of chip volume, which is dependent on the level of

water and sediment. Cost of chipping to forestry company can be alleviated if people of community want to go directly into forestry blocks and chip on-site (if they have the machinery).

33.2.1. The Group proceeded to discuss if chipping or burning is the better option. Burning will have impact with releasing carbon into atmosphere, however a member noted there are burners that don't release smoke, burning at 1000 degrees. The member shared that California is researching dropping wood into the ocean – but then the next thing on mind is scale.

33.2.2. Staff noted a need to have market on transporting slash material and in terms of changing the material use. Cost will be borne one way or another – either upfront or down the line. Another staff suggested that Council could do a benefit-cost analysis of options.

33.2.3. A member with forestry background shared the order of preference in dealing with slash material (from low cost to high cost): Decompose > Burning > Chipping

33.3. A member highlighted that we should not be trying to create a market out of slash, instead focusing on reducing slash.

34. Staff is keen to have further conversation on silviculture practices and what solutions can look like. Some areas are too risky for forestry, so there's a need to think about how we identify those areas and how would transition look like in those areas. Climate change is also important for consideration.

35. Staff showed a table recording slash events dating back to 1994. A member noted that slash events have been occurring even longer than 1994, like 1892. The Group agreed that it is an ongoing problem, not just one-off. The challenge for this Group is having new solutions to address historic problems.

36. Staff asked what some realistic outcomes for Uawa are, in terms of forestry and freshwater management with alignment between the two Kaipapa. Slash catcher was raised as a possible solution to address biomaterial issues. The key thing to note is that slash catcher should not be treated as the be-all and end-all.

36.1. Sectors now have more science in developing better technologies or solutions. Another measure that is also part of the solution is the Land Overlay 3B work.

36.2. The Group discussed about forestry harvest and what is reasonable. A member mentioned that coupe harvesting is not the solution as lots of edges will be created through pockets of harvesting, leading to windthrow effect. Staff noted that the Group can discuss this further in Hui 3, though the Ministerial Inquiry into Land Use (MILU) report did recommend reducing harvest size.

36.3. Catchment restraints were suggested as an alternative to coupe harvesting, where limits on forestry harvest is set on a catchment-basis.

36.4. The Group discussed if harvest areas are limited based on forestry blocks, or the limit/target is based on catchments. A member suggested that members with forestry background to bring this topic back to their directors, as the industry as a whole need to be proactive conversation and come up with option.

36.5. Staff suggested that the approach will be similar as the Freshwater Farm Plan (FWFP), which involves identifying risks and setting out approach to manage the risks. A member responded there are two kinds of risks: from harvesting (i.e. window of vulnerability) and from not harvesting (i.e. mature trees failing and falling down slopes). The member disagreed with the 40-hectare coupe harvesting recommendation in the



MILU report, instead suggesting an alternative approach that is feasible – however it's on the forestry industry to have this conversation.

- 36.6. Staff commented on risks of forestry harvest and forestry management in Gisborne.
  - 36.6.1. Pine trees of years 5 to 8 are the critical years in managing forestry harvest risks.
  - 36.6.2. In Gisborne, forestry management faces the risk of 12-year-old pine trees collapsing after severe weather events, as seen in Cyclone Hale.
  - 36.6.3. The intention of proposing coupe harvesting is, by reducing the size of harvestable area in a harvest, the region would see a reduced risk of harvested land failing and impacting the communities.
- 36.7. A member asked that there be clear definitions for slash and driftwood.
37. Staff went over the Catchment Forestry Plan (CFP), which was briefly introduced in Hui 1. The CFP was initially pitched as a catchment-scale management plan following a Council workshop with forestry industry held late last year. Now, CFP will need annual forestry activity update, where the update includes proposed projects to be done.
38. The CFP introduces a Sustainable Land Management framework – which is holistic, managing land for the land (protection and enhancement), and subsequently, if you manage the land you manage the water. Part of the CFP also considers the cumulative effect of forestry activities in the year – staff suggesting that internally within forestry companies, they will need to know what each other is doing, in order to manage cumulative effects. The CFP emphasises the need to understand the region and the specific catchment, moving away from stand-specific activities to a more holistic focus of the overall forestry lifecycle.
39. Staff shared aerial imagery examples of forestry blocks in the region, pointing out what is seen and acknowledged as good practice (including abiding by the National Environmental Standards) in other regions is not necessarily good practice in Tairāwhiti's geological context. Staff mentioned canopy closure can't be seen in the region due to slips or soil productivity.
  - 39.1. In response to staff noting that infrastructure changes hydrology of the landscape, a member agreed that water will create its own channel. Another member commented that they have seen small cavity forming under, which eventually lead to land washed into waterways and the sea.
  - 39.2. In response to a comment that there's a disconnect between the National Environmental Standards and practice guide, a member noted that Eastland Wood Council is meant to review the good forestry guide.
  - 39.3. A member suggested that where, at a specific site with science identified as unsuitable areas for forestry, would options include 1) central government buying back the land, or 2) planting the top 60% of land with production forestry but bottom 40% of land to revert naturally. Another member mentioned that some forestry companies replanted in unsuitable land because they're required to in their resource consent.
  - 39.4. Staff noted that boundary line of Land Overlay 3B follows the contour change, though the boundary line will need to be ground truth as to justify the rationale of the line.

- 39.5. Staff commented the potential to dashboard all forestry and farming happening in the catchment and the region to inform future planning. A member responded stating they were keen to know how many hectares have been harvested so far. Another member noted that there is a report that forecasted 4.5 million tonnes to be harvested across the next 6-8 years in the region.
40. A member commented that, given the seriousness of the situation the catchment is facing, tangata whenua should be involved in the discussion of solutions before they can show support on any solutions.
41. There were concerns raised on much of forestry land (that were converted out of farmland) are now owned by overseas companies who are often not held accountable for their actions. Concerns also observed on the spread of carbon forestry – a member asked if there's checks-and-balances in place to manage risks and mitigation to ensure vegetation cover is permanent.
42. In response to implementing CFP for permanent vegetation cover, staff suggested that CFP is used to manage commercial forestry (which is in turn managed by the National Environmental Standards), and therefore carbon forestry can be managed through CFP/TRMP too. The definition of permanent will need to be clarified, since permanent has been used for non-permanent things.
43. Staff provided an overview of the plan changes (as raised in paragraph 11). The first plan change, acknowledging comments on coupe harvesting, will look to develop and present options for forestry harvest to Council at September meeting, with public notification in October. Staff commented that Land Overlay 3B will take 12-18 months, aiming to complete by mid-2026 alongside the freshwater planning.
- 43.1. In response, a member suggested trialling the CFP with some areas in a forestry block before bringing the CFP to the September Council meeting. Staff clarified that it has not been confirmed if the CFP will be brought to the September Council meeting.
- 43.2. Another member suggested for landowners to have a similar management plan, since there's one for farming (i.e. FWFP) and now for forestry (i.e. CFP).
44. Staff closed the session by informing the Group that catchment groups are mobilising across the rohe, such as the Te Arai Catchment Group commissioning a digital twin of the catchment to test different land use scenarios. Council is also trying to get a sediment transfer model, which tells what the sediment loading is through time and if we are meeting the goals we've set to achieve.

### **Closing, next steps**

45. Each attendee shared their thoughts of how the hui went. The Chair informed the Group that Pat Seymour will resume her role as Chair from next hui (Hui 3) onwards.
46. The hui closed with a karakia at 3:47 PM. The next hui date is Tuesday 20 August 2024, with staff promising to email to the Group a week before the hui.

# Appendix 1 – Long Term Vision

## [EXTRACT FROM UAWANUI SUSTAINABILITY PROJECT, page 13]

*A shared vision for Uawa / Tolaga Bay was developed by Te Aitanga a Hauiti and the Community of Uawa / Tolaga Bay. It identifies our long-term vision and the principles and landmarks that will guide us.*

### He Manawa Whenua – He Oranga Tangata

#### Healthy Environment – Healthy People

Steep and unstable parts of the upper catchment are protected by plantation and native forests that reduce erosion and provide healthy water sources.

Land is used wisely, with long term sustainable production matched to soils, erosion and underlying land capability.

We undertake life-long learning to provide a well-educated, thoughtful, creative and motivated people who manage our land, water and coastal resources wisely and innovate to generate ongoing prosperity.

Nature is valued throughout Uawa and is woven through the landscape as a network of habitat areas, linkages and supportive agriculture and forestry production systems.

The high quality natural environment and cultural heritage of Uawa are key to our identity and are managed to retain their value.

Native plants, animals and ecosystems, from the hills to the coast, are well understood and managed to support long term sustainable food gathering.

Understanding dialogue, building relationships and collaboration bind together a strong Uawa community and extend its network nationally and internationally.

We utilise our own knowledge and relationships but also foster external links to science, innovation and markets to generate prosperity for the community.

The health of people is supported by their access to clean water, high quality local food and healthy lifestyle.

Everyone who lives and works in the catchment is acknowledged for their role in enhancing the health of the environment and downstream water quality.

There are profitable businesses that are stable and resilient, providing long term economic benefit to their owners and the whole community.

We celebrate our dual heritage and share a future that builds on the values and strengths of our different cultures.

# Appendix 2 – Hui 2 Workshop notes (Freshwater session)

## VALUES

### General values

- Access to firefighting water
- Whakapapa
- Waka culture
- Kaitiakitanga
  - We are guardians of our taiao, we must be balanced in our way of caring for and managing the whenua, awa and taonga
- Our people's values
- Recreation
- Waka ama
- Eeling
- Fishing
- A tatou korero
- Whanau Freshwater values
- Whakapapa Taiao
- Land story (local)
- Mana
  - The gathering of kai is undisturbed and plentiful
- Mauri
  - E.g. flourishing & thriving waterways and coastlands
  - Te Mauri o te Wai
- Kaitiaki
  - We have the capacity and capability locally to manage our own freshwater resource
- Wairua
  - Our culturally significant sites remain respected and available for tangata whenua to use
- Rotoparera – Te hau parerau
  - Manamotuhake
  - Maori Science
- Whanaungatanga
  - If we nurture the whenua and awa, the whenua and awa will look after whanau; the generations to come and anyone associated with our whenua and awa

- Manaakitanga
  - We nurture and respect Te Mana o te Wai, whenua and all inhabitants and iwi
- Kaikokiritanga
  - We strive for excellence, we are agile to evolve and are committed to excellent outcomes for all
- Rangatiratanga
  - We have integrity, we empower each other to make the best possible decisions
- Do not bury inorganic waste on the whenua
- Storage of water from weather, drought
- Wetlands
  - Protect
- We are kaitiaki of the now.
  - We should aim to leave whenua in better or same state
- Kai gathering
- Whakapapa
  - By us for us
- Waka culture

## **On map**



- Freshwater Puna from Mangatokerau
- Artesian water for domestic use
- Puna (Springs)
  - Protection Management
  - Historic Significance
- Mana Atua
  - Kaitiakitanga

## VISION

Fragile land in permanent woody vegetation cover

➔ Complements production forestry + farming activity

Freshwater springs from 1769

➔ Still flowing

➔ Should still be in 300 years time

Town water supply spring – strong + healthy

Land around state highway is better managed

➔ To prevent erosion + scours

Culverts retrofitted (sedimentation issues)

Crown acts as it should

Compliance + monitoring

➔ Roadside drains, bridge access

What did Uawa look like the day before Cook arrived?

How do we transition

➔ Risk based, local, mosaic