

Next Generation Project Consultative Group

Notes from the meeting held on Wednesday, 29 August 2007, 7pm
Port Otago Limited Building, Port Chalmers.

In Attendance: Andre Mabon, Angela McErlane, Annica Lindgren, Artie Heineman, Bill Lloyd, Brett Hastie, Bruce Hill, Bruce Inglis, Bruce Ritchie, Carol Meikle, Dave O'Malley, David Redshaw, Dr Selva Selvarajah, Geoff Plunket, Graeme Carse, Hoani Langsbury, Jan Tucker, Jo Cecchi, Joan Conway, John Christie, John Milburn, John Perry, Lincoln Coe, Neil McDonald, Paul Freeland, Peter Brown, Phil Mitchell, Roger Belton, Roy Innes, Warren Lewis

1. Welcome

Geoff Plunket welcomed all those present and introduced the Next Generation Project Team (Lincoln Coe – POL, David O'Malley – OCTA, and Phil Mitchell – Mitchell Partnerships). Geoff emphasised that, because of the implications of the project, the Project Consultative Group (PCG) was very important and the Port was committed to spending the time to understand those implications. He noted that ships are generally getting bigger so POL and the community had some decisions to make.

2. Project Timeline

Lincoln Coe explained his role at POL and as project leader. He then identified some of the issues that needed to be addressed and some of the specialists already identified to assist with the assessments that will be needed. These include Dr Martin Single from the University of Canterbury, (assisting on coastal processes and the physical sciences), and Dr Mark James from NIWA (assisting with addressing the ecological effects from the project). A number of experts will be required and suggestions from the PCG regarding other expertise that could be used would be welcomed. These matters are addressed in Phil Mitchell's presentation.

In regard to the timeline, defining some of the work in a feasibility study is targeted for the end of October. This will outline cost, time and risks with implementing the project. There is therefore 4 to 8 weeks available to complete this work. Detailed science and analysis will then follow (in 2 to 3 months time). However, that timeline is indicative and time will be taken to get it right and include input from the community.

In response to a related question on whether there was a "final date established" for the project, Geoff Plunket advised this was not the case. It was intended to have sufficient time to do the work upfront properly. It was s probable that it could take 3 to 5 years to complete the project.

3. Project Consultative Group

Phil Mitchell took the group through a presentation on how a PCG might operate in relation to this project. A copy of this is attached. In his experience as an environmental consultant involved in public consultation processes, Phil stated that the key to a successful PCG would revolve around:

- q Having a robust process in place
- q Having sufficient information available
- q Having sufficient time for interested parties to consider that information, and
- q Working together.

Examples of other projects where a PCG approach had been utilised (Huntly, Kinleith, Mangere Sewage Treatment and Tongariro) were then outlined. These were all large scope, complicated projects, with a diversity of views and not inconsiderable tension. However the consultation process undertaken ended up in solutions that were agreed by consensus. Phil believed that if this consultation group worked well, then it would be able to achieve a similar result.

Principles of a successful consultative group process were:

- q A written Terms of Reference
- q Membership open to anyone who wishes to participate
- q Wide ranging scope
- q Representatives need to consult internally and report back.
- q Independent Chair
- q Regular meetings (two weekly at first and then monthly).
- q Agree on information gaps and investigations required
- q Sharing all relevant information as it becomes available.
- q Providing an opportunity to discuss solutions and agree on them, recognising that it is OK not to agree
- q Recognising and accepting that participating in the process does not compromise any party's legal rights.
- q Costs of administration and work will be met by POL

Phil finished his presentation by suggesting that the meeting needed to:

- q Decide whether a consultative group was a good approach.
- q Discuss membership
- q Decide who should chair it
- q Arrange a time for the first "official" meeting, and
- q Establish a Terms of Reference.

4. Discussion

4.1 Is a PCG a good idea?

There was general consensus that a PCG would be a very sound basis to move forward on. It was agreed that a Terms of Reference would need to be established before the group met again. It was agreed that Port Otago should produce a first draft and circulate this to people for comment –see below.

A question was raised on whether the PCG centred only on ecological issues or could it consider wider issues such as transport and socio-economic issues. Phil Mitchell responded that the group would determine what it considers important and needs to have a "broad" Terms of Reference.

Another point raised concerned the lack of understanding of what the project entailed (e.g. what 3 million m³ of dredged material looks like). It was acknowledged that the group needed to understand the scope so as to be able to ask questions and identify the issues. This was the reason for meeting at an early stage of the project so the group could establish the questions before detailed studies were commenced.

Support for the concept of a PCG was unanimous (based on a show of hands)

4.2 Membership

At this stage, all those present introduced themselves and outlined their area of interest or representation. It was noted that this was a diverse group with a range of interests represented. It was suggested that those representing groups needed to have a mandate from their group, and that membership of the PCG should remain flexible as issues were identified.

4.3 Chairperson

Chairing the group was then discussed and it was agreed that a competent, independent chair was essential. There were several suggestions including:

- q The independent chair of the Ravensdown Community Liaison Group
- q The POL chair of the Port Environment Liaison Committee
- q Drawing the Chair from those present

No decisions were sought on this and selecting a Chairperson was deferred to the next meeting of the PCG.

4.4 Next Meeting

The date for the next meeting was set for Tuesday, 18 September at 7pm at the same venue. POL would continue to take notes of the meetings and provide these and other relevant information to the PCG prior to each meeting. The agenda for the next meeting would include:

- q Selection of a chairperson
- q Discussion of the draft Terms of Reference
- q A full briefing on the scope of the project and outline of work undertaken
- q Identification of issues by the PCG

4.5 Terms of Reference

It was agreed that POL would draft a terms of reference to be circulated to all members prior to the next meeting.

4.6 Other points

The group was keen to be involved in shaping the scope of the project before too much work was done. This would happen at the next meeting following a presentation from POL.

Meeting closed at 8.35pm.