

I hereby give notice that an ordinary meeting of the Environment and Sustainability Forum will be held on:

Date: Tuesday, 21 May 2013
Time: 1.30pm
Meeting Room: Reception Lounge
Venue: Auckland Town Hall
301-305 Queen Street
Auckland

Environment and Sustainability Forum

OPEN AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson	Cr Wayne Walker
Deputy Chairperson	Cr Sandra Coney, QSO
Members	Member James Brown Cr Dr Cathy Casey Cr Ann Hartley, JP Cr Mike Lee Cr Des Morrison Cr Noelene Raffills, JP Member Glen Tupuhi
Ex officio	Mayor Len Brown, JP Deputy Mayor Penny Hulse
Ex officio (without voting rights)	All other Councillors
Independent Maori Statutory Board Alternate	Member David Taipari

(Quorum 4 members)

Mary Binney
Democracy Advisor

13 May 2013

Contact Telephone: (09) 373 6211
Email: mary.binney@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Environment and Sustainability Forum will:

- Consider and make recommendations via a report to the Regional Development and Operations Committee in relation to high level policies, plans and initiatives to achieve the integrated and sustainable development of natural and physical resources of the region; and by:
 - providing leadership on the forum functions;
 - engaging with local boards on environment and sustainable issues;
 - advocating for Auckland on matters relating to the environment and sustainability; and
 - policy and planning on environmental sustainability issues.

ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1	Apologies	7
2	Declaration of Interest	7
3	Confirmation of Minutes	7
4	Petitions	7
5	Public Input	7
6	Local Board Input	7
7	Extraordinary Business	7
8	Notices of Motion	8
9	Application for Exemption for Breach of the Ambient Air Quality Standard	9
10	Auckland Plan Implementation - Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan	13
11	Trade-offs between high-class land and development, and future pressures on Auckland's soil resources	19
12	Community Watershed Initiatives (formerly the Sustainable Catchments Programme including Project Twin Streams)	25
13	Enviroschools Report	29
14	Consideration of Extraordinary Items	

1 Apologies

An apology from Councillor Noelene Raffills has been received.

2 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Environment and Sustainability Forum:

- a) confirm the minutes of its meeting held on Wednesday, 3 April 2013 as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

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

5 Public Input

Standing Order 3.21 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Committee Secretary, in writing, no later than **two (2)** working days prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of **thirty (30) minutes** is allocated to the period for public input with **five (5)** minutes speaking time for each speaker.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public input had been received.

6 Local Board Input

Standing Order 3.22 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to **five (5)** minutes during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give **two (2)** days notice of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 3.9.14 to speak to matters on the agenda.

At the close of the agenda no requests for local board input had been received.

7 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

- (a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and
- (b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

- (i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
- (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

- (a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-
 - (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
 - (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but
- (b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

8 Notices of Motion

At the close of the agenda no requests for notices of motion had been received.

Application for Exemption for Breach of the Ambient Air Quality Standard

File No.: CP2013/09633

Purpose

1. To inform the Environment and Sustainability Forum of a recent breach of air quality standards and outline the actions being taken as a result.

Executive Summary

2. The fireworks display in the Auckland Domain on 7 March 2013 resulted in a breach of air quality standards. Council officers are preparing an application to the Minister for the Environment seeking an exception for the exceedance. Council officers will also work with relevant parties to minimise the effects of these types of events in the future.

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Sustainability Forum:

- a) note that an application is being prepared for the Minister for the Environment requesting that the exceedance of national air quality environmental standards in Auckland on 7 March 2013 be considered as an exceptional event.

Discussion

Background

3. In 2004 the government passed regulations that set air quality national environmental standards (AQ NES) that are the minimum requirements that outdoor air quality should meet in order to guarantee a set level of protection for human health and the environment. The ambient air quality standards are for set time periods and key pollutants. The AQ NES allow a specified number of permissible exceedances of the standards each year. The regulations were revised in 2011 so that if a region does not meet the standards, any new industries discharging to air must offset their emissions (regulation 17). This stays in force for five years from the most recent breach of the standard.
4. The regulations require regional councils / unitary authorities to monitor the air quality in their gazetted airsheds and publicly notify any breaches of the standards (Regulation 15). For PM₁₀ a breach of the standards would occur if the 24 hour average of 50 µg/m³ is exceeded more than once over any 12 month period. There is an expectation by the Minister for the Environment that regional authorities take actions or have plans in place to ensure that the ambient air quality standards are met.
5. The regulations also allow regional councils / unitary authorities to apply to the Minister for the Environment for an exception for any breach of the standards if they consider it was caused by exceptional circumstances.

Exceptional Event

6. On 7 March 2013 the 24 hour PM₁₀ standard was exceeded in the Auckland urban airshed. A 24 hour concentration of 77 µg/m³ was recorded at the Khyber Pass monitoring site. This was the second exceedance within a 12 month period, constituting a breach of the AQ NES regulations. The breach was publicly notified, as required by Regulation 16, in the Auckland Herald on 28 March 2012. A breach of the AQ NES regulations means that the Auckland Urban airshed becomes a "polluted airshed" and this has implications for industry when applying for resource consents for discharges of contaminants into air, such as PM₁₀.

7. The previous exceedance of the 24 hour PM₁₀ standard (57 µg/m³) occurred on 9 July 2012 and was measured at the Pakuranga monitoring site. It was considered to have been caused by emissions of PM₁₀ from domestic home heating (e.g. open fires). Auckland has had exceedances of guidelines and standards for other pollutants (such as nitrogen dioxide, PM_{2.5} and sulphur dioxide) due to a range of sources, but these are pollutants are not subject to the same industry offset provisions.

Application for an Exemption

8. The exceedance of the 24 hour PM₁₀ standard has been investigated and was found to have been caused by a fireworks display held in the Auckland Domain on 7 March 2013. The event was organised by the Auckland Arts Festival Trust as part of the 2013 Auckland Arts Festival. Auckland Council is one of the core funders of the Arts Festival and is also responsible for the administration of the Auckland Domain as a public park. The consents for the use of the Domain for the event were obtained by the Auckland Arts Festival Trust, while a test certificate approving the display plan for the fireworks display was issued by the Environmental Protection Authority under the Hazardous Substance (fireworks) Regulations.
9. Exceptional circumstances (exceptional events) are not defined in the AQ NES Regulations and are decided by the Minister for the Environment on a case-by-case basis. The circumstance around the exceedance of the AQ NES standard on 7 March may meet the requirements for an exceptional event and council officers are preparing an application to the Minister for the Environment for a determination that this occurrence be exempt from regulations relating to air discharge consents.
10. The Ministry for the Environment has provided a users' guide¹ for regional councils on what would constitute an exceptional event. The guidance on exceptional events was developed after a review of overseas literature² and notes that the following criteria would be considered if an air quality exceedance is to be reclassified as an 'exceptional event':
- the event affected air quality; and
 - the event was not reasonably controllable or preventable and was beyond the control of the regional council; and
 - there exists a clear causal relationship between the specific event and the monitored concentration; and
 - the event was caused by human activity that is unlikely to recur at a particular location, or was a natural event; and
 - there would have been no exceedance or violation but for the event
11. The users' guide states that all of the above criteria must be satisfied. These five criteria should be addressed in any application for an exception and they will be used to assist the Minister when making a decision. Both international literature and supporting documentation³ around changes to the AQ NES in 2011 mention that discharges from a fireworks display could be considered an exceptional event. For example the USEPA allows exceptions for fireworks displays as they are considered national or cultural events. However, the USEPA regulations require that the US state governments take reasonable measures to protect the public from air emissions from fireworks displays.

¹ 2011 Users' Guide to the revised National Environmental Standards for Air Quality – published by Ministry for the Environment

² USEPA CFR9 - Code of Federal Regulations Part II, Environmental Protection Agency, Treatment of Data Influenced by Exception Events; Final Rule (22 March 2007).

³ Air quality - Getting the balance right - Report of the Technical Advisory Group on National Air-Quality Standards Report – November 2009

12. The AQNES guidance document states that it is important that decisions on exceptional events be justified, clear and transparent. The Ministry for the Environment will, therefore, maintain a register of:
 - all applications for exceptional events
 - the Minister's decision for each application
 - the reasons for that decision
13. The register is publicly available on the Ministry for the Environment's website and, to date, no applications for exceptions have been recorded.
14. The Minister for the Environment must make a decision on an application for an exceedance to be considered an 'exceptional event' within 3 months of receiving the application. There is no provision in the RMA or the AQ NES regulations for any review of this decision.

Consideration

Local Board Views

15. The implications of the outcomes of the application to the Minister are primarily a regional matter and, therefore, Local Boards have not been consulted. This report will be sent to Local Boards for their information, in particular the Waitemata Local Board will be notified, as the Auckland Domain is located within the Boards' area.

Maori Impact Statement

16. This is not a significant issue for Maori; however, the application is linked to the council's strategic priorities in the Auckland Plan, including improving air quality for all of Auckland's communities, including Maori.

General

17. This event has highlighted some issues that the council should consider for future firework displays. In particular, there are additional measures that the council could take to reduce the potential impact from these activities. For example:
 - a) Provide additional public education concerning potential health risks associated with exposure to high ambient concentration of PM₁₀ related to future fireworks displays, e.g. alerting public of the potential for short-term air quality impacts that may result from the discharge of fireworks at large displays and ways they might reduce their exposure.
 - b) Take reasonable measures to reduce exposure of the public to high concentration of pollutants associated with the fireworks displays, for example exploring the use of lower emitting fireworks, monitoring of prevailing winds and locating events downwind of large numbers of people.
18. The Air Quality Team will work with council events organisers (who consent events in public spaces) and fireworks display operators to explore options to minimise the effects of these types of events.

Implementation Issues

19. There are no implementation issues involved in making the application to the Minister for the Environment. However, if the Minister decides not to allow an exception for the event, then the council would need to consider further measures to manage emissions from fireworks displays in the future and there will be some implications for industries which require air discharge consents.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Authors	Mike Harvey - Specialist Air Janet Petersen - Team Leader Air Quality
Authoriser	Ludo Campbell-Reid - Environmental Strategy & Policy Manager

Auckland Plan Implementation - Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan

File No.: CP2013/09146

Purpose

1. To provide information on the purpose, objectives and key steps involved in the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan, a significant project that is helping to implement the Auckland Plan.

Executive Summary

2. The Auckland Plan sets the direction to improve natural hazard management in Auckland and build safe and resilient communities. A strategic work programme is identified as one action that will help achieve the reduction of risk from natural hazards.
3. Auckland Council plays a leading role in natural hazard risk reduction with over 55 teams involved in some aspect of hazard management. Currently the management of hazards within Auckland Council is not well coordinated, with no high level vision or work programme outlining how to effectively consider and reduce risk from natural hazards.
4. The Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan (NHRMAP) will ensure Auckland Council has a coordinated risk management approach embedded in work practices while delivering best practice solutions in a cost-effective manner. The NHRMAP will allow council to use resources effectively by targeting activities that deliver the greatest reduction in risk. Ultimately this project will ensure that risks to communities are reduced and that the Auckland Plan priority of building resilience to natural hazards is achieved.

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Sustainability Forum:

- a) receive the Auckland Plan Implementation - Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan report.

Discussion

Context

5. The Auckland region is exposed to a wide range of natural hazards which can be broadly categorised as geological, climatic and coastal. Each type of natural hazard has distinct characteristics that influence the location, frequency and magnitude of an event. The severity of natural hazard events varies across the region over time due to factors that include the local environment conditions (natural and human) and external influences such as climate change.
6. Natural hazards can have a devastating and long-lasting impact on our society, economy, built environment and infrastructure. Some of the impacts associated with natural hazard events include: danger to life, damage to property and infrastructure, environmental impacts, social impacts, and financial costs associated with mitigation or remedial works. For example, the tornado that tore through the Hobsonville and Whenuapai areas on 6 December 2012 claimed three lives and damaged 384 properties, with 89 incurring major damage. The insurance costs arising from the tornado have been reported at \$6.5 million by the Insurance Council of New Zealand.
7. Hazard impacts can be significantly reduced by avoiding development in areas which are prone to some natural hazards. However, it is well recognised that complete avoidance of all areas prone to natural hazards is not possible if we are to achieve the projected

growth and development in the Auckland region. As the population of the region increases there will be an even greater demand to develop land that is prone to natural hazards, for example in floodplains. This will result in a greater number of people being exposed to the impacts of natural hazards.

8. With this in mind, it is essential to manage the risks associated with natural hazards so that we can reduce the negative impacts of natural hazard events as far as practicable and create resilient communities that are able to recover effectively from natural disasters.

Risk-based Approach to Natural Hazard Management

9. Past development and planning decisions have not always taken a risk-based approach. Traditionally natural hazards have been managed based on the likelihood of the hazard occurring, for example managing for a one-in-100-year flood event. There has been little consideration of the consequences associated with natural hazard events outside of these timeframes. This approach can be overly conservative in some areas and increase risk in others, particularly when a natural hazard exceeds the size that has been designed for. For example, where intensive development occurs behind a seawall or stop bank that is eventually overtopped. The move towards a risk-based approach addresses these limitations by considering the consequences of an event and managing for these in addition to the likelihood of the event occurring.
10. Managing natural hazard risk involves the consideration of a number of factors:
 - the likelihood of the hazard occurring
 - the size and nature of the hazard
 - the exposure and vulnerability of elements at risk (people, buildings, infrastructure etc)
11. Risk to a community is increased by increasing exposure to natural hazards, such as by developing and undertaking activities on land prone to natural hazards. Risk is further increased if the elements that are exposed are vulnerable to the effects of the hazard. Elements that are more vulnerable are usually impacted to a greater extent from a natural hazard than those that are less vulnerable. For example, a retirement village in a hazard prone area is a vulnerable activity, in part due to the difficulty of evacuation during a hazard event. The consequences of a natural hazard can be estimated by assessing both the exposure and the vulnerability of elements at risk.
12. The level of risk to a community is also dependent on the size, nature and likelihood of a natural hazard. This can change over time due to environmental influences such as the effects of climate change or due to human intervention such as land disturbing activities (e.g. diverting floodwater, vegetation removal and earthworks).
13. A risk-based approach to natural hazard management involves assessing the hazard as well as what the consequences may be. This ensures that the economic, social, cultural and environmental consequences of a particular development/activity are taken into account. The risks to communities can be reduced by an improved understanding of each type of natural hazard and its impacts, coupled with effective management to avoid or mitigate the adverse effects.
14. A risk-based approach does not focus on completely avoiding risks from natural hazards, but rather it considers a level of risk that the community decides they are willing to bear. This acceptable level of risk allows for appropriate activities to occur in areas subject to natural hazards. Where the level of risk is considered too great, activities should be avoided or appropriate mitigation measures put in place to reduce the risk to an acceptable level. In an operational context it allows for cost-effective investment in infrastructure and a clear understanding of where investment should stop.

Reasons for a Strategic Action Plan

15. The Auckland Plan outlines a number of priorities to achieve the Mayor's vision of "*the world's most liveable city*". One of these is to build resilience to natural hazards. The Plan identifies through Directives 7.15, 8.5, 10.4 and 12.1 the need to manage risk from

natural hazards. Action 4 (under Directives 7.14 and 7.15) of the Auckland Plan Addendum identifies the development of a Natural Hazards Risk Management Strategy as one of the actions to help achieve these directives. The NHRMAP will deliver a clear path forward to achieve the directives under the Auckland Plan.

16. The need to improve natural hazard management is also recognised by Central Government. Following the Canterbury earthquakes the government asked a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to recommend changes to the Resource Management Act (RMA) to improve the way we manage risk from natural hazards. Underpinning the TAG recommendations is acknowledgement that we need to ensure that we manage the risks from natural hazards and move away from managing based on the likelihood of the event.
17. These recommendations are also represented in the recently released RMA discussion document entitled '*Improving our resource management system*' which sets out the government's proposals for a third round of RMA reforms. Proposals include improving national consistency in the way we manage natural hazards and ensuring that the risks of all natural hazards can be appropriately considered in resource consent decisions. Ultimately the proposals aim to improve resilience to natural hazards and reduce the costs to communities from natural hazard events.
18. Auckland Council plays a leading role in natural hazard management and will be responsible for ensuring any legislative changes are addressed through our resource management plans and in other management practices. Currently, there are at least 55 teams in council that have a role to play in managing natural hazards. Despite the widespread mandate to manage natural hazards, there is no high level strategic vision or work programme outlining how to effectively consider and reduce risk to our region. Rather, many teams are continuing to operate based on legacy council approaches. The legacy approaches to hazard management were different across the region and were largely based on managing hazard events of a specific likelihood rather than managing risk.
19. As the decisions made by one group managing natural hazards impact on others, it is proving difficult to achieve clear and measurable results in the reduction of risk. This has led to disjointed management of natural hazards which is not efficient or cost-effective in the reduction of risk. The creation of a unitary authority in Auckland has provided an opportunity to align natural hazard management practices across the region.
20. The NHRMAP is a strategic hazards risk management work programme which will ensure groups managing natural hazard risks are working towards a common vision which is underpinned by a risk-based approach. The action plan will align natural hazard work programmes and practices within council resulting in an efficient use of resources, which will help avoid duplication of work efforts ultimately saving time and money. A key benefit of the risk-based approach is that we can effectively use resources to target activities that will deliver the greatest reduction in risk.
21. The NHRMAP will also provide future direction for the Unitary Plan, one of the key tools for reducing natural hazard risk to communities through land use planning. The draft Unitary Plan discussion document incorporates a high level risk-based approach which is reflected in the objectives and policies. This is seen as a transitional approach, with further work being needed to ensure the risk-based approach is reflected in the rules of the Plan and, therefore, effectively reducing risk when implemented on the ground. The NHRMAP will provide the direction needed to refine the provisions of the Unitary Plan to reflect a coherent risk management approach.
22. This project will deliver on the directives of the Auckland Plan, which seek to reduce risk from natural hazards and improve resilience while also aligning with central government changes to the way we manage natural hazards through our resource management plans. This project was approved by the Auckland Plan Committee as part of the Strategy and Policy Forward Programme. Input to the Unitary Plan from the NHRMAP may be constrained by the potential restriction on plan variations as proposed by the latest RMA

reform package. As a result any new policy directions that may result from the action plan could only be inserted after the Unitary Plan becomes operative.

Project Approach

23. This report provides more detail regarding the NHRMAP project, particularly its objectives, deliverables, benefits, progress and outlines the next steps. This project is scheduled to take 3 years to complete and will be delivered by June 2015.

Project Objectives:

- To ensure that the diverse groups managing natural hazard risks within council are working toward a common vision and set of objectives underpinned by a risk-based approach.
- To ensure that natural hazard risks are managed in a way that delivers best practice and innovative solutions in a coordinated and cost-effective manner.
- To improve the sustainability and resilience of the built environment to natural hazards.

Expected Deliverables:

Deliverable	Type
1. A stocktake of current work practices and gap analysis	Document
2. A risk assessment to determine Auckland's current risk profile	Document
3. An assessment of risk management options (best practice and innovative solutions)	Document
4. A determination of the community's acceptable level of risk	Document
5. A strategic action plan – identifying strategic objectives and establishing a prioritised list of activities to deliver on these objectives	Document
6. A forum for stakeholders to communicate, coordinate and support each other during implementation	Task
7. A monitoring programme - state of the environment, policy effectiveness, action plan implementation	Framework

Exclusions:

- The project will not include implementation of an action plan(s). Action plans will be confirmed through the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan process and implementation will be managed by a change team which will be established when closing the project.
- The project will not cover hazards that are primarily managed by non-partner organisations.

Expected Benefits:

Benefits of risk-based approach:

- Improved community resilience to natural hazards.
- Improved community ownership of risk management decisions.
- Set limits on the active management of risks by identifying an agreed acceptable level of risk.

Benefits of coordinated approach:

- Improved long term planning and budgeting.
- Efficient use of resources avoiding duplication of research and re-runs due to restricted scoping.
- Effective use of resources to target activities that delivers the greatest reduction in risk.

- Comprehensive management of natural hazard risks by identifying and filling gaps (reduce liability) and removing overlaps (improve efficiency).
- Improved internal and external relationships.

Progress to Date:

24. The NHRMAP work is following a project management framework which has been adopted as per Auckland Council's Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO) guidance. This provides a clear decision making process and a focus on what needs to be done to achieve the deliverables of the project.
25. Progress made to date includes:
 - Appointed a project sponsor – Clive Manley, Manager Civil Defence and Emergency Management.
 - Established a cross-council steering group and project team representing the teams that will use the outputs of the NHRMAP and the teams that will help deliver the project. This includes representatives from stormwater, environmental policy, planning, research investigations and monitoring, civil defence, risk and assurance and consents.
 - Approved concept paper.
 - Established a Natural Hazard Risk Management Group to facilitate natural hazard management discussions within council and to coordinate hazard management activities and delivery of projects.
 - Identified existing council projects that the NHRMAP can align with (e.g. the NewCore project – a council initiative to consolidate the systems and applications used across council).

Next Steps:

26. With the concept paper approved and a steering group established this project will now move into a planning phase. The planning phase will determine what has to happen and when in order to achieve the project's objectives. Several workstreams have been identified to bring about the success of the project. These include an assessment of our current state of natural hazard management and an assessment of Auckland's risk profile. The planning stage will identify any dependencies between the deliverables and resource requirements.
27. Staff will provide regular updates to the Environment and Sustainability Forum at key project milestones. It is envisaged that political involvement will be sought at key decision points in the project. Project planning will identify when and how this engagement will occur.

Consideration

Local Board Views

28. A comprehensive communications plan will be developed and will form a key part of the project planning documentation. This plan will set out exactly how and when Local Boards will be consulted during the project. Local Boards will be particularly important when determining communities' acceptable level of risk. A summary of the communication plan and, in particular, the timing and nature of Local Board consultation will be provided in the next project update.

Maori Impact Statement

29. The comprehensive communications plan will set out how and when council will engage with Mana Whenua during the project. Council will liaise with Maori Strategy and Relations in the development of the communications plan. Consultation details will be provided to the Environment and Sustainability Forum in the next project update.

General

30. There are no other issues requiring consideration at this stage of the project.

Implementation Issues

31. There are no implementation issues at this stage of the project.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author	Jane Olsen - Principal Specialist, Hazards
Authoriser	Ludo Campbell-Reid - Environmental Strategy & Policy Manager

Trade-offs between high-class land and development, and future pressures on Auckland's soil resources

File No.: CP2013/04840

Purpose

1. To present recent information on the trade-offs between high-class land (elite and prime land) and development, and future pressures on Auckland's soil resources.

Executive Summary

2. Soils are natural capital assets and are a non-renewable resource. Once developed upon they are lost forever through irreversible damage and degradation. Some of the best, most productive soils in New Zealand are located in South Auckland, supporting a significant proportion of New Zealand's outdoor vegetable production.
3. Section 52 of the Auckland Plan requires policies to 'conserve productive agricultural land on the urban periphery to protect both our export base and our ability to supply our own population during times of food shortages'. Draft Auckland Unitary Plan objectives in section 2.8.2 state that 'the subdivision, use and development of elite and prime land is managed to maintain its capability, flexibility and accessibility for primary production'.
4. 27% (123,365 hectares) of the Auckland total land area is classified as elite and prime agricultural land.
5. Spatial analysis indicated that about 10,400 hectares of elite and prime land has been lost in Auckland.
6. Urban extension has disproportionately encroached onto elite and prime land since 1996.
7. Looking into the near future, lodged greenfield developments equate to a potential loss of about 6000 hectares of elite and prime land.
8. The Auckland Plan indicates that the population of Pukekohe is envisaged to grow to 50,000 over the next 30 years.
9. 86% of elite land, not already lost, is located in and around west Pukekohe, an area that supports a significant proportion of New Zealand's outdoor vegetable production.
10. Various factors render Pukekohe a highly efficient powerhouse in terms of outdoor vegetable production including its highly fertile and well-structured soil, its unique and effectively frost free climate, the availability of irrigation water, the supply of labour and its proximity to a multitude of freight options.
11. About 90% of land being proposed in the South Greenfield Areas of Investigation is elite and prime land equating to 13% of Auckland's total elite soil resources.
12. To ensure the protection of the remaining high-class land outside these proposed areas of growth various measures in the draft Unitary Plan are proposed to safeguard the productive potential of remaining elite and prime land.
13. The Auckland Plan aspirations and draft Unitary Plan objectives reflect the careful balance that needs to be maintained to ensure both the need to accommodate growth as well as protecting potential productive agricultural land are met for future demand.

Recommendations

That the Environment and Sustainability Forum:

- a) receive the report
- b) request that the report be distributed to Local Boards and the Independent Maori Statutory Board for their information

Discussion

Background

14. Soils are natural capital assets and are a non-renewable resource. Once they are lost to development, they are lost forever through irreversible damage and degradation to the soil. For an ever-increasing global population, a formidable challenge is securing adequate food supplies. Soil and water are fundamental to ensure that these needs are met. According to global demographic models, the global population is projected to reach 8, 9 and 10 billion by years 2025, 2043 and 2083, respectively, putting immense pressures on our natural resources to meet basic demands. Global food production needs to double to provide sustenance for the projected 9 billion population by 2043.
15. In New Zealand, there are growing concerns about the competition for high-class land (elite and prime land), for rural versus urban and peri-urban uses on the fringe of large cities. Urbanisation disproportionately affects New Zealand's most high-class and productive soils, which could have a negative impact on the economic sustainability of New Zealand's primary production capacity into the future. A national study conducted in 2010 reported that urbanisation rates were highest for Land Use Capability (LUC) Class 1 (5.86%) and Class 2 (3.96%) compared with LUC Classes 3-8 that ranged from <0.01-2.0%.⁴ The Auckland Council Regional Policy Statement defines elite land as LUC Class 1 and prime land as LUC Classes 2 and 3 (LUC 2+3).
16. The Auckland Plan recognises these national concerns and section 52 states the importance of conserving 'productive agricultural land on the urban periphery to protect both our export base and our ability to supply our own population during times of food shortages'. To implement this, the draft Unitary Plan Section 2.2.3 Supply of urban land, stipulates that land for urban use should avoid elite land. Furthermore, controls for rural subdivision in Section 4.2.4 Subdivision, state that 'Sites being subdivided in an identified receiver area must' (amongst other things)... 'Other than Countryside living zones, contain no elite or prime land.'
17. That said, the Auckland Plan and draft Unitary Plan identify that the loss of elite and prime land could potentially be an on-going issue with a projected population increase of one million by 2040, equating to an additional 400,000 new dwellings. In order to accommodate some of this population increase, land around two satellite towns Warkworth and Pukekohe, have greenfield areas for investigation identified where a large proportion of the city's future greenfield growth is envisaged to occur over the next 30 years. Pukekohe has the majority of LUC Class 1 in Auckland, an area that supports a significant proportion of New Zealand's outdoor vegetable production and a significant source of economic activity and employment for the region in terms of vegetable production. Various factors render Pukekohe a highly efficient production system including its highly fertile and well-structured soils, its unique and effectively frost free climate, the availability of irrigation water, the supply of labour and its proximity to a multitude of freight options.

⁴ Rutledge, D T; Price, R; Ross, C; Hewitt, A; Webb, T; Briggs, C (2010). Thought for food: impacts of urbanisation trends on soil resource availability in New Zealand. *Proceedings of the New Zealand Grassland Association*, (72), 241-246

18. A spatial analysis was undertaken to determine the current losses of Auckland's high-class land resources (and up to 2011/2012) to various development types, whether it be urban extension, operative or approved (plan changes providing for urban development) greenfields or building consents, to inform various work streams in order to achieve Auckland Plan objectives. Once current losses were assessed potential future pressures on Auckland's soil resources were investigated.

Analysis and findings

19. A total of 7172ha, 1832ha and 1395ha of high-class land (LUC 1-3) has been lost to urban extension, operative greenfield developments and building consents, respectively, in the Auckland region. This amounts to 10,399ha (8.4%) of the region's high-class land and equates to a loss of 359ha (8.5%) Class 1, 6162ha (11.3%) Class 2 and 2482ha (3.8%) Class 3 to urban extension and operative greenfields. The majority of land being allocated for urban extension in recent years is on high-class land (LUC 1-3), with losses being greatest since 1996.
20. The dataset used in the study has limitations due to a lack of building consent records prior to 1991 and the fact that the LUC layer on the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory was not designed to be used at the property level at the scale of 1:50,000. As a result, there will be issues with accuracy but the dataset gives a broad indication of what has and will likely occur.
21. Other pressures threatening the loss of high-class land include lodged greenfield developments (plan changes providing for urban development) that currently amount to an additional potential loss of 6,010ha (4.9%) of high-class land. Furthermore, with the Auckland Plan seeking to provide for a one-million population increase by 2040, there will be additional pressures on high-class land. This will include the need for additional greenfield development over and above what is already planned; these areas are noted as "Greenfield Areas of Investigation" in the plan's Development Strategy.
22. The encroachment of urban growth into rural communities could also potentially have 'reverse sensitivity' impacts and social consequences that can drive agricultural activity away. In order to accommodate urban neighbours in a rural community, farmers can be faced with new problems which include regulation of routine farming activities such as time constraints when operating noisy machinery or restrictive pesticide or fertiliser use. Farmers may either adapt to these requirements or react and potentially sell their land. Amongst other concerns, reverse sensitivity matters were raised by rural stakeholders during recent Unitary Plan discussions about changes to the rural urban boundary.
23. Although the Auckland Council Regional Policy Statement defines LUC Class 1 as elite land and LUC Classes as 2 and 3 as prime land, only LUC Class 1 is protected from development in section 2.6.2.2 which states that 'Extensions may be made to the metropolitan urban limits' 'and to the limits of rural and coastal settlements from time to time, but only where (ix) Areas of elite land are avoided'. Hundreds of hectares of elite land have, however, been lost to various developments throughout the Auckland region, particularly since 1996, and future growth pressures indicate this could continue.
24. In proposing to provide for 10-40% of Auckland's growth (up to 160,000 dwellings) outside the 2010 metropolitan urban limit (MUL), the Auckland Plan makes a commitment for the city to grow in an outward direction (while at the same time growing through intensification).
25. The Auckland Plan indicates that the greenfield investigation areas will accommodate up to 90,000 new dwellings over the next 30 years. The population of Pukekohe is envisaged to grow to 50,000 and Warkworth to 20,000 over the next 30 years. The accommodation of Auckland's future urban growth and the need for additional greenfield development has been stated in the Auckland Plan development strategy (these areas are noted as "Greenfield Areas of Investigation").
26. Currently, over 90% of land identified as an option for inclusion in the rural urban boundary (RUB) in the South Greenfield Areas of Investigation is considered high-class land

(excluding alternative business, separate plan change and Ramarama South business options).⁵ Of this, 555 ha occupy Class 1 land, 5050 ha Class 2 and 1936 ha Class 3 land equating to 13%, 9% and 3% of Class 1, 2, 3 total regional resources, respectively. The West Greenfield Areas of Investigation also occupy a significant proportion of Class 2 land. These are additional pressures and potential trade-offs challenging Auckland's high-class soil resources.

27. To ensure the protection of the remaining high-class land outside these "Greenfield Areas of Investigation" various measures such as the 'Transferable Rural Site Subdivision' proposals in the draft Unitary Plan have been implemented to safeguard the productive potential of remaining high-class land. This includes 'receiver site exclusion zones' whereby transferable rural site subdivisions are excluded from these zones that contain a significant proportion of high-class land.⁶
28. The Auckland Plan aspirations and draft Unitary Plan objectives reflect the difficulty of balancing both the need to accommodate growth as well as protecting potential productive agricultural land for current and future demand.

Consideration

Local Board Views

29. It is recommended that all local boards receive this report so that local board members fully understand how potential trade-offs related to the loss of high-class land affect current and future communities. This will allow the opportunity to provide input and discussion on such matters.

Maori Impact Statement

30. It is recommended that this report is distributed to the Independent Maori Statutory Board so that the board members fully understand how potential trade-offs related to the loss of high-class land affect current and future communities. This will allow the opportunity to provide input and discussion on such matters.

General

31. This report to the Environment and Sustainability Forum concludes that there are serious pressures on Auckland's high-class land, which have repercussions for their potential productive capacity and economic sustainability.

Implementation Issues

32. Not applicable

⁵ Future growth option and a rural urban boundary south. Map prepared for the draft Auckland Unitary Plan Addendum, 15 March 2013
<http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/EN/planspoliciesprojects/plansstrategies/unitaryplan/Documents/proposedsouthernrubmapalloptions.pdf> (Accessed 14/04/2013)

⁶ Map, Auckland Council 2013: central Franklin receiver exclusio
<http://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Images/Final%20Images/Map%20Diagrams%20-%20revised/Central%20Franklin%20Receiver%20Site%20Exclusion%202013-03-04.pdf> (Accessed 16/04/2013)

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author	Dr Fiona Curran-Cournane - Land and Soil Scientist
Authorisers	Greg Holland - Team Leader, Environmental Science, Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit Grant Barnes - Acting Manager, Auckland Strategy and Research Ludo Campbell-Reid - Environmental Strategy & Policy Manager

Community Watershed Initiatives (formerly the Sustainable Catchments Programme including Project Twin Streams)

File No.: CP2013/09528

Purpose

1. To provide the Forum an update on the Community Watershed Initiatives programme (previously known as the Sustainable Catchments Programme and Project Twin Streams) as requested at the Forum's April meeting.

Executive Summary

2. The Community Watershed Initiatives (CWI) programme brings together Project Twin Streams (PTS) and the Sustainable Catchments Programme (SCP) delivered by the Regional Environmental Priorities Team in the Environmental Services Unit (ESU). It is funded in the Long Term Plan through both the ESU and Stormwater unit budgets. As a programme, the CWI is in its first year of inception with the focus largely on establishment and planning together with the delivery of some new on-the-ground improvement projects and ongoing PTS work.
3. The strategic objective of the CWI is to contribute to the achievement of Council's stormwater, water quality and stream restoration outcomes through integrated, community-based interventions in priority catchments. The types of interventions could include riparian and wetland restoration, walkways, interpretation signs and research projects. Linking up and leveraging off existing council, iwi and community activities is critical to the programme's success. Council therefore provides an integration and or facilitation role within a catchment.
4. Six catchment areas are currently part of the programme. These catchments are Waitemata (Project Twin Streams); Mahurangi; Kaipara (Hoteo); North East Coast (Whangateau Harbour); Waitemata (Oakley, Motions and Meola Creeks); Manukau (Papakura Stream); and Greater Tamaki.
5. The CWI is also delivering on one of the Mayor's 100 projects; rolling out PTS across the region. Its methodology draws heavily on PTS and other community catchment programmes. The original PTS capex funding comes to an end by June 2015 so a key focus is developing a transition plan for that project.

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Sustainability Forum:

- a) receive the report.

Discussion

6. The Community Watershed Initiatives (CWI) programme brings together Project Twin Streams (PTS) and the Sustainable Catchments Programme (SCP). Programme funding is made up of \$1.5 million per year for 10 years from the Stormwater Unit as well as the remaining PTS capex budget \$1.8 million to June 2015 (excluding the current year) from the Environmental Services Unit (ESU) budget.
7. The objective of the CWI is to contribute to the achievement of Council's stormwater, water quality and stream restoration outcomes through integrated, community-based interventions in priority catchments.

8. The types of interventions could include riparian and wetland restoration, walkways, interpretation signs and research projects. Typically this would not include hard engineering based works (e.g. stream daylighting) however the CWI may deliver the planting and community engagement aspects of such a project. Providing an integration and or facilitation role within a catchment is also a key function for many of the catchments.
9. The focus of the CWI in its first year is the delivery of a number of restoration projects as well as programme design including development of monitoring and evaluation plans.

Current Areas

10. Six catchments are currently part of the programme. The catchments were chosen by considering existing programmes already underway, emerging storm water priorities and known areas of community action. These catchments are:
 - Waitemata (Project Twin Streams)
 - Mahurangi
 - Kaipara (Hoteo)
 - North East Coast (Whangateau Harbour)
 - Waitemata (Oakley, Motions and Meola Creeks)
 - Manukau (Papakura Stream)
 - Greater Tamaki
11. In addition other work is being supported, including the La Rosa Stream daylighting project.
12. The CWI is a regionally focused programme that works in local catchments. At a regional level programme processes and principles are established to ensure consistent approaches are taken within each location. Each catchment project then implements these processes in a way that responds to local catchment conditions and local iwi and community aspirations. Each catchment project will have its own locally appropriate identify such as PTS and the Mahurangi Action Plan.
13. With the exception of Project Twin Streams (PTS), all catchment projects are funded regionally. A decision has recently been made to reallocate PTS funding to the western local boards.

Methodology & Relationship with Stormwater

14. The CWI can be seen as delivering on one of the Mayor's 100 projects, rolling out PTS across the region. The CWI methodology draws heavily on PTS and other community catchment programmes, and in particular:
 - the delivery of water focused environmental outcomes through community based methods
 - a strong focus on working with and through iwi and community
 - the use of creative engagement (art-based projects) as a key tool to engaging communities
 - working through identified community leaders where possible
 - acknowledging the importance of access and amenity to communities in relation to water
 - recognising the importance of addressing iwi and community aspirations in regards to water to ensure long term objectives are achieved
15. Through the development of the programme's methodology it has become apparent that the CWI will play different roles in the urban and rural areas, responding to the differing role of Stormwater. In the urban catchments the bulk of the planning is stormwater led so the CWI is focused on implementation. In rural areas CWI scope covers both catchment planning and implementation.
16. A CWI engagement plan has been prepared to outline the approach for iwi and communities. Discussions continue with Stormwater and Policy to ensure that engagement

with Local Boards, iwi and community relevant in CWI catchments is consistent and aligned to ensure that people are not over consulted.

17. The CWI is aligned to the Council's direction both through the Auckland Plan and Draft Unitary Plan (Auckland Plan Strategic Direction 7 Acknowledge that Nature and People are Inseparable –Priority One Value our Natural Heritage, and Priority Two Sustainably Manage Natural Resources). The Draft Unitary Plan includes provision for protection and enhancement of riparian margins, restoration of Hauraki Gulf ecosystems, supporting restoration activities that will protect coastal environments and providing opportunities for Mana Whenua to be involved in integrated management of natural and physical resources. The CWI also reflects the emerging government direction toward collaborative water management as outlined in their Freshwater Reforms paper 2013.

Current Work Underway

Waitemata (Project Twin Streams)

- Ongoing restoration works continue on Oratia, Opanuku, Waikumete and parts of the Henderson Streams through a mix of community organisations and physical works contracts. A number of creative engagement projects are also underway.
- The physical restoration work requirements on the Swanson Stream and parts of the Henderson Creek have been completed by the community with support from contractors.
- A partnership between Parks and ESU has been established and the maintenance of these two areas is now managed by Parks under their existing physical works contracts through Local Board funding.
- Parks, in conjunction with ESU, are also managing the staged removal of large weed trees for all five streams. Pest control has also been initiated this autumn.
- The community engagement work on Swanson Stream and Henderson Creek is still managed by ESU.
- A transition plan, including implementation of phase two, is being developed for PTS once its original capex funding comes to an end in June 2015.

Mahurangi

- Ongoing management of grants (now defunct Landowner Assistance Fund) funded projects.
- Rural land management advice provided to landowners.
- Continued support of community lead initiatives such as Mahurangi Farm Forestry Trail.
- Development of Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
- Implementation plan being developed.

Kaipara/Hoteo

- Rural land management advice provided to landowners.
- Soil testing and drafting of farm plans.
- Ongoing management of grants funded projects.
- Development of background reports to identify priority activities e.g. iwi and stakeholder and catchment description reports.
- Development of Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
- Implementation plan being developed.

North Coast (Whangateau)

- Development of Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
- Implementation plan being developed.
- Soil testing and farm plan support.
- Rural land management advice provided to landowners

Waitemata (Oakley, Motions and Meola Creeks)

- Five restoration projects delivered through Wai Care.

- Implementation plan being developed.

Other Projects

- La Rosa Daylighting project, undertaking tree planting and community engagement aspects.

Manukau (Papakura Stream)

- Implementation plan being developed.

Greater Tamaki

- Implementation plan being developed.

Consideration

Local Board Views

18. Relevant local boards were briefed on the CWI last year. Local Board workshops in May and June will be attended to provide updates on the programme and receive feedback on catchment project priorities.

Maori Impact Statement

19. Water is a significant issue of interest to iwi. As advised by Te Waka Angamua; Maori Strategy and Relations team, iwi have provided Council clear feedback that they wish an integrated conversation in regards to water. Discussions therefore are ongoing with both Stormwater and Policy to ensure that CWI iwi engagement is consistent and aligned.
20. Given the extent of the programme, to date over 15 different iwi have been identified as requiring engagement. Discussions are underway with Te Waka Angamua as to how best progress this scale of engagement and a briefing provided (alongside the Stormwater Unit), at the Regional Iwi Forum's May meeting.

General

21. There are no other associated issues requiring consideration.

Implementation Issues

- 19 A key factor influencing the success of the CWI programme is integration with other teams across Council, in particular with Stormwater, Land, Water and Coastal Policy, Parks and Community Development. Project teams are being set up to support this integrated, catchment based implementation.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Authors	Kim Morresey - Team Leader Regional Priorities Viv Sherwood - Manager Regional Environmental Programmes Gael Ogilvie - Acting Manager, Environmental Services Unit
Authorisers	John Dragicevich - Manager Infrastructure and Environmental Services Ludo Campbell-Reid - Environmental Strategy & Policy Manager

Enviroschools Report

File No.: CP2013/09629

Purpose

1. To update the Environment and Sustainability Forum on participation of the early childhood sector in the Enviroschools Programme and strategies to reduce the waiting list of schools wishing to participate in the programme.

Executive Summary

2. There are currently 176 Enviroschools in the Auckland region comprising 29 secondary schools, 121 primary schools and 26 early childhood centres. This is an increase of 21 schools (14%) since July 2012.
3. The greatest demand to participate in the Enviroschools programme over the last five years has come from the early childhood sector. As a result of nationwide interest The Enviroschools Foundation has designed a cost effective project in partnership with the regional network, to better cater for the involvement of the early childhood sector in the Enviroschools programme. This involves working with clusters of early childhood centres including Auckland Kindergarten Association and Counties Manukau Kindergarten Association. Staff from these organisations are supported by Council to facilitate the programme, as opposed to employing an independent facilitator, as occurs with schools.
4. The waiting list of schools wishing to join the Enviroschools programme has been significantly decreased in the last twelve months due to an increase in resources and redeployment of staff to this priority area.

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Sustainability Forum:

- a) receive the report

Discussion

Background information of the Enviroschools programme

5. In the Auckland region the Enviroschools programme is fully integrated within a suite of education for sustainability programmes that cater for all levels of schooling and engagement with the environment, e.g. Learning Through Experience (Regional Parks), Make A Difference (MAD) Youth Sustainability programme, and an Outreach programme for schools starting on their journey towards sustainability. Enviroschools may also participate in a range of other programmes e.g. Wai Care.
6. Enviroschools is a nationwide programme that supports young people to design, plan and implement projects that create healthy, more sustainable schools and communities. By leading projects and working with their communities, students are contributing to the well-being of their place and gaining the experience, decision-making and leadership that empowers them to be active responsible citizens.
7. Enviroschools is designed to support young people as they move through schooling - creating a continuous pathway from early childhood through secondary. Levels of achievement in Enviroschools communities are recognised by certificates and flags - Bronze, Silver, Green-Gold and beyond Green-Gold.
8. Schools and early childhood centres in the Auckland region have been supported by legacy councils to participate in the Enviroschools programme since 2002. There are currently 176 Enviroschools in the Auckland region comprising 29 secondary schools, 121 primary schools

and 26 early childhood centres, as per the table below. This is an increase of 21 schools (14%) since July 2012.

	July 2012	April 2013	Increase
Early Childhood	20	26	+ 6
Primary	111	121 *	+ 10 *
Secondary	24	29 *	+ 5 *
Total number of Enviroschools	155	176	+ 21

* Paper work being processed to complete registration

8. The Enviroschools Foundation manages the Enviroschools programme nationally and works in partnership with over 70 organisations including central and local government agencies, community groups and business. Local government is the backbone of the programme regionally, and councils in Waikato, Auckland and Bay of Plenty have been acknowledged as instrumental to the development of the programme.
9. The Foundation provides strategic direction and a range of services to the regions, including training and mentoring, programme development and innovation and resource development. Regional networks provide coordination, facilitation, school networking and professional development, including skilled people, ideas and networking opportunities.
10. This national - regional collaboration creates many efficiencies. It enables innovation as well as creating a nationwide identity that is locally diverse and responsive to different regional needs and situations.
11. This partnership approach operates at a significant scale, involving over one quarter of New Zealand's primary and secondary schools, and a growing number of early childhood centres (880 in all). Currently the network engages with 240,000 children and young people who are part of the Enviroschools Programme.

Early Childhood in Sector in Auckland's Enviroschools

12. Working with the early childhood sector is recognised as an effective way to influence family behaviours as at this stage of education parents are often actively participating with the education of their children. There are 1,233 early childhood centres in the Auckland region, catering for 21,650 children.
13. Demand from the Early Childhood sector to join the Enviroschools Programme has been growing at a rapid pace. To cope with this demand a part-time coordinator has recently been contracted to further tailor the programme to the needs of early childhood and coordinate delivery to the sector.
14. It is important to have a delivery model that is cost effective, manageable and tailored specifically to the early childhood sector. The Enviroschools Foundation has designed a project in partnership with the regional network, to better cater for the involvement of the early childhood sector in the Enviroschools programme.
15. Key features of this project as it relates to Auckland are to:
 - establish clusters of early childhood centres based on existing organisations e.g. Auckland Kindergarten Association and Manukau Kindergarten Association
 - provide nationally led professional development opportunities for kindergarten leaders
 - support early childhood facilitators.
16. Inspired by St James Kindergarten in Grey Lynn (who achieved Green-Gold status in 2010) there are currently 20 AKA Enviroschools with eight trained facilitators. In 2012 Counties Manukau Kindergarten Association (CMKA) trained three facilitators to support four new

Enviroschools. In time, it is the intention that the remaining 22 CMKA centres will become part of the Enviroschools network.

17. Northern Kindergarten Association, which has 13 centres, has also expressed an interest in joining Enviroschools. Interim support is being provided by Education for Sustainability Advisors.
18. Anecdotally, the demand for participation in environmental programmes from the early childhood sector in the Auckland region is mirrored in many parts of New Zealand and internationally.

Enviroschools waiting list

19. Interest in the Enviroschools Programme has also been high from primary and secondary schools over the last few years. A waiting list to join the programme has been in place since pre-transition to Auckland Council. A variety of strategies has been introduced to cope with demand to join the programme e.g. development of the WasteWise Schools Programme as a first step on the pathway to developing a sustainable school and community as well as securing the services of an early childhood specialist.
20. It is anticipated that the current waiting list (20 schools) will be reduced by July 2013.

Reduction of Enviroschools waiting list:

	July 2012	April 2013	Probable July 2013
Total number of schools	37	20	10

Breakdown of current waiting list:

Total number on waiting list = 20	Explanation
9	Early Childhood. This group will be catered for by the end of June 2013 through the work of the newly appointed Early Childhood EfS Coordinator
5	These primary schools are currently on the WasteWise programme. They may choose to register for Enviroschools when they have graduated from this two year programme.
1	This primary school has asked to be reconsidered as an Enviroschool in Term 2 2013. A facilitator is available for this school.
3	Primary schools. Facilitators currently are at full capacity in these areas – west and central Auckland. We expect to accommodate them by late 2013.
2	These primary schools are in the process of reviewing their application due to change of staff and priorities at the school.

Consideration

Local Board Views

21. Local Board views have not been sought in the preparation of this paper however, informal conversations with a number of Local Board members indicate support for and a desire to increase the number of Enviroschools.

Maori Impact Statement

22. The Guiding Principles of the Enviroschools programme include Maori perspectives which are fully integrated at all levels for mainstream schools.

Implementation Issues

23. The planned growth in the early childhood sector will be staged over a three year period. In the current financial year there are no financial implications as efficiencies in the current method of delivering the programme have been made so that support is available for kindergartens.
24. In the 2014/15 financial year additional funding will be requested in order to grow the EnviroSchools programme to include other early childhood providers

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Authors	Sandy Bell - Senior Education for Sustainability Advisor Hilary Chidlow - Team Leader Education for Sustainability
Authorisers	John Dragicevich - Manager Infrastructure and Environmental Services Ludo Campbell-Reid - Environmental Strategy & Policy Manager