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DOCUMENT APPROACH
This document has been prepared for use by Napier Port to support resource consent applications for the development of the Proposed Wharf and Dredging Project (PWDP).

THE CONSULTATION REPORT IS DIVIDED INTO THREE PARTS:

PART 1: PROJECT ESTABLISHMENT;
Sets out the foundation of the consultation campaign; the governance structure, the agreed approach and the resources put in place to support the process.

PART 2: CONSULTATION APPROACH; AND
Sets out the approach to who and how Napier Port wanted to communicate the project.

PART 3: CONSULTATION IMPLEMENTATION.
Is a record of the consultation activities carried out in the lead up to the preparation of the Assessment of Effects on the Environment (AEE) Report and analysis and response to the feedback collected.
PART 1: PROJECT ESTABLISHMENT

This section sets out the foundation of the consultation campaign undertaken for this project, including the governance structure, the agreed approach and the resources put in place to support the process.

INTRODUCTION

In 2015, Napier Port decided to progress a project to seek resource consent for a new wharf and dredging. Recognising the importance of consultation as part of its corporate responsibilities, and in the statutory approvals processes, a comprehensive communication and consultation process has been progressed over the past 21 months. This report sets out the nature and scope of the consultation, and the findings to date. Napier Port sees the process as ongoing and has made commitments to the community to continue to consult as the project proceeds.

COMMUNICATIONS CONTEXT

Recognising the project’s scale and potential complexity, Napier Port wanted to proactively engage with its stakeholders, many of whom could be directly and indirectly impacted by the proposal. This engagement extended to its neighbours, the wider community and commercial stakeholders across Hawke’s Bay. While the project was the catalyst, Napier Port made a decision to reach out and to build relationships beyond its immediate project needs. Essentially, Napier Port recognised its importance to the wider community but it also understood that beyond those who worked at the Port, the wider Hawke’s Bay community may not have understood the importance of the Port in future-proofing the region. Therefore, the company decided it would actively work to increase understanding of the Port and its place in the region’s economy through a variety of engagement activities. As part of this, Napier Port chose to take a very open communications approach to this project.

The end result was a project team who were keen to engage with, and keep the community at the forefront of its Proposed Wharf and Dredging Project (PWDP).

CONSULTATION OBJECTIVES WITH IWI AND THE WIDER COMMUNITY

While the proposed location of the wharf is entirely within Napier Port’s existing port management area, the company was keenly aware that any significant capital project would be of interest to the community, particularly the dredging and disposal aspects of the project. It wanted to understand what people valued about the coastal environment that Napier Port operates in and how it could carry out the project while protecting those values for future generations.

In particular, Napier Port was aware that local hapū had specific interests in the project. Napier Port had started down the path of engaging some mana whenua, having signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Te Matau a Māui Voyaging Trust in July 2016. However, the company still had a significant way to go to build and rebuild relationships with mana whenua.

A consultation and communications plan developed for the project states:

“...The objective of the consultation process is to re-establish long-term relationships with the tangata whenua and to listen to stakeholders’ perspectives and gather additional information it may not have yet considered or been aware of. The intent is that the consultation process will help shape the consent application and the Port’s long-term relationship with iwi.”

Taking an engagement approach to the project also provided an opportunity for Napier Port to engage with the community generally, to promote Napier Port’s role in the regional economy and its place in the future prosperity of Hawke’s Bay.
CONSULTATION FRAMEWORK

PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION

Napier Port has conducted early and open pre-consultation with stakeholders and the community on its Proposed Wharf and Dredging Project (PWDP).

Consultation can be a valuable source of information, particularly in identifying and assessing potential adverse effects and can also contribute to good project development and design.

The Fourth Schedule (Clause 1(h)) of the RMA states that, if there has been consultation, an Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) should include a statement that identifies those persons interested in or affected by the proposal, details of any consultation undertaken, and any response to the views of those consulted.

CONSULTATION OBJECTIVES

Napier Port sought specialist consultation and stakeholder engagement advice to ensure a robust framework was established from the outset. BRG (Busby Ramshaw Grice Ltd), one of New Zealand’s leading public affairs agencies were selected as they provided a multi-disciplinary communications support to the project, offering resource consent stakeholder engagement and kaupapa Māori expertise, among other media management skills. The company also engaged a dedicated internal communications resource to drive the stakeholder engagement and pre-consultation programme.

Consultation was undertaken in accordance with a consultation and communications plan, developed with the assistance of BRG and Allan Planning. The plan was a “living document” which was updated as needed. The plan outlined the “RMA consultation objectives” as being:

- All people and organisations interested in or affected by the Project are given the opportunity to actively and fully participate in the consultation process.
- Best practice requirements for tangata whenua consultation are met.
- All participants in the process have sufficient understanding of the Project to enable informed and useful responses.
- All participants are satisfied that consultation has been undertaken in a genuine and open-minded manner.
- All participants are satisfied that their responses, feedback and advice has been carefully considered.
- All participants have a full understanding of how the consultation output has been treated.
- The consent authority (HBRC) is satisfied that the consultation has been undertaken comprehensively and competently.
- Napier Port has a full record and an audit trail of a comprehensive consultation process to support this Project and any future actions.
PART 2: CONSULTATION APPROACH

This section sets out Napier Port’s approach to consultation and communication; to who and how Napier Port wanted to communicate the project.

CONSULTATION PLANNING

Napier Port made a decision to consult with stakeholders and the wider community ahead of lodging the resource consent and wanted to set a high standard for how that would be achieved. With that determined, the Culture and Capability team was charged with developing the strategy and implementing it.

PROJECT INFORMATION

In order to inform stakeholders and the community about the project, Napier Port needed to provide a suite of basic information. Many aspects of the project were highly technical and required simplifying for public consumption and understanding. It was recognised that this information needed to take a number of forms and be promoted through a range of channels.

KEY STAKEHOLDERS

The Consultation and Communications Plan (Napier Port, 2016) identified key stakeholder groups that Napier Port wanted to engage with. They were:

- Port staff and contractors;
- Iwi;
- Statutory bodies including central government and local territorial authorities;
- Commercial enterprises;
- Recreational groups;
- Community groups, including Port neighbours;
- Businesses, including Port customers and lease-holders;
- Relevant environmental groups; and
- Central government politicians.

STAKEHOLDER PLAN

Napier Port developed a Stakeholder Plan (Napier Port, July 2016) which expanded on the Key Stakeholder list (Section 4.1.3) to outline specific groups or individuals to engage with and the best approach for engaging with each. It also outlined what engagement had already occurred and identified gaps and actions for addressing them.

A Pre-Consultation Timeline (Appendix 1) was developed, outlining which groups would be engaged, when and through what methods. The timeframes on this plan were later extended due to the complexity of some of the technical findings and the decision to do further investigation.

Napier Port developed a stakeholder matrix to track those interactions, outlined in Section 6.
PART 3: CONSULTATION IMPLEMENTATION

This section is a record of the consultation activities carried out in the lead up to the preparation of the Assessment of Effects on the Environment (AEE) Report and the feedback collected and responses by Napier Port.

IWI & HAPŪ CONSULTATION

Napier Port is dedicated to building and maintaining long term relationships with hapū who have an interest in the future of the port and the environment it operates in. While this is a relatively new focus, Napier Port is dedicated to connecting with the Māori community on a number of levels.

The PWDP has also provided an excellent opportunity to engage with the Māori community.

In the very early stages of the project, it was established that seeking input from local hapū/iwi was a priority, to enable Napier Port to gain an understanding of the cultural values and significance of the area the PWDP project would be carried out in. From the outset, Napier Port was conscious that local hapū had a particular interest in the welfare of the Pania Reef ecology and its cultural significance.

Napier Port was advised that the most appropriate mechanism for achieving a greater understanding of the cultural significance of Pania Reef, was the preparation of a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA). Following initial discussions with Ngāti Kahungunu, Hawke’s Bay Regional Council, Napier Port Planning Consultants and BRG to establish a ‘starting list’ of hapū/iwi to engage with, Napier Port Senior Managers commenced an initial round of ‘kanohi ki te kanohi (‘face to face’) meetings.

Ngati Pārau stated its mana whenua over the project area. It was decided by hapū representatives that having a single representative of mana whenua was the most practical option, while still engaging individually with each hapū.

It was agreed between Ngāti Kahungunu Iwi Incorporated (NKII), Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust (MTT) and Ngati Pārau, that Laurie O’Reilly, a direct descendant of Pania, would act as the mana whenua representative, to coordinate the CIA and liaise with the relevant hapū/iwi groups for overall input into the CIA. In addition, Mr O’Reilly requested that an independent environmental consultant, Shade Smith of Triplefin, would carry out an additional technical peer review of the relevant studies relating to Pania Reef, to ensure that the science was well understood and considered from a Māori perspective.

Engagement with hapū and iwi, including hui, phone calls and emails, are outlined in the Pania Reef Stakeholder Engagement Table (Appendix 2).
# IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Consultation implementation, by month, was carried out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>● Consultation and Communication Plan developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>● Meetings with Ngāti Pārau, Mana Ahuriri and Ngāti Kahungunu Iwi Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MARCH   | ● E-update to staff/stakeholders on project proposal  
          | ● Project website launched  
          | ● Public announcement |
| APRIL   | ● Meeting with Maungaharuru-Tangiū Trust  
          | ● Primary Sector Awards (Project mentioned in speech) |
| MAY     | ● E-update to stakeholders on studies  
          | ● Meeting with Ngāti Kahungunu Iwi Incorporated  
          | ● Second meeting with Ngāti Pārau |
| JUNE    | **Promotion:**  
          | ● Billboards erected at Breakwater Beach and Bluff Hill Lookout  
          | ● Common presentation developed for all PWDP presentations  
          | ● Events: Export NZ/Chamber of Commerce breakfast (Project mentioned in speech)  
          | **Presentations:**  
          | ● Hawke’s Bay Primary Producers Round Table tour  
          | ● Four Napier Port staff presentations outlining the PWDP |
| JULY    | **Promotion:**  
          | ● Story on project in Hawke’s Bay Branch New Zealand Ship & Marine Society newsletter  
          | **Presentations:**  
          | ● Rata (Sustainability Certification Group)  
          | ● Otatara Heights Probus Club at Taradale RSA  
          | **Events:**  
          | ● SMT took a trip on Te Matau a Māui waka with Ngāti Pārau, NKII members  
          | ● Ministerial visit announcing $25M roading package. Chairman Alasdair MacLeod hosted and discussed wharf development with Ministers Joyce, Guy and Foss  
          | ● Export Awards - Napier Port Most Sustainable Export Award presentation. Napier Port Chair Alasdair MacLeod MCD event and spoke about the PWDP throughout |
| AUGUST  | **Promotion:**  
          | ● Brochure, information boards for drop-in sessions and advertising developed.  
          | **Meetings:**  
          | ● Erin Harford-Wright and Breanna Cullen met with Ahuriri Business Association president, Amanda Sye, regarding business views of the project, concerns around traffic implications.  
          | **Presentations:**  
          | ● Business Hawke’s Bay board  
          | ● Ahuriri Business Association  
          | ● Ahuriri Probus Club  
          | ● Property Institute |
| SEPTEMBER| **Promotion:**  
          | ● Brochures delivered to Napier Hill, Ahuriri and Westshore homes; tabloid advertising in Hawke’s Bay Today and Napier Courier; radio advertising and adlibs; pages added to project website.  
          | **Presentations:**  
          | ● Tukituki MP Craig Foss  
          | ● Napier MP Stuart Nash  
          | ● Napier City Councillors |
### OCTOBER

**Promotion:**
- Noise Mitigation Package announcement

**Presentations:**
- Hastings Mayor Lawrence Yule
- MWH Young Professionals Group
- Events: A&P Show stand

### NOVEMBER

**Promotion:**
- Stakeholder e-update and media release on further investigation into disposal site location

**Presentation:**
- PIANC – Marine Engineers Association

### DECEMBER

**Presentations:**
- Rotary Club of Napier
- Institute of Food Science and Technology

**Meetings:**
- Port Noise Liaison Committee updated
- Napier Fisherman’s Association
- Season update to Transport Operators – including Wharf Development
- Legasea – Recreational Fishers Advocates

### JANUARY

**Presentations:**
- Greendale Probus Club meeting
- Ahuriri Business Association “Future of Ahuriri” presentation
- Ahuriri Sunrise Rotary Club presentation

**Meetings:**
- Season update to Pipfruit Industry - including Wharf Development
- Andy Claudatos – Paddle Crab fisherman meeting

### FEBRUARY

**Meetings:**
- Surfbreak Protection Society presentation / meeting

**Events:**
- Attended Waka Haerenga Festival Powhiri at Matahiwi Marae

### MARCH

**Presentations:**
- Taradale Rotary Club – including Wharf Development

**Meetings:**
- National Aquarium – engagement on Blue Penguins
- HBRC staff make site visit to proposed 6 Wharf Site
- Second season update to Transport Operators – including Wharf Development
- Second season update to Pipfruit industry – including Wharf Development

### APRIL

**Presentations:**
- Taradale Men’s Probus Group presentation
- Napier Probus Club presentation
- Ahuriri Sunrise Rotary Club presentation
- Hawke’s Bay Compulsory Military Training Club presentation

**Event:**
- Minister of Transport, Simon Bridges presentation and site visit
### MAY

**Presentations:**
- Hawke’s Bay InterComm (HB communications staff) – presentation
- Greendale Probus – Bus Tour
- Napier City Council officers – presentation

**Meetings:**
- Legasea – Recreational Fishers Advocates – update meeting
- Napier Fisherman’s Association – update meeting

### JUNE

**Meetings:**
- Whanganui a Orotu Taiwhenua update from TripleFin
- Pre-election candidates update – Stuart Nash, Anna Lorck, Lawrence Yule, David Elliott

### JULY

**Meetings:**
- Napier Port Noise Committee updated

**Presentations:**
- NZ Society of Genealogy
- Hastings Men’s Probus

### AUGUST

**Meetings:**
- National Aquarium – engagement on Blue Penguins
- Hawke’s Bay Surfers update
- MP for Napier, Stuart Nash
- Minister of Tourism, Paula Bennett
- Minister for Workplace Relations and Safety, Michael Woodhouse

### SEPTEMBER

- Hui-a-hapū hosted, by Ngati Pārāu at Waiōhiki Arts Village, on environmental investigations
- MP for Napier, Stuart Nash

---

*Stakeholder Engagement Record*
CHANNELS

The consultation and communications plan identified a number of channels for Napier Port to direct its messaging through. The channel and how it was used are detailed below:

E-UPDATES

Napier Port has sent out three e-updates to both internal and external stakeholders, including staff, tenants (such as PanPac, Ravensdown, C3, Hawke’s Bay Stevedoring Services, ISO, Higgins, HOLCIM, Golden Bay, Specialised Container Services), customers, shipping lines, local government (Hawke’s Bay Regional Council, Napier City Council, Hastings District Council, Wairoa District Council and Central Hawke’s Bay District Council), community groups and people who have provided feedback directly.

The first e-update was sent via MailChimp in March 2016 to announce that Napier Port was embarking on the project and what the preferred option was (E-Update One - Appendix 3). This went out to 189 stakeholders including staff, iwi, transport operators, local and national MPs, councillors, tourism and business groups, customers and tenants.

In May 2016, a second E-update (E-Update Two - Appendix 4) was issued to outline the “in-depth and independent investigations” Napier Port was commissioning so we can understand potential effects of the development”. This went out to more than 560 stakeholders including representatives of Māori organisations, local and national MPs, councillors and staff, recreational users, customers, tenants, business groups and tourists.

A third E-update was sent in November 2016 (E-Update Three - Appendix 5), announcing that Napier Port was doing further investigation into the location of dredge disposal sites after stakeholder engagement raised concerns about the disposal site close to Westshore and sediment movement.

A fourth update was sent in May 2017, announcing Napier Port’s proposal to locate the dredge material disposal site off-shore (E-Update Four - Appendix 6).

MEDIA

On March 2016, Napier Port issued a media release (Media Release One - Appendix 7) announcing the project, why it was necessary and requesting feedback via the new project page http://projects.napierport.co.nz/the-project. The project hit the national headlines, including Newshub’s Paul Henry show, due to the shape of the map (Herald Article - Appendix 8) released alongside the media release. Headlines included “Napier Wharf Plan Cock-Up” in the New Zealand Herald. Articles relating to the project are outlined in full in Media Release and Articles Table (Appendix 9).

Despite the negative nature of the headlines, with support from BRG, Napier Port was able to seize the opportunity for national interest and demonstrate that it was open and transparent in its approach to issues around the project. As a result the project received more publicity than it would have otherwise. This is demonstrated by an interview by Jesse Mulligan on Radio New Zealand with Chief Executive, Garth Cowie.

On October 9, Napier Port issued a media release (Media Release Two - Appendix 10) titled “Community asked for feedback on proposed wharf” announcing pre-consultation drop-in sessions in Ahuriri on September 19th and in Westshore on September 20th. This was picked up by Radio New Zealand, NewstalkZB, Hawke’s Bay Today and the Dominion Post.

On November 28, Napier Port issued a media release (Media Release Three - Appendix 11) titled “Wharf Consent Lodgement Extended for Ongoing Investigations” announcing that stakeholder engagement and further scientific studies had raised concerns about disposing of large volumes of dredge material close to Westshore and that it was doing further investigation into alternative locations.

In March 2017, Hawke’s Bay Today ran a front page and Page 3 headline “Shares in Napier Port Could Be Put Up For Sale as Directors Look at Expansion”. The article questioned how Napier Port intended to pay for the wharf development. This article was followed by a series of articles from local commentators, including Napier MP Stuart Nash, Hastings councillor, Simon Nixon, Tukituki Labour candidate, Anna Lorck and Hawke’s Bay Regional Councillor, Tom Belford. On May 19th 2017, Napier Port released a media release to Hawke’s Bay Today titled “Community Input Helps Shape Napier Port’s Wharf Development” (Media Release Four - Appendix 12) outlining the decision to apply for a dredge disposal site to the east of Napier Port, to minimise the risk of fine sand sediment being reanimated by currents and wave action.

A series of other media releases and subsequent articles which raise the profile of Napier Port activities and support the need for the PWDP but do not mention it specifically are tracked by the company.
NAPIER PORT PROJECT PORTAL

In March 2016, Napier Port launched a dedicated “New Wharf and Phased Dredging Plan” project page http://projects.napierport.co.nz/

The page includes an overview of the project, including video footage of the Port in action, the project and a call to action for viewers to give feedback. The Project description page has been updated to include a detailed description of the project plan; including the consenting process, ship simulations that show artists impressions of the wharf and the likely visual impact; project justification; the design; the proposed dredging programme; Pania Reef and the ecology of the seafloor; cultural significance; visual impact; noise and traffic; and wave modelling.

At the time of writing, 82 comments had been made via Napier Port’s Feedback Portal http://projects.napierport.co.nz/feedback/. The feedback received has been outlined in Section 6.5.

An FAQ page is included and an updates page, which was regularly updated:


![Project portal website](image-url)
DROP-IN SESSIONS AND INFORMATION STANDS

Napier Port identified two specific neighbouring communities of interest which it wished to engage with the PWDP project, namely Ahuriri residents and Westshore residents.

It held two consecutive drop-in days, one at Hawke’s Bay Fishing Club in Ahuriri, on September 19, and another at Westshore Surf Club, on September 20. For efficiency these drop-in sessions were promoted together and used the same format and information boards.

Information board topics included: project need and economic impact; project description; project design; dredging; wave modelling; Pania Reef and sea floor ecology; cultural significance; visual impact; noise and traffic; how to give feedback and the consent process.

A brochure promoting the events went into every letterbox on the Port side of Napier Hill, Ahuriri and Westshore. Radio advertising was broadcast on The Hits and NewstalkZB leading up to the event and adlibs were broadcast in breakfast radio on The Hits.

Tabloid print ads were published in the Napier Courier for two weeks prior to the events and a tabloid ad was printed in the Hawke’s Bay Today on the Saturday prior.

The Ahuriri event attracted around 40 attendees and the Westshore event another 30 attendees.

Every visitor was greeted by a member of the project team, asked to sign the consultation register and encouraged to ask questions of staff and give feedback – either verbally or by filling in a feedback form. Feedback from these events are outlined in Section 6.5.

Napier Port had a stand at the Hawke’s Bay A&P Show on 19th-20th October 2016. Like the drop-in sessions, members of the PSG team were present to answer questions and take feedback. Approximately 20 people approached the stand, including Minister for Primary Industries, Nathan Guy.

Napier Port provided another opportunity for the public to discuss the project when it set up another stand at the A&P Show in October 2017.
DISPLAYS

The drop-in sessions were supported by a display at The Box at 36 Waghorne Street, a shipping container on the Ahuriri Village Green, between 19th – 26th September.

Staff were also identified as key stakeholders so a display was set up in the Napier Port cafeteria so staff could take time to read the information boards, as well as taking a brochure home.

Presentations by the Chief Executive to all staff provided the opportunity for them to understand and engage in the project.

BROCHURE AND ADVERTISING

As previously outlined, 2,250 brochures were distributed to homes in surrounding suburbs and given out to attendees of the drop-in sessions, as well as cafes, restaurants, the Four Square and the Post Office in Ahuriri. Posters, which were duplications of the advertisement (pictured), were also put up at those sites.

Display in Napier Port cafeteria

WDPP brochure

Consultation advertising in Hawke's Bay Today and Napier Courier
BILLBOARDS
Billboards were erected at Breakwater Beach (near the Napier Port main office entrance) and at the Bluff Hill Lookout. The billboards tell the story of the Port and describe the PWDP project.

PRESENTATIONS AND PORT TOURS
Napier Port has hosted 15 groups at the Port for presentations on the project, typically followed by a bus tour of the operation, as well as 20 off-site presentations. These have been carried out by either Garth Cowie, Andrew Locke or Bruce Lochhead and supported by other members of the PSG.

Those groups have included:
- Napier, Hastings and Hawke’s Bay Regional councillors;
- Chamber of Commerce members;
- Hawke’s Bay Primary Producers Round Table;
- Numerous Probus Clubs;
- Numerous Rotary Clubs
- Tukituki MP Craig Foss;
- Tukituki MP Lawrence Yule;
- Napier MP Stuart Nash;
- Cruise ship tour operators;
- Citizens Environmental Advocacy Group;
- Pipfruit New Zealand, Hawke’s Bay growers;
- Transport operators;
- Napier City Council staff;
- Ahuriri Business Association;
- Business Hawke’s Bay;
- Napier Commercial Fisherman’s Association;
- Surfbreak Protection Society; and
- Legasea.

FEEDBACK PROCESSES
The consultation and communications plan included a process for recording consultation feedback. The objective of seeking feedback was to inform the application and supporting information, and for the Project to:
- Meet the intention of the Consultation and Communications Plan, and
- Meet the RMA consultation objectives.

The plan also outlined a feedback management process:
- Detailed notes to be taken during all consultation, including phone calls;
- Discussion points and responses to be sent to all participants following meetings (within three working days of meeting being held);
- All website queries to be captured and responses provided in five working days. If necessary, FAQ to be updated if common themes/question trends emerge;
- Central repository and availability of consultation/communication record; and
- Participant details, issues raised and Napier Port responses to issues raised will be documented in the information supporting the resource consent applications.

FEEDBACK CHANNELS
While feedback from hapū is captured within the CIA, other feedback was captured in a Consultation Feedback Summary Spreadsheet (Napier Port, October 2016). This summary included feedback captured a number of ways:
- The feedback portal [http://projects.napierport.co.nz/feedback/](http://projects.napierport.co.nz/feedback/) where people provided feedback via this portal and, if they had a question, this was responded to by the communications team within a few days. This link was widely promoted through print and radio advertising and in the brochure distributed to letterboxes and at events;
- General queries at group presentations were also recorded via the feedback portal; and
- Through attendees to drop-in session events (or staff on their behalf) filling out feedback forms.

CONSULTATION THEMES
Napier Port has directly engaged with more than 2000 members of the community through a variety of means, including presentations at the Port and in the community, port tours and drop-in sessions (all described above).

This section aims to summarise the feedback Napier Port received from those people by key themes; exploring the topics raised and Napier Port’s response to the issues raised.
### DREDGING AND DREDGE DISPOSAL

**ISSUE:** Concern about erosion at Westshore due to deeper channel: At the Westshore Surf Club drop-in session in particular, there was concern about erosion at Westshore. Theories as to the causes of erosion varied, including the effect of realigning the Tutaekuri River, natural realignment after the 1931 earthquake, Napier Port’s breakwater and dredging of the shipping channel. There was concern from a number of attendees that further dredging of the shipping channel would exacerbate erosion.

**NAPIER PORT RESPONSE:** Team members highlighted the investigations into wave climate that were being carried out, including the Coastal Process Studies in Support of Applications (Worley Parsons) and peer review by Dr Martin Single, and that refinements had been made to the channel design to minimise impact on beaches. The team assured attendees that that the Advisian’s report would investigate “any changes to the supply of sediment to the shoreline resulting from the new development and change in wave climate”. 

**ISSUE:** Concern about adverse effect on fisheries and ecology: A number of attendees to the Hawke’s Bay Sport Fishing Club drop-in session were concerned about the ecological effect of disposing of large volumes of dredge material close to shore. Concerns included where the dredge material might drift to, as well as its effect on seafloor ecology, particularly small invertebrates that fish feed on. There was strong concern about the future of Hawke’s Bay recreational fishing. There was discussion about dredged material moving north to Bay View and the effect it had on in-shore fishing there. There were also concerns raised by a number of divers attending drop-in sessions and providing feedback through the portal about sediment at Pania Reef, either settling on the reef or causing turbidity impacting on dive quality. There were varying points of view about whether this was from material dredged out of the shipping channel, material dredged out of the estuary to keep the inner harbour clear or sand dumped on Westshore Beach.

**NAPIER PORT RESPONSE:** The team highlighted the investigations done on the dredge plume and drift from the disposal site, the “Post-disposal fate of Dredge Spoil Sediments (Worley Parsons)”. It also discussed the “Assessment of Effects on Benthic Ecology and Fisheries Resources from proposed Capital Dredging and Spoil Disposal for Port of Napier” by Cawthron Institute, which had performed many studies for the Port in the past, and would use that extensive knowledge and data to prepare a report on the potential ecological effects for the development, including:

- Additional benthic (near and just below seabed) surveys in the proposed dredge zone, supplementing existing data
- Additional sediment chemistry analysis
- Dive surveys at Pania Reef
- Multi-beam survey of Pania Reef
- Benthic sediment sampling
- Fisheries and Marine Mammals Assessment
- Team members discussed that data to date shows that the turbidity (discolouration) likely to be caused by the capital dredging campaign would be equivalent to or less than the turbidity caused by Hawke’s Bay storm events and that Pania Reef is resilient enough to cope with that.
- Napier Port engaged with members of recreational fishing group, Legasea, at the A&P Show in October and invited them to discuss their concerns with the team. At this meeting in December, Napier Port informed Legasea members that it was delaying lodging consent applications to allow for further investigation into disposing of dredged material further off-shore. There was general support for the disposal site going further off-shore.
- Prior to publically releasing Napier Port’s decision to apply for an off-shore disposal site in May 2017, Napier Port meet with Legasea members again. While generally supportive of the decision the group was keen to see reports that assess sediment movement.
DREDGING AND DREDGE DISPOSAL CONTINUED

ISSUE: Concern that the new dredge channel will affect frequency and quality of surf: In March 2016, Napier Port received feedback from a local surfer, who made two enquiries through the feedback portal regarding the impact of dredging to date on local surfbreaks. He and several surfers who attended drop-in sessions recommended Napier Port use the wharf project as an opportunity to create a surf break or artificial reef in the Bay. In November, the Surfbreak Protection Society (SPS) enquired via the feedback portal about being engaged regarding deepening the shipping channel.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Napier Port responded to the local surfer that studies were being conducted, including surveys to understand the underlying seabed, which paid particular attention to existing surf breaks. His queries were responded to and he was invited to attend meetings but due to other commitments he could not attend.

Napier Port meet two SPS representatives in February to discuss preliminary findings of investigations confirming that surfbreaks had been a consideration of the project from the outset. The SPS representatives made it clear that they blamed Napier Port for a reduction in surf break quality. The team explained that the shipping channel design had been refined to ensure any impacts were minimised and that the findings of the Advisian reports were that there would be no or minimal impact to surf breaks at Whakaire Point and Hardinge Rd, and in some conditions surfability may be improved. Between February and May, Napier Port received a series of emails providing feedback and a number of requests for information regarding surf break impacts. Napier Port responded to each request with information it had available at the time. Requests for advanced release of reports that investigated surf-related issues were declined as the reports were not yet complete. SPS repeatedly asked for an additional peer review by their own consultant eCoast, at Napier Port’s cost. However, Napier Port declined this request as it was already planned that the coastal processes reports would be peer reviewed by Dr Martin Single and HBRC’s own independent expert. Napier Port offered to meet with SPS’s consultant, eCoast, to work through concerns raised by SPS. This was not taken up by SPS. Napier Port continued to engage with the local surfer who had made independent requests for information.

In August, Napier Port hosted an update for local surfers at Napier Port. Thirteen surfers were invited and six attended. Concerns about surf quality were discussed, findings presented and at the end of the meeting and by email after the meeting, several attendees stated they were happy with the level of information provided and findings that the impact on surf breaks would be minor, if not positive.

PROJECT SCOPE

ISSUE: What and how much reclamation is involved: Several people asked if the proposed wharf would reclaim Breakwater Beach and several others mentioned a previous proposal to reclaim that beach. A number of people also asked if the breakwater was being extended as part of the proposal.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Napier Port made it clear that it had no plans to develop the area for operations and that it understood that the community valued the “port beach”. It communicated that Napier Port had invested in making the beach a community asset by minor sand deposition, landscaping the surrounding reserve and installing a beach shower for users. In response to questions about extending the breakwater, Napier Port revealed that it had investigated many options for the wharf location but the current preferred site was chosen, among other things, due to not needing to extend the breakwater, which costs $60,000 per square meter.
ISSUE: Can dredged material be used for other purposes and not just dumped in the sea? A number of attendees at the Westshore Surf Club drop-in session were keen to see dredged material go near or onto Westshore Beach.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Drop-in sessions gave the team the opportunity to clarify project details, including the type of dredge that is proposed to be used and how close it can get material to Westshore Beach, the content of the dredged material and the small volume of material likely to be appropriate for beach re-nourishment. Napier Port also discussed the studies being conducted, including the Post-disposal Fate of Dredge Spoil Sediments (Advisian), Dr Martin Single peer review, Assessment of Effects on Benthic Ecology and Fisheries Resources from proposed Capital Dredging and Spoil Disposal for Port of Napier (Cawthron Institute).

A media release, “Wharf Development Lodgement Extended for Ongoing Investigations”, was issued in November, and sent to stakeholders, outlining further investigation into disposal locations and the effectiveness of re-nourishment at Westshore.

In May, a media release titled “Community Input Helps Shape Napier Port’s Proposed Wharf Development” announced that Napier Port was now proposing to locate the disposal site 5km east of the Port.

After the media release, Napier Port meet with proponents of using dredge material to renourish Westshore Beach, Larry Dallimore, Richard Karn (Westshore Residents Association president) and Barrie Crabbe. While Napier Port explained that the vast majority of the dredged material was not appropriate for disposal in-shore, attendees were still keen to see what material could be used to support Westshore Beach renourishment.

NOISE ISSUE: Concern about increases in noise caused by the increased cargo volume the new wharf would allow:

Disruption to residents of Bluff Hill and Hardinge Rd from Port noise, particularly at night, has been an ongoing issue for Napier Port and this was raised by a number of neighbours who attended the Ahuriri drop-in session.

Some neighbours and Ahuriri business people raised concerns about recent increases in truck numbers and the noise that generates through Ahuriri village.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Napier Port has consistently met the requirements of the District Plan in relation to noise and is also a member of the Port Noise Liaison Committee, which meets to discuss noise issues.

Since July 2016, Napier Port has been working closely with the Napier Port Noise Liaison Committee on a mitigation programme to reduce noise experienced by the most affected neighbours. Initially, the port offered to mitigate homes to a value of $50,000 for each property in matched funding however, after assessment in April 2016, Napier Port offered to seal doors and windows and install air-conditioning, as recommended by acoustics experts Marshall Day Acoustics (MDA), at its own cost. If, after that, homeowners wish to do more extensive mitigation Napier Port will still contribute 50% of the cost. Napier Port has conducted on-going monitoring, with assistance from MDA.

Napier Port engaged MDA to conduct a “Construction Noise Assessment” to investigate the potential noise impacts of the new development, building on the extensive body of data it already has on the port. The advice is that the construction noise standard requirements will be readily met. While there may be a slight increase in noise, a maximum of 2dBA over a long period related to growth in cargo volumes, this increase would still be within the Napier District Plan requirements at all points.

POSITIVE EFFECTS ISSUE: Economic benefits – general: A number of feedback submissions were in support of the project due to the opportunities it would bring to Hawke’s Bay’s economy. They saw the need for the development as a positive indicator for regional growth. Some even went as far as enquiring whether the development was large enough to cater for future growth.

Many others who raised concerns about specific aspects of the project, prefaced their feedback with comments that supported the project on the basis that Napier Port is at the heart of the region’s economy.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Napier Port has included in its presentations and project information, the growth trends Napier Port is facing, particularly in its key exports of fresh produce and wood products, the need for the wharf to accommodate that growth and the opportunity cost to the regional economy of not proceeding with the development.
ISSUE: Economic benefits – enhanced cruise ship capacity: Some comments supported building Napier’s capacity for taking two larger cruise ships at once. One person on a port tour enquired about Napier CBD’s ability to cater for the numbers of passengers that two large ships would bring. Several were interested in the size of next generation cruise ships, while others were aware of the benefits that cruise ships bring to Hawke’s Bay and that passengers often return to the region as independent travellers.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Napier Port included the increasing demand of cruise visits and the regional income from them in its presentations and project information, including that Napier Port currently turns away 5-6 cruise vessels a year due to lack of space, equating to a loss of $20m in regional income.
ISSUE: Port Ownership: Drop-in sessions coincided with the local government election campaign. The Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme was also a topic of debate and the ownership of the Port was implicated as an asset of the Hawke’s Bay Regional Investment Company (HBRIC). An attendee of the Chamber of Commerce event, in September, asked “If HBRIC changes the ownership structure (of the Port) by selling shares, will that change the Port’s ability to debt fund the wharf development?” One comment through the feedback portal strongly opposed Port assets being used as security against the dam.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: In response, the team highlighted that Napier Port is a limited liability company, 100% owned by the Hawke’s Bay Regional Investment Company, which is in turn wholly-owned by Hawke’s Bay Regional Council. Napier Port’s assets are owned by Napier Port – they cannot be mortgaged by anyone else.

The question raised by articles at the time related to who owns Napier Port Company, not who owns the Port’s assets. This is a political issue for HBRIC and HBRC, not Port management. Napier Port has $350M in assets and currently carries $80M in debt. HBRIC is a 100 percent shareholder in the Port and, if it decides to sell shares in the Port then, that is a decision for HBRIC and HBRC. If that was a decision taken by HBRIC, it would not affect the day-to-day operation of the Port.

ISSUE: Effect on property valuations/ house prices: One person enquired via phone as to how the wharf development would affect house prices in the area.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Napier Port referred the enquirer to the Property Council NZ. Land value and house prices are not RMA matters, unless they clearly relate to an aspect of amenity such as noise or visual impact. In this case all such effects would be minor or less.

ISSUE: Port Operational Aspects: There were a number of comments via the feedback portal about operational issues outside of the wharf development, including queries regarding the aesthetic value of Thames Street Empty Container Depot, how Napier Port manages the ballast water discharge of visiting ships and how health and safety around dangerous goods would be managed.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: These issues have been responded to on a case-by-case basis. In relation to Thames Street, Napier Port has invested in landscaping to soften the visual impact of the depot. In relation to ballast water, Napier Port complies with the Ministry for Primary Industries rules and the requirement of the Hawke’s Bay Regional Council Environment Plan for ballast water discharge. Dangerous goods would be managed in line with current procedure.

ISSUE: Pre-consultation process: Napier Port received regular positive feedback for its approach to pre-consultation and engagement with the community.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Napier Port advised those who commented on the quality of consultation that genuine engagement had been a priority for the project from the outset and feedback was being carefully considered.

ISSUE: Project timing: A number of people enquired about the timing of the proposed project construction. Some asked about when larger ships were likely to come to Hawke’s Bay.

NAPIER PORT RESPONSE: Napier Port staff informed that the project would not proceed until there was demand that warranted it, however it was likely that if consent was granted that wharf construction would take two years from commencement. Shipping lines, particularly cruise lines, had indicated they would be bringing ships larger than Napier Port could currently accommodate within five years.
# Stakeholder Engagements

## Table 2: Stakeholder Engagement Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Engagements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Iwi          | Ngāti Kahungunu Iwi Inc.                   | • Meetings (2) with Napier Port  
• Meetings with CIA convener  
• Update letter  
• E-updates  
• Phone calls  
• Hui-a-hapū |
|              | Ngāti Pārau                                | • Meetings with Napier Port (4)  
• Meetings with CIA reps  
• Email updates  
• Update letter  
• Phone calls  
• Hui-a-hapū |
|              | Mangahururu-Tangitū Trust                  | • Meetings with Napier Port (3)  
• Meetings with CIA convener  
• Email updates  
• Update letter  
• Phone calls |
|               | Mana Ahuriri                               | • Meeting with Napier Port (1)  
• Invitations to meet  
• Update letter (2)  
• Email updates |
|               | Te Matau a Māui Voyaging Trust            | • Senior Managers waka trip  
• Update meeting (2)  
• Facebook |
| Elected Representatives | Councils: Councillors and management at Hastings District and Napier City councils | • E-updates (x3)  
• Presentation on-site  
• Port tour  
• Facebook |
|               | Councils: HBRC, Wairoa and Central Hawke’s Bay | • Invitation to presentation and tour  
• E-updates (x3) |
|               | Local Minister: Tukituki Craig Foss (National) | • E-updates (x3)  
• Presentation on-site  
• Port tour  
• Ministerial visit |
|               | National Party Candidates, Lawrence Yule (Tuki Tuki) and David Elliott (Napier) | • Presentation on-site |
|               | Local Minister: Napier Stuart Nash (Labour) | • E-updates (x3)  
• Presentation on-site (2)  
•  |
|               | Ikaroa-Rawhiti MP: Meka Whaitiri (Labour)   | • Invitation for June update meeting |
|               | Labour Party Candidate, Anna Lorck (Tuki Tuki) | • Presentation on-site |
Industry-related Ministers: In July 2017, Steven Joyce (Economic Development /MBIE) and Nathan Guy (MPI) visited Napier Port to announce REDS strategy. Transport Minister visit in April 2017. Workplace Relations and Safety Minister and Minister for Tourism, August 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS GROUPS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chamber of Commerce | • Ministerial visit Hon. Steven Joyce and Hon. Nathan Guy  
| | • Ministerial Visit – Hon. Simon Bridges  
| | • Ministerial Visit - Hon. Michael Woodhouse.  
| | • Ministerial Visit – Hon. Paula Bennett.  |

| Chamber of Commerce | • Breakfast event  
| | • Articles in Pulse  
| | • BAS event  
| | • Port tour  
| | • Presentation on-site  |

| Business HB | • 2016 Presentation to Board  
| | • Meeting with CEO  
| | • 2017 Presentation to Board  |

| Ahuriri Business Association | • Presentation at ABA event (2)  
| | • Article in newsletter  |

| Tourism HB | • Presentation at operators meeting  
| | • Meeting with GM  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBOURS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Seascape | • Invitation for presentation / port tour in November  
| | • Attendance at drop-in sessions  |

| Ahuriri Community | • Brochure drop  
| | • Drop-in session  
| | • Posters/ brochures in cafes  
| | • Radio / print advertising  
| | • Display at The Box  |

| Westshore Community | • Brochure drop  
| | • Drop-in session attendance  
| | • Radio / print advertising  
| | • Facebook via Westshore Surf Club  
| | • Meeting with Larry Dallimore, Richard Karn (2) and Barrie Crabbe  |

| Napier Sailing Club | • Brochure drop  
| | • Radio / print advertising  |

| HB Sport Fishing Club | • Hosted drop-in session  
| | • Attended drop-in session  
| | • Posters in club/ screens  
| | • Feedback via portal  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATIONAL GROUPS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Surfers | • Questions answered via portal  
| | • Attended drop-in session at Westshore / Ahuriri  
| | • Surf Protection Society meeting  
| | • Local surfer meeting  |

| Divers | • Drop-in sessions  
| | • Meetings with dive guide Jonathan Dick (NKII)  |

| Legasea | • Radio / print advertising  
| | • Attended drop-in session  
| | • Engaged at A&P Show stand  
| | • Meeting with members (2)  |
## Interest Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napier Port Fisherman’s Association</td>
<td>Meeting with Rick Burch and Mike Terry (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINZ (Fishing Inshore NZ)</td>
<td>Phone calls with Oliver Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invitation to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-update (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship &amp; Marine Society</td>
<td>Article in society newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintage Port Line</td>
<td>Reunion in Napier – CEO presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishers with quota for fish and paddle crabs</td>
<td>Response to feedback via portal from paddle crab quota holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Meeting with DOC officer Neil Grant (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Environmental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Aquarium of New Zealand</td>
<td>Meeting Blue Penguin curators (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Community at-Large

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Facebook via Napier Port, ABA/NCC/HBRC/Westshore Surf Club/ Te Matau a Māui Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Print advertising (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drop-in sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Napier Courier/ Hawke’s Bay Today articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>PSG participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drop-in session participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>E-updates (x4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>E-updates (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>E-updates (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Lines</td>
<td>E-updates (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Consultation and Communications Plan (Napier Port, 2016) included a high-level engagement process and indicative timeframe for consultation.

### APPENDIX 1: PRE-CONSULTATION TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications/ community and stakeholder engagement strategy developed and agreed</td>
<td>Initial Iwi engagement (2nd to 4th week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk registry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Story&quot; agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist studies and/or reports initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early April</td>
<td>Stakeholder group meetings (continue from March if needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As early in March as possible</td>
<td>Public statement including: - media engagement - website release, inc FAQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stakeholder groups initial contact (mix of emailed letter/phone calls): - DOC - Recreational Groups - Chamber of Commerce - Residents/Neighbours* (*determined by visual &amp; noise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed project billboards at Port beach &amp; Port Hill lookout parking lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (email letter) to 'others' identified as needing information/contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback re specialist studies/reports to key stakeholders/previous meeting participants (depending on specialist study report schedule/availability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up meetings/open days if needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local body elections (12 August close of nominations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local body elections: final mailing date/election date: 8 October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft to HBRC for input prior to formal submission (early Sept)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consent application submitted (date to be confirmed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- DOC
- Recreational Groups
- Chamber of Commerce
- Residents/Neighbours
- Major customers
- Proposed project billboards at Port beach & Port Hill lookout parking lot
- Information (email letter) to 'others' identified as needing information/contact
- Feedback re specialist studies/reports to key stakeholders/previous meeting participants (depending on specialist study report schedule/availability)
- Follow up meetings/open days if needed
- Local body elections: final mailing date/election date: 8 October
- Draft to HBRC for input prior to formal submission (early Sept)
- Resource Consent application submitted (date to be confirmed)
## APPENDIX 2: HAPU STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TABLE

### HAPU AND IWI ENGAGEMENT TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVES</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Pārau</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi</td>
<td>Initial hui. Ngati Pārau stated mana whenua over the project area, particularly Pania Reef. Laurie direct descendant of Pania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Ahuriri</td>
<td>15/02</td>
<td>Joinella Maihi-Carrol, Barry Wilson, Piri Prentice and Wayne Johnston</td>
<td>Initial hui. Mana Ahuriri stated mana whenua over the area and its interest in the regional economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Kahungunu Inc. &amp; Te Taiwhenua o Whanganui a Orotu</td>
<td>23/02</td>
<td>Jonathan Dick, Roy Pewhairangi</td>
<td>Hui: Potential effects on Pania Reef raised. NKII’s interests environmentally sustainable development, Māori tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Pārau, Maungaharuru-Tangitū Trust, Ngāti Kahungunu Inc. (Mana Ahuriri invited)</td>
<td>9/04</td>
<td>Hapū representatives meet to discuss CIA process (Napier Port not present)</td>
<td>Hui: Laurie O’Reilly reported representatives resolved a single mana whenua representative for the CIA simplest option but that Napier Port should continue to engage with hapū directly. Laurie O’Reilly elected as CIA representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Pārau</td>
<td>11/05</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi</td>
<td>Hui: Discuss CIA terms of reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Ahuriri</td>
<td>May/June</td>
<td>Beverley Kemp-Harmer, Piri Prentice</td>
<td>Invitations to meet to discuss the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Kahungunu Inc.</td>
<td>6/05</td>
<td>Jonathan Dick, Roy Pewhairangi</td>
<td>Hui: Update on studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Kahungunu Inc.</td>
<td>12/05</td>
<td>Fish Hook Summit</td>
<td>Garth presentation on project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Pārau</td>
<td>9/06</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly</td>
<td>Hui: Project scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Pārau, Ngāti Kahungunu Inc.</td>
<td>4/07</td>
<td>Jonathan Dick, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi and Tareha whanau</td>
<td>Senior Leadership on waka trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Pārau</td>
<td>3/08</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly</td>
<td>Hui: CIA timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Pārau/ TripleFin</td>
<td>18/08</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly/ Shade Smith</td>
<td>Hui: CIA timing / Scope of reports to be reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungahururu-Tangitū Trust</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>Ina Kara-Smith</td>
<td>Hui: Report availability timing, scope of MTT contribution to CIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngati Pārau, Maungahururu-Tangitū Trust, Mana Ahuriri and Ngāti Kahungunu Inc.</td>
<td>13/10</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Shayne Walker, Ina Kara-France, Jonathan Dick, Beverley Kemp-Harmer, Piri Prentice</td>
<td>Reports made available through DropBox and email outlining process, timing, as well as invitation to attend a presentation and port tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/11</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Shayne Walker and Shade Smith</td>
<td>Phone call: CIA process on hold, due to further investigation into dredge disposal site location and invitation to meeting to discuss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi, Hugh Tareha</td>
<td>Hui: Discussed offshore disposal site locations. Consensus was happy with whatever is best for Pania Reef</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/12</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Jonathan Dick</td>
<td>Email: Sought advice on which hapū have mana kaitiaki over Town Reef as alternative disposal site closer. Advised Ngati Pārau hapū to engage on this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/11</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Shayne Walker and Shade Smith; Naio Tiuka, Beverley Kemp-Harmer, Piri Prentice, Shade Smith</td>
<td>Phone calls/emails: Advise suite of reports available for review and DropBox invitations sent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/04</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Shayne Walker, Shade Smith</td>
<td>Email: Confirming CIA timing and advise Avi-fauna report being completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04</td>
<td>Shayne Walker</td>
<td>Hui: MTT contribution to CIA and Avi-fauna report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/04</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly</td>
<td>Phone call: Discuss Avi-fauna report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/05</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Shayne Walker, Jonathan Dick, Naio Tiuka, Shade Smith, Beverley Kemp-Harmer, Piri Prentice</td>
<td>Email: Avi-fauna and updated marine mammals report provided via DropBox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi, Shade Smith</td>
<td>Meeting: Update on CIA issues, progress and timeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06</td>
<td>TripleFin’s Shade Smith presented to Te Taiwhenua o Whanganui a Orotu</td>
<td>Hui: TripleFin presented initial findings of technical review of Napier Port scientific reports. Laurie O’Reilly says members were positive about project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/9</td>
<td>Laurie O’Reilly, Te Kaha Hawaikirangi, Shade Smith and six hapū members</td>
<td>Hui: Michel de Vos presented environmental findings of technical studies to hapū members, with TripleFin’s Shade Smith providing support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Napier Port releases proposed berth and dredging plan for consultation

Dear << Test First Name >>,
Over the past few years, we have been working through options to provide Napier Port with more berthing alternatives and greater flexibility to meet growing demand. I am pleased to announce that we now have a proposal, which is in the early stages of planning.

In the last quarter of this year, Napier Port plans to seek resource consent to add a new berth within our existing boundary. The berth, which would require dredging and the construction of a new wharf, would be located at the northern end of the container terminal. This would be long enough (350 metres) and deep enough to handle the vessels currently calling but also provide some scope for larger vessels in the future.

We want to know what you think
We will be undertaking specialist investigations to understand all possible impacts before we submit our resource application.

Over the coming weeks and months, we will also be in touch with you or another member of your organisation to ensure you have the opportunity to hear more about the proposal and make sure we take your views into consideration before submitting our resource consent application.

To read more about the proposal, I invite you to visit our project website by clicking on the link below.

Regards,

Garth Cowie
Chief Executive

View website
Consultation and studies for proposed new wharf and staged dredging programme underway

Dear Breanna,

The Hawke’s Bay harvest is in full swing, with Napier Port processing some of its highest export volumes in the past decade. Read more about the volumes [here](#).
In-depth and independent investigations have started so we can understand potential effects of the development. These include the following:

- **Geotechnical investigations** to determine the quantities of sand, silt and mudstone in the proposed development area.
- **Ship simulations** to test the proposed design of the channel and berth in different weather and wave conditions.
- **Noise modelling** to understand how noise from the new wharf would travel.
- **We are employing an external consultant to undertake an assessment of the economic impact of the development on our region.**
- **We are assessing the visual effects,** including a visual representation of the wharf.
- **We are looking at shoreline effects,** including wave modelling, any potential changes to surf breaks or sediment flow, potential impacts on the Port Beach, and whether the dredged material can be used to nourish Westshore beach.
- **We are assessing the make-up of the dredged material and modelling the dredge plume to understand any potential effects on Pania Reef.**
- **Ecological effects** including an assessment of any impact on fisheries and marine mammals, dive surveys and multi-beam surveys of Pania Reef.
- **A cultural impact assessment** to help us understand the cultural significance of the area, and identify any effects – positive or negative – of our proposal upon cultural values.

A full list of studies is available on [our website](#).

**Your feedback is informing our plans.** We have received some questions and feedback about the proposal, which I would like to thank you for.

Questions ranged from how Napier Port proposes to pay for the development to where we plan to place the disposal material. While we don’t yet have the detail - this is part of the work we are doing now - we are using your questions and comments to update our [FAQs](#). Ultimately they will also help shape our final business case.

So please get in touch with me via this email address if you have any questions or feedback you want us to address. In the meantime, I will keep you up to speed as our planning progresses.

Regards,

[Signature]

Garth Cowie
Chief Executive
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Wharf Consent Lodgement Extended for Ongoing Investigations

Dear Erin,

Napier Port now plans to lodge its resource consent applications for the proposed wharf development and phased dredging project in the first half of 2017, so it can do further work to confirm the best locations for disposal of dredged material.

Napier Port had planned to submit its applications to Hawke’s Bay Regional Council before the end of this year but, as a result of community input, now wants to allow more time for ongoing investigations for this part of the project.

Napier Port chief executive, Garth Cowie, says the Port chose to consult early and well ahead of formal notification of the applications so it could understand any potential impacts of the project on its stakeholders and the community.

Mr Cowie says most feedback has supported the economic opportunities the project would bring, however several groups, including divers and recreational fishers, have raised concerns about potential impacts from disposal of dredged material.

“We started this process to share our plans and then listen to what people had to say. What we are hearing is that some people are concerned about the possible impact that such a volume of dredged material might have if it’s deposited within the Bay,” Mr Cowie says.

The initial proposal was looking to deposit dredged material at inshore disposal areas, with sandy material deposited closer to Westshore with the intention of re-nourishing the beach.

“We know this project will allow Hawke’s Bay’s economy to thrive but we also know we want to do it in a way that doesn’t negatively impact on our marine environment.”
"We have a regular maintenance dredging programme and we know from independent studies of those that they have minimal, short-term impacts."

"We also know that the potential volume of dredging material from the later stages of this project is different so we've done additional studies. While they too indicate only minimal impact, we think it's prudent in the long term to look at alternate locations."

"We simply want to be absolutely confident that the final proposed location is the best disposal site from an environmental and community perspective. To do that we need a clear understanding of sediment movement, including the effectiveness of re-nourishment," Mr Cowie says.

So while dredging deposit location sites investigation will continue, other specialist studies into the project's potential effects on the ecology of the seafloor and Pania Reef, dredging and dredging plume impacts, any changes in waves and coastal processes, including on surf breaks, and noise and traffic impacts are all nearing completion. Their results will be used as part of the consent applications.

About the project and consultation process

The proposed wharf development and phased dredging project would see a 350m wharf constructed along the existing container terminal and a deeper, wider shipping channel progressively dredged over time to accommodate larger ships for increasing export trade.

Over the past six months, Napier Port has been actively engaging with iwi and hapū, business, recreational users, central and local government, environmental groups and its own staff. So far, more than 1200 members of the community have engaged with the project through drop-in sessions, presentations, public displays, advertising and a feedback portal on its website.
APPENDIX 6: E-UPDATE FOUR

Community input helps shape Napier Port's proposed wharf development

After input from the community and careful modelling and analysis, Napier Port has decided to amend its original proposal for where it wishes to dispose dredged material, including mostly fine sand and silt, dredged up as part of its planned development.

Napier Port will shortly be seeking consent to build a 350 metre wharf along its existing container terminal and to deepen and widen its shipping channel for the larger ships expected. It had previously considered disposing of the approximately 3 million cubic metres of dredge material at its currently consented disposal sites near to Westshore and expanding it to accommodate the larger volume.

Over the last 15 months, Napier Port has conducted a pre-consultation process prior to lodging resource consent applications, speaking with around 2000 local people, stakeholders and the broader community. That process saw the port engaged in close discussions with groups, including divers and recreational fishing groups, who raised concerns about the proposal for significant volumes of dredge material being deposited close to shore.

Napier Port Chief Executive, Garth Cowie, says Napier Port was particularly concerned to ensure that future sediment disposal would not negatively impact the marine environment.

"While we had already invested heavily in specialist studies, we decided in November to extend those investigations to further include an off-shore disposal site as a serious option," Mr Cowie says.
An extension of the current consented disposal sites was initially considered for the wharf and channel dredging proposal, however after stakeholder engagement and further scientific investigation, Napier Port is now proposing to dispose of dredged material at a location 5km to the east of the port.

The investigations have helped us to understand how effective depositing dredge material near the shore may have been in re-nourishing Westshore Beach, as well as where the different types of sediment are likely to end up.

Mr Cowie says the studies identified that a majority of the material is not suitable for renourishment and the remainder is too fine and will move or be carried anti-clockwise, first south and then east and potentially back towards the Port’s shipping channel.

Dredging to clear the shipping channel over the last decade has yielded small volumes of sand and fine silt. However, we now know from new monitoring and improved modelling techniques that disposing of the material at the Westshore disposal site is not having any long term benefits to the beach.

“The studies showed the coarser sand that did end up on the beach was providing nourishment for a period before being carried north along the coast by wave action. The studies have confirmed the observations of many of the people we spoke to.”
COARSE SAND MOVING ALONG THE BEACH THROUGH WAVE ACTION (LITTORAL DRIFT)

On average models show wave action washing any coarse sand from disposal site onto beach before wave action carries it north. Stage one of the proposed dredging programme is estimated to produce about 90% silt and mudstone and just 10% sand. The overall project is estimated to produce 70% silt and mudstone and 30% sand. Sand will be a mixture of fine and coarse that cannot be separated.

FINE SAND AND SILT RE-SUSPENDED BY WAVES AND THEN CARRIED BY CURRENTS

Models show wave action re-suspends fine sand and silt from the current or considered disposal sites before currents carry it south then east in an anti-clockwise direction.
Napier Port takes its impact on the environment, particularly the marine environment, extremely seriously and as a result of the latest findings has decided that the dredged material from the development would best be disposed of at a site approximately 5km off-shore, directly east of the port.

This site is much deeper than the inshore site and investigations show that the deeper water means that the material disposed will be less susceptible to adverse weather events. Accordingly, any sediment is less likely to be disturbed in a significant storm.

Napier Port is pleased it decided to engage the community early in robust pre-consultation and invest in further investigations, as it now feels confident that the project will have minimal impact on the local marine environment.

"The input from stakeholders at an early stage has allowed the port to develop a far stronger wharf development and dredging resource consent application," Mr Cowie says.
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Napier Port releases proposed wharf and phased dredging plan for consultation

Napier Port today released a draft proposal to add a new berth within its existing boundary for public consultation.

The berth, which would require dredging and the construction of a new wharf, would be located at the northern end of the container terminal.

Napier Port chief executive Garth Cowie says it would give the Port the ability to handle the increasing volumes and larger ships expected at the Port in the future.

"Shipping patterns are changing, and larger vessels are projected to visit New Zealand. At the same time, volumes are set to increase considerably," says Garth.

"We have already made significant investments to build capacity and increase productivity, but in our peak season there is a maximum capacity the Port's main container berth can handle.

"This new wharf would allow us to efficiently handle projected volume growth, larger ships and meet our customers' future requirements for the foreseeable future," says Garth.

The Port is planning to seek a resource consent in the last quarter of this year for the new wharf and its phased dredging programme (and the subsequent disposal of dredge material). The consent, if granted, would allow the Port to dredge in stages to a new maximum of 14.5 metres at low sea levels (from a current consent maximum of 12.8 metres) and to extend the shipping channel.

"The timetable for any construction or phased dredging will be dictated by the time at which increasing container volumes and potentially larger vessels are likely to begin calling at the Port," says Garth.

"We're not certain of when that will be but we do know that we need to be ready to start work immediately if required to remain the port of choice for central New Zealand.

"If we are not ready, shipping lines and cargo volumes could go elsewhere, resulting in increased costs in the supply chain for our local exporters and importers," he says.

Before submitting its application, the Port is consulting with stakeholders to understand their perspectives and gather additional information. At the same time, it is also investigating potential environmental effects through a series of independent, specialist technical assessments and reports.

All the reports and the consultation discussions and documents will help to shape the final business case and resource consent application.

To read more about the Port’s proposed development and submit feedback, visit www.napierport.co.nz.
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The New Zealand Herald
Napier wharf plan cock-up

The wharf design that has caused all the huff. Photo / Supplied

As rumours go, it's probably not what Napier Port was expecting, but you should never underestimate some people's ability to see crudity in almost anything - even dredging designs.

Costing more than $50 million, the new wharf is the port's biggest single investment since it was established.

The release of a preliminary design map included the new channel extending far out away from the port.

Some have commented that the dredging in the design had a phallic shape, but Napier Port chief executive Garth Cowie preferred to say it was "like a petrol pump nozzle".

A different map would be used during public consultation, he said, and it had been changed on the Napier Port website.

Cowie previously said the new wharf was needed to cope with increasing cargo volumes and bigger ships.

The proposal for the new berth, north of the current container terminal, is subject to public consultation and a raft of reports commissioned.

The new berth would require extensive dredging, the amount of which was yet to be determined.

If resource consent was granted, which will be applied for by the end of the year, dredged depth would go to 14.5m from the current 12.8m and the shipping channel extended.

Cowie said it would "future-proof" the port.

"Shipping patterns are changing, and larger vessels are projected to visit New Zealand. At the same time, volumes are set to increase considerably," he said.

"We have already made significant investments to build capacity and increase productivity, but in our peak season there is a maximum capacity the port's main container berth can handle.

The start of the project would be tied to need.

"We're not certain of when that will be but we do know that we need to be ready to start work immediately if required to remain the port of choice for central New Zealand.

"If we are not ready shipping lines and cargo volumes could go elsewhere, resulting in increased costs in the supply chain for our local exporters and importers.

"It is quite an exciting opportunity and it will certainly make sure we can continue to be part of exporters' supply chains."

Cost for the inter-generational asset was yet to be determined, with the volume of required dredging unknown.

Napier Port has already accommodated ships too wide for the Panama Canal and recent crane purchases, part of a $34 million spend following 2014 harvest delays, could easily work with wider ships.

- NZ Herald
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<td>BayBuzz</td>
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Napier Port is asking Hawke’s Bay people what they think of a proposal to construct another wharf and to deepen and extend the existing shipping channel.

Hawke’s Bay’s export economy is thriving and strong growth is forecast into the future. Napier Port needs to increase its capacity to secure the region’s ability to ship its products to the world.

Napier Port is proposing to build a new 350m wharf along the northern edge of its existing container terminal, requiring a deeper swing basin (where the ship turns) and berth pocket (where a ship sits when moored).

Cargo and cruise ships are progressively getting larger and deeper, so Napier Port want to be able to dredge the shipping channel from the existing consented depth of 12.8m to 14.5m.

The project would be carried out in two stages. Stage one would see the construction of the wharf and dredging of the berth pocket and swing basin. Stage two would see the dredging of the channel, but this may be done over as many as six separate phases. Napier Port is applying for a staged consent so dredging can be progressively carried out to meet demand for larger ships to come to Hawke’s Bay.

Napier Port is intending to submit resource consent applications to Hawke’s Bay Regional Council later this year, which will be assessed by independent commissioners.

Chief Executive, Garth Cowie says while the Port is a significant contributor to Hawke’s Bay’s economy, it also takes its role within the community and the sustainable management of the environment very seriously.

“This is a project of significant scale so we have engaged leading local and international experts to carry out detailed modelling on how the design might affect the environment, such as the ecology of the sea floor and Pania Reef, coastal processes, noise and the view from surrounding communities.”

“Those models mean we can refine the design to ensure any impacts are fully addressed. Early indications are that any potential impacts can be managed effectively,” Mr Cowie says.

Napier Port is also working closely with its stakeholders to understand what they value about the area - hosting Port tours, presenting to organisations and holding meetings with local hapū, neighbours, recreational groups, exporters and business groups.

Napier Port is inviting the community to information drop-in sessions at any time between 4pm and 7pm - at Hawke’s Bay Sport Fishing Club in Ahuriri, on Monday September 19th, and Westshore Surf Club, Tuesday, September 20th - to speak to Napier Port staff about the project.

Information will also be on display at The Box, 36 Waghorne Street, Ahuriri between Monday September 19th and Sunday September 25th.

“We are Hawke’s Bay people too, our staff are part of the community – we all have an interest in getting this right for both Hawke’s Bay’s economic growth and for the future of our environment,” Mr Cowie says.

To read more about Napier Port’s proposal visit our project webpage: projects.napierport.co.nz

To provide feedback visit: projects.napierport.co.nz/feedback/
APPENDIX 11: MEDIA RELEASE THREE
WHARF CONSENT LODGEMENT EXTENDED FOR ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS

Napier Port now plans to lodge its resource consent applications for the proposed wharf development and phased dredging project in the first half of 2017, so it can do further work to confirm the best locations for disposal of dredged material.

Napier Port had planned to submit its applications to Hawke’s Bay Regional Council before the end of this year but, as a result of community input, now wants to allow more time for ongoing investigations for this part of the project.

Napier Port chief executive, Garth Cowie, says the Port chose to consult early and well ahead of formal notification of the applications so it could understand any potential impacts of the project on its stakeholders and the community.

Mr Cowie says most feedback has supported the economic opportunities the project would bring, however several groups, including divers and recreational fishers, have raised concerns about potential impacts from disposal of dredged material.

“We started this process to share our plans and then listen to what people had to say. What we are hearing is that some people are concerned about the possible impact that such a volume of dredged material might have if it’s deposited within the Bay,” Mr Cowie says.

The initial proposal was looking to deposit dredged material at inshore disposal areas, with sandy material deposited closer to Westshore with the intention of re-nourishing the beach.

“We know this project will allow Hawke’s Bay’s economy to thrive but we also know we want to do it in a way that doesn’t negatively impact on our marine environment.

“We have a regular maintenance dredging programme and we know from independent studies of those that they have minimal, short-term impacts.

“We also know that the potential volume of dredging material from the later stages of this project is different so we’ve done additional studies. While they too indicate only minimal impact, we think it’s prudent in the long term to look at alternate locations.

“We simply want to be absolutely confident that the final proposed location is the best disposal site from an environmental and community perspective. To do that we need a clear understanding of sediment movement, including the effectiveness of re-nourishment,” Mr Cowie says.

So while dredging deposit location sites investigation will continue, other specialist studies into the project’s potential effects on the ecology of the seafloor and Pania Reef, dredging and dredging plume impacts, any changes in waves and coastal processes, including on surf breaks, and noise and traffic impacts are all nearing completion. Their results will be used as part of the consent applications.

About the project and consultation process

The proposed wharf development and phased dredging project would see a 350m wharf constructed along the existing container terminal and a deeper, wider shipping channel progressively dredged over time to accommodate larger ships for increasing export trade.

Over the past six months, Napier Port has been actively engaging with iwi and hapū, business, recreational users, central and local government, environmental groups and its own staff. So far, more than 1200 members of the community have engaged with the project through drop-in sessions, presentations, public displays, advertising and a feedback portal on its website.
APPENDIX 12: MEDIA RELEASE FOUR
COMMUNITY INPUT HELPS SHAPE NAPIER PORT’S PROPOSED WHARF DEVELOPMENT

After input from the community and careful modelling and analysis, Napier Port has decided to amend its original proposal for where it wishes to dispose dredged material, including mostly fine sand and silt, dredged up as part of its planned development.

Napier Port will shortly be seeking consent to build a 350 metre wharf along its existing container terminal and to deepen and widen its shipping channel for the larger ships expected. It had previously considered disposing of the approximately 3 million cubic metres of dredge material at its currently consented disposal sites near to Westshore and expanding it to accommodate the larger volume.

Over the last 15 months, Napier Port has conducted a pre-consultation process prior to lodging resource consent applications, speaking with around 2000 local people, stakeholders and the broader community.

That process saw the port engaged in close discussions with groups, including divers and recreational fishing groups, who raised concerns about the proposal for significant volumes of dredge material being deposited close to shore.

Napier Port Chief Executive, Garth Cowie, says Napier Port was particularly concerned to ensure that future sediment disposal would not negatively impact the marine environment.

“While we had already invested heavily in specialist studies, we decided in November to extend those investigations to further include an off-shore disposal site as a serious option,” Mr Cowie says.

The investigations have helped us to understand how effective depositing dredge material near the shore may have been in re-nourishing Westshore Beach, as well as where the different types of sediment are likely to end up.

Mr Cowie says the studies identified that a majority of the material is not suitable for renourishment and the remainder is too fine and will move or be carried anti-clockwise, first south and then east and potentially back towards the Port’s shipping channel.

Dredging to clear the shipping channel over the last decade has yielded small volumes of sand and fine silt. However, we now know from new monitoring and improved modelling techniques that disposing of the material at the Westshore disposal site is not having any long term benefits to the beach.

“The studies showed the coarser sand that did end up on the beach was providing nourishment for a period before being carried north along the coast by wave action. The studies have confirmed the observations of many of the people we spoke to.”

Napier Port takes its impact on the environment, particularly the marine environment extremely seriously and as a result of the latest findings has decided that the dredged material from the development would best be disposed of at a site approximately 5km off-shore, directly east of the port.

This site is much deeper than the inshore site and investigations show that the deeper water means that the material disposed will be less susceptible to adverse weather events. Accordingly, any sediment is less likely to be disturbed in a significant storm.

Napier Port is pleased it decided to engage the community early in robust pre-consultation and invest in further investigations, as it now feels confident that the project will have minimal impact on the local marine environment.

“The input from stakeholders at an early stage has allowed the port to develop a far stronger wharf development and dredging resource consent application,” Mr Cowie says.

BACKGROUND

- The Wharf Development is vital to ensuring Hawke’s Bay can export its increasing exports to global markets – Napier Port is expecting a 49% increase in cargo by 2026;
- Ships are getting longer, wider and deeper. Cruise lines have indicated they will be bringing ships of more than 360 meters here in the next five years.
- Napier Port has invested numerous specialist studies on the potential impacts of the development on the ecology of the seafloor and Pania Reef, dredging and dredging plume impacts, waves and coastal processes, surf breaks, noise and traffic.
- Napier Port is planning to lodge resource consent applications with Hawke’s Bay Regional Council;
- The wharf development and associated dredging is estimated to cost more than $100M. If resource consents are granted, a business case will be completed. However, Napier Port is confident the project can be paid for through debt and a reduced dividend to its owner.