TŪ MĀIA
LIMITED

14 Hakihea 2022

Tiwana Tibble
C/o Te Rimu Trust

Tēnā koe Tiwana

CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT – TE RIMU TRUST

Please find the final copy of the Cultural Impact Assessment and I, Roy Hoerara confirm, agree with and attest to the tabular form of this attachment. This annontated chart matrix setting aims to provide more clarity, as Te Rimu Trust seeks approval to establish a barge facility upon its land holding.

Merry Xmas and Happy New Year to you and your whānau as well as to the trustees of Te Rimu Trust.

Nāku iti noa

14/12

Roy Hoerara
Company Director

s 9(2)(a) 17/77 Tory Street, Wellington 6011
s 9(2)(a)

Te Rimu Trust Cultural Impact Assessment

1. Introduction

This Cultural Impact Assessment paper relates to the proposed construction and operation of a marine facility. This impact assessment is divided into four categories and employs a traffic-light approach which assesses the cultural considerations as progress is being made.

2. Background

Te Rimu Trust (applicant) propose to establish a marine facility upon particular land located at Te Araroa on the east coast of the North Island, Aotearoa New Zealand. This report from independent consultant Dr Roy Hoerara, assesses firstly the perceived impact; and secondly the advances made by the applicant with a series of measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any cultural Impacts upon the immediate landholding and adjacent whenua (land). Details of both the four clusters as well as the assessment headings are found in the next section.

This assessment has also used the following sources:

- *Kōrero tuku iho*
- *Historical research*
- *One on one interviews – by local pakeke (elders) who have requested to remain anonymous*
- *A submission from local kaumatua and community advocate Hal Hovell; and*
- *The Te Araroa Barge Facility: Cultural Report, Darrel Naden, July 2022.*

Furthermore, the impacts that are considered also include those that have been reported in the media or otherwise heard from, and those who have challenged the proposal. Furthermore, it should be noted that Tonkin and Taylor (Environmental Specialists) has also identified a number of potential Impacts. Their work has also been considered in this response.

Morover, it should also be contextually noted that the applicant, Te Rimu Trust (all of whose owners whakapapa to Kauwhakatuakina as well as Hinerupe) hold substantial mana whenua of the site where the facility is located, and consequently they are as conscious as anyone of the potential cultural impact of the proposal, hence this assessment.

3. Contextual Platform

The following platform indicates 39 areas that have been identified by Te Rimu Trust. They cover the following four environmental clusters, namely:

- *Site;*
- *Mahinga Kai: Kapata Kai;*
- *Takutai Moana; and*
- *Wāhi Tapu*

Although not enforceable, Section 17 of the Resource Management Act provide for entities seeking resource consents how they would go about avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects as it relates to the environment. For this cultural impact assessment tabulation, Te Rimu Trust has identified thirty nine potential environmental issues and have utilised the following platform for each of these, as follows:

***Avoided** – infers that the issue has been identified with very little impact and doesn't require addressing or has been addressed. These are coloured red to denote that the Te Rimu Trust is happy that the effects and its ongoing responses have avoided known cultural impact;*

***Mitigated** – this infers that such issues have ongoing impact requiring further attention. Mitigation still requires ongoing attention by Te Rimu Trust;*

***Enhanced** – refers to that the proposed Development of a barge facility will be environmentally enhanced, by the established barge facility and further infers that the environment will flourish and grow positively, as a consequence of the said facility; and*

***To complete** – suggests that the Te Rimu Trust still has on-going work to work on in these areas*

TABLE	1. SITE		
	Issue	**Description of potential cultural impact**	**Response (Avoided; Mitigated; and Enhanced and To Complete)**
1	*Tarewapia Urupā*	*Proximity to construction and operation may affect tapu of urupā.*	*Avoided: the construction and operation is too far from the urupā to have an impact.* *There are many examples where urupa are unavoidably located immediately next to SH35, for example local Whānau a Kahu Pukehou Urupa. See on Map 1. In addtion, exploratory trenching has been undertaken by the archaelogist along the western boundary of the urupā. No archaeolgical material was found near the western boundary through trenching. The design of the marine access facility incorporates a substantial buffer (provided by beaches and indigenous vegetation) between the urupā and activities which may affect the values of the urupā.*
2	*Te Toki a Hinerupe*	*The overall area should not accommmodate commercial construction or marine operations due to the rich ancestral history of Kawakawa Bay*	*Avoided. The history of the land does not suggest there should be a rāhui on commercial operations.* *Enhanced. This provides an opportunity to celebrate and acknowledge the rich ancestral history of the area. In the past, dairy farming and aggregate supply businesses operated here, however a memorial/story plaque could be erected here.*
3	*Waipai wetland*	*The proposal may have an impact on the Waipai wetland and the species sustained by it – waterfowls such as huroto - and eels.*	*Mitigated. The Tonkin and Taylor report concludes, that subject to mitigation being implement the marine access facility will not detrimentally affect any wetlands on Te Rimu Trust whenua. The report further notes that a substantial wetland and stream margin restoration programme will form part of the proposal.*
4	*Coastal Impacts: sediment*	*Construction of breakwater and revetments and operation of faciity may deposit sediment in the marine habitat.*	*Avoided Sediment disturbance and suspension in the water column of the moana from the construction of the breakwaters and dredging is not expected to result in appreciable increases in turbidity above natural background levels asscociated with coastal processes. This is because Kawakawa Bay is exposed to the predominant wind and swell direction and has a high wave energy environment. Furthermore, there are fine sediments being constantly transported by the two rivers into the embankment.*

			These fine sediments sit as a thin veneer on top of larger (aggregate) sediments. The fine sediments are constantly being remobilsed into the water column. The marine ecological assessment shows that there are limited to no kaimoana living in and moving through the area to be affected by construction
5	*Coastal impact: erosion*	*Construction of breakwater and revetments and operation of faciity may change wave energy and cause erosion to coast (including wāhi tapu).*	*Mitigated. Any effect of the breakwaters on interuption of longshore sediment transport can be mitigated by transfer/placement of sediment onto the downdrfit side to remedy localised erosion effects. This a very common practice for these types of schemes*
6	*Karakatuwhero River: mana and mauri*	*Construction and operation may impact on the natural flow of the Karakatuwhero River, for instance due to the removal of metal to enable operation or as a commercial by-product (increased metal extraction).*	*Avoided. None of the aggregate to be excavated to form the mooring basin is to be sourced from the active bed or floodplain of the awa. Therefore, there will be no impact on the flow of the awa.*
7	*Karakawuhero River: mauri o te wai*	*Construction and operation may diminish the purity of the water of the Karakatuwhero River, for instance due to the removal of metal to enable operation or as a commercial by product (increased metal extraction).*	*Avoided As above, there will be no impact on the awa.*
8	*Road safety*	*Facility construction and operation will lead to increase traffic and consequent increase in danger of injury or death to local people.*	*Mitigated. Addressed in the Integrated Trasnport Asessment; all Safety issues can be mitigated through design of intersections*
9	*Cultural landscape*	*The facility will cause a scar on the cultural landcape.*	*To complete The Landscape and Visual Assessment being prepared by Isthmus Group comments on effects on Kawakawa Bay and the backshore environment, as elements of the cultural landscape*

	2. MAHINGA KAI: KAPATA KAI		
	Issue	**Description of potential cultural impact**	**Response (avoided, mitigated, enhanced) and to complete**
10	*Access to kaimoana*	*Access to harvest kaimoana (finfish and shellfish) may be impeded by construction and operation of facility.*	*Avoided. As above, the marine ecological assessment shows there are between limited to no kaimoana living in and moving through the area to be affected by construction and operation. Following construction the breakwaters will create new and different habitats for kaimoana.*
11	*Abundance of kaimoana: foreign organisms*	*Abundance of kaimoana (finfish and shellfish) may be constrained by construction and operation of facility, including introduction by vessels of foreign organisms.*	*Avoided. As above, the marine ecological assessment shows there are limited to no kaimoana living in and moving through the area to be affected by construction and operation. A Biosecurity Management Plan (primarily targeting vessel hulls and vessel bilgewater (if applicable) will be developed and implemented to mitigate all potential effects.*
12	*Abundance of kaimoana: carbon*	*Abundance of kaimoana (finfish and shellfish) may be constrained by construction and operation of facility, including increased carbon emisiosns which may harm shellfish.*	*Avoided. The marine ecological assessment shows there are limited to no kaimoana living in and moving through the area to be affected by construction and operation. Carbon emission sources are assumed to be from the petroleum based products used in vessels and these will be managed appropriately to ensure no harmful dischages to the moana result.*
13	*Abundance of kaimoana: oil and fuel spills*	*Abundance of kaimoana (finfish and shellfish) may be constrained by construction and operation of facility, including the risk of fuel spills or run off.*	*Avoided As above for "carbon".*
14	*Abundance of kaimoana: chemical leeching*	*Abundance of kaimoana (finfish and shellfish) may be constrained by construction and operation of facility, including the risk of leeching from marine paints and non-fouling additives.*	*Avoided The marine ecological assessment shows there are limited to no kaimoana living in and moving through the area to be affected by construction and operation. Antifoul applied to vessels using the mooring basin will have to meet recognised eco toxicity standards in order to be approved for use. Periodic sediment sampling and analysis will be undertaken within the mooring basin to confirm contaminants are not depositing in the sediments at levels that would affect the marine. If contaminants*

			are found to be at levels which are harmful then the sediment will be removed and a review of procedures and standards relating to vessels authorised to use the facility will be initiated.
15	*Abundance of kaimoana: overfishing*	*Facility may lead to an increase in recreational and commercial fishing with risk to abundance of species.*	*Avoided As above, the marine ecological assessment shows there are limited to no kaimoana living in and moving through the area to be affected by construction and operation. Following construction the breakwaters will create new habitat for kaimoana.*
16	*Access to freshwater fish*	*Access to harvest freshwater fish may be impeded by construction and operation of facility.*	*Avoided Freshwater fish live in Te Puni Stream and in the awa. There is no public access to the Te Puni stream currently so no changes will result.*
17	*Abundance of freshwater fish*	*Abundance of freshwater fish may be constrained by construction and operation of facility.*	*Avoided No works are proposed in freshwater resources so no such impact can result.*
18	*Manu/birds*	*Access to harvest waterfowl may be impeded by construction and operation of facility.*	*Avoided Waterfowl live in the wetlands and the Te Puni Stream/awa estuary. There is no public access to the Te Puni stream or wetlands currently so no changes will result.*
19	*Manu/birds*	*Abundance of waterfowl may be constrained by construction and operation of facility.*	*Avoided Waterfowl are not located in the construction area. All waterfowl live in the wetlands and the Te Puni Stream/awa estuary.*
20	*Kararehe/matine mammals*	*Marine mammals may be harmed or deterred by sounds generated through the construction and operation of the barge facility.*	*Avoided No marine mamals have been reported or observed within, or near the proposed construction area.*
21	*Rākau/trees and vegetation*	*Access to harvest may be impeded by construction and operation of facility. Abundance may be constrained by construction and operation of facility*	*Avoided There are no trees located in the construction area and the vegetation to be affected by construction is predominantly gorse and pastoral grass.*

	3. TAKUTAI MOANA		
	Issue	***Description of potential cultural impact***	***Response (avoid, mitigate, enhance) and opportunities***
22	Use	*Constuction and operation of the facility may impede use of the takutai moana for launching and landing vessels for cultural purposes.*	*Avoided. Does not happen as a matter of course at present.* *Access limited only to area directly occupied* *The marine access facility will create safe access for lauching and retrieval of vessels. There is not currently safe vessel access due to the exposed nature and slope of the beach*
23	*Ownership*	*Impact of construction and operation of facility on ownership rights that may be acquired by Takutai Trust under takutai moana legislation.*	*Avoided* *Te Rimu Trust is the owner without restricted access to foreshore.* *See below as Te Rimu Trust will cooperate and work with Takutai Moana Trust to develop an MOU that services both sets of interests with regard to coastline ownership rights.*
24	*Kaitiakitanga*	*Impact of construction and operation of facility on ability to exericse kaitiakitanga such as clearance of debris and waste from, or planting to support, takutai moana.*	*Avoided. Access limited only to area directly occupied.* *Enhanced. Potential to facilitate greater access for cultural purposes to majority of coast such as through pathway to Te Araroa*
25	*Harvest*	*Impact of construction and operation of facility on ability to harvest shells, driftwood and seaweed, for cultural purposes.*	*Avoided. Access limited only to area directly occupied* *Enhanced. Potential to facilitate greater cultural access for cultural purposes to majority of coast such as through pathway to Te Araroa.*
26	*Rituals*	*Impact of construction and operation of facility such as karakia, cleansing, burial of pito at takutai moana.*	*Avoided. Access limited only to area directly occupied* *Enhanced. Potential to facilitate greater access for cultural purposes to majority of coast such as through pathway to Te Araroa.*

27	*Governance and management*	*Impact of construction and operation of facility on governance and management rights that may be acquired by Takutai Trust under takutai moana legislation DN*	*To complete Work with Takutai Moana Trust to develop an MOU that contains process to avoid any impact on management or governance rights*

	4. WĀHI TAPU		
	Issue	**Description of potential cultural impact**	**Response (avoid, mitigate, enhance) and opportunities**
28	*Tarewapia Urupā*	*Proximity to construction and operation may affect the tapu of urupā.*	*Avoided The construction and operation is too far from the urupā to have an impact.* *It is understood that whānau are considering relocating urupā due to high water table and encroaching tidal foreshore.*
29	*Te Toki a Hinerupe*	*The overall land area should not accommodate commercial construction or marine operation due to history of land*	*Avoided The history of the land does not suggest there should be a rahui on commercial operations. In the past dairy farming and aggregate supply businesses operated here, however a memorial/story plaque could be erected here?*
30	*Te Tihi o Whetūmatarau*		*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
31	*Taumoko -pā o Hineruope*		*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
32	*Hinetokatā*		*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
33	*Maniaroa*	*Batte site*	*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
34	*Waikarawhete*		*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
35	*Maungakākā*	*Urupā located at Maungakākā and East Coast*	*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
36	*Tapapapa pā*		*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
37	*Hungahungatoroa*	*Located in Karakatuwhero River*	*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
38	*Waikurare stream*		*Avoided Not in vicinity of proposed facility.*
39	*Other currently unknown sites*	*Potential for koiwi, artefcats or occupation sites to be identified and disturbed during construction of facility*	*Avoided Initial achaeologist survey suggest little/no risk* *To completeOnoging monitoring by archaeologist of any excavations, along with cultural monitoring by mana whenua* *Any discoveries will be addressed in accordance with discovery protocol agreed with local community.*