

10 March 2022

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Request for Official Information responded to under the Local Government and Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) – reference: OIR 2122-204

I refer to your two information requests we received on 24 February 2022 for the following:

- 1. I write in reference to the email received by Lyndsey Craig (below). I would like to bring your attention to paragraph 5, which states:***

"We know the report will be seen as contentious in some quarters and have endeavoured to work collaboratively with key groups who have concerns."

Could you please provide the list of the "key groups who have concerns" that the Council has endeavoured to work with collaboratively.

As you are aware in 2019, a co-design working group was established for the Takutai Kāpiti project. Members of that group included Coastal Ratepayers United (CRU) and North Ōtaki Beach Residents Group (NOBRG).

The working group met for a period of 12 months. The discussions and decisions made by that group on the Takutai Kāpiti Project included the scope of services for the open procurement process run to secure the technical experts who would conduct the assessment. In addition, members of that working group (including CRU) were invited to be part of the procurement panel marking the tender submissions and deciding who to award the contract of services to.

More recently, as you are aware, last year, CRU provided written feedback on the methodology report which underpins the findings of the recently released assessment.

Jacobs provided a written response to the CRU methodology review and addendum on 5th October. Further feedback from CRU dated 10th Nov was provided to Jacobs. This formed the basis of discussion for a meeting between CRU and Jacobs on 23rd Nov.

These matters were taken into account as appropriate in the Volume 2 report. This included further clarification of additional analysis is required for the use of the PFSP's in District Planning (e.g., decisions on scenarios and thresholds), further commentary on the use of the RCP8.5 scenario, tying the intermediate 2120 scenarios to RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios, and the inclusion of a sediment budget approach in the appendices based on the beach profile responses and taking account of theoretical beach sediment losses due to SLR.

2. I'm writing in reference to the presentation made to Councillors by Jacobs regarding Volume 2 earlier this week.

I would like to request a copy of that presentation.

A copy of the [presentation](#) Jacobs provided to Council is available on the Takutai Kāpiti website in the [Resources section](#). You will also find it under Related Links at the bottom of the Council webpage [Coastal science - Kāpiti Coast District Council \(kapiticoast.govt.nz\)](http://kapiticoast.govt.nz)

Ngā mihi

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sean Mallon', enclosed in a thin black rectangular border.

Sean Mallon

Group Manager Infrastructure Services
Te Kaihautū Ratonga Pakiaka