

**BEFORE THE COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED ON BEHALF OF THE
OTAGO REGIONAL COUNCIL, CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL,
AND QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER The Resource Management Act
1991

IN THE MATTER of an application for resource
consents for Suction Dredge
Gold Mining on the Clutha River
/ Mata Au

BETWEEN **COLD GOLD CLUTHA
LIMITED**
Applicant

AND **OTAGO REGIONAL COUNCIL
(RM22.434)**
**QUEENSTOWN LAKES
DISTRICT COUNCIL
(RM220834)**
**CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT
COUNCIL (RC220255)**
Consent Authorities

AND **TE RŪNANGA O MOERAKI
KĀTI HUIRAPA RŪNAKA KI
PUKETERAKI**
**TE RŪNANGA O ŌTĀKOU
HOKONUI RŪNANGA INC**
**Submitters (Collectively Kāi
Tahu Ki Ōtākou)**

**CULTURAL EVIDENCE OF RIKI PARATA
ON BEHALF OF HOKONUI RŪNANGA INC & KĀI TAHU KI
ŌTĀKOU**

3 November 2023

MIHIMIHI

Ko aku waka whakairo ko Takitimu, ko Uruao
Kei runga ko Ōparure Kei raro ko Mataura e rere ki te moana o te Ara a Kiwa
Ko Māruawai taku whenua taurikura e takoto nei T
akoto mai ko Matamata, te mōkai tapu o Rakitauneke, te taniwha
Ko Te Au-nui Pihapiha Kanakana te rere
Ko Hoka-nui, Kowhaka-ruru, Tarahau-kapiti ngā puke
Ko Tūtemakohu raua ko Te Rakitauneke ngā tīpuna
Tū mai ko Ō Te Ika Rama, te whakaruruhau o te mano
Tēnei te reo o Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, Ngāti Kurī, Ngāi Tahu ngā iwi

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Riki Neihana Parata.
2. I whakapapa to Kāi Tahu, Kāti Mamoe, Waitaha, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongotai
3. I hold the qualifications of Bachelors of Environmental Management, Masters in Environmental Science
4. My entire life, I have enjoyed a relationship with te taiao (the environment) and wai māori (freshwater) based on mātauranga and practising tikanga. For the past 9 years I have focused my career on monitoring and managing freshwater and freshwater habitats using mātauranga frameworks and tikanga, both alongside and as an alternative to 'western' scientific approaches.
5. I am employed as the Kaiārahi Taiao Mātauranga at Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao, where I lead a team of seven kaimahi working in wai māori (freshwater) research, monitoring and education. I am also an executive member of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc.
6. Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao is a company and registered charity owned wholly by Hokonui Rūnanga Inc. The company is mandated to protect and advance the rights and interests of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc in Kaupapa taiao (natural environment).
7. Hokonui Rūnanga Inc is one of 18 papātipu rūnanga who collectively form Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (Te Rūnanga). Under the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996, Te Rūnanga is recognised as the iwi authority over the Ngāi Tahu takiwā, which includes all of Te Wai Pounamu/South Island from a boundary running between Te Parinui o Whiti/White Bluffs in Marlborough and Kahurangi Point in Nelson, south; and includes Rakiura/Stewart Island and offshore and sub-Antarctic Islands.
8. Hokonui Rūnanga is centred on Māruawai – the floodplains of the Mataura River, including the township of Gore, and extends over a substantial area of Ōtākou/Otago and Murihiku/Southland sharing interests with other rūnanga.
9. The takiwā of Hokonui Rūnanga Inc is described in the Ngāi Tahu (Declaration of Membership) Order 2001 as centred on the Hokonui Region with shared interests in the lakes and mountains between Whakatipu-Waitai (near

Martins Bay) and Tawhitarere with other Murihiku Rūnanga and those located from Waihemo south.”

10. My evidence is given from my knowledge as mana whenua represented by Hokonui Runanga Inc. However, I have the support all four rūnanga who represent those who are mana whenua within Ōtākou/Otago Region, to provide this cultural evidence on behalf of mana whenua.
11. The four rūnanga who represent Kāi Tahu ki Ōtākou are: Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou and Hokonui Rūnanga.
12. Nga rūnanga and their takiwā are described in the Cultural Impact Assessment prepared for the application by Aukaha Ltd and attached to my evidence. The upper reaches of the Mata-au between Luggate and the top of Lake Dunstan are within the takiwā of Kāi Tahu ki Otago and Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku.

Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses

13. I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and I agree to comply with it. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement are within my area of expertise except where I state that I am relying on information provided by another party. I have not knowingly omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

14. My evidence focuses on the association of mana whenua with the Mata-au (Clutha River and catchment).
15. My evidence traverses the following topics:
 - (i) Ngāi Tahu association with the Mata-au (Clutha River)
 - (iii) Wai māori – including mauri and mahinga kai; and
 - (iv) Effects of the proposed activity on wai māori.
16. I am familiar with the proposed activity and the resource consent application, the proposed site, the Mata-au (Clutha) catchment and the evidence of Mr Sycamore presented on behalf of the applicant.
17. A comprehensive description of Ngāi Tahu history and association with the Mata-au is included in the Cultural Impact Assessment provided by

Aukaha Ltd to the applicant and attached to my evidence. I rely on and refer to that information in my evidence.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

18. The Mata-au (Clutha River) is culturally significant to mana whenua. It is a Statutory Acknowledgement Area under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
19. I concur with the assessment in the Cultural Impact Assessment prepared by Aukaha Ltd of the cultural values associated with the Mata-au (Cutha River) and the potential impacts of the proposed activity on those values.
20. I do not agree with the applicant's assessment that any effects on cultural values will be minor.
21. In my view the applicant has used inadequate and inappropriate information in assessing cultural effects. In particular, I believe the applicant has applied an inappropriate framework for assessing cultural values and impacts of the proposed activity on cultural values; and misunderstood key concepts including mauri and mahinga kai.
22. In my opinion, the proposed activity does not accord with wai māori and will have significant impacts of mana whenua cultural values associated with the Mata-au (Clutha River).

NGĀI TAHU ASSOCIATION WITH THE MATA-AU

23. All freshwater is culturally significant to mana whenua. Within this context, the Mata-au is highly significant to Ngāi Tahu whānui. Ngāi Tahu whānui is a term which is used to describe the broad collective of Ngāi Tahu and our ancestors including Ngāti Mamoe and Waitaha.
24. As described in section 8.1 of the Cultural Impact Assessment, the headwaters of the Mata-au are located amongst mountains often named for significant tūpuna, with the waters flowing from them being considered the purest. The awa as it flows from Lake Wānaka to the outlets of the Matau and Kōau branches at Tauhinu is joined by significant tributaries, including the Ōrau, Paetarariki, Lindis, Kawarau, Ōtewhata, Manuherekia, Poumahaka, Tuapeka, Waitāhuna and the Waiwera, which increase its size and volume.
25. The Mata-au is our whakapapa and mahinga kai: a source of life, resources and knowledge. It facilitates our memory and connection to place, and is a

focus for our identity. The Mata-au was part of an ara tawhito (networks and trails) that provided access for mana whenua from the coast to the upper lakes of Wānaka, Hāwea, and Whakatipu-wai-māori including for mahinga kai.

26. The entire system acted as a significant mahinga kai. Weka, kōura, kanakana, and tuna were key food sources collected along its length, and there were bountiful stands of tī kōuka from which to source kāuru and the route was used to transport and trade pounamu.
27. The Mata-au is also the place where Ngāi Tahu's leader, Te Hautapunui o Tū, established a boundary between the takiwā of Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Mamoe. Ngāti Mamoe were to hold mana (authority) over the lands south of the river and Ngāi Tahu were to hold mana northwards. Eventually, the unions between the families of Te Hautapunui o Tū and Ngāti Mamoe resulted in the union of whānau and hapu which made this boundary redundant, but the awa symbolises the link and continuity between past and present generations and reinforces tribal identity.
28. All societies use and relate to features in the landscape as markers of history, but they are particularly important to retaining memory in oral societies.
29. Evidence of mana whenua associations with the Mata-au are found along its full length including in oral references in stories and memories, original placenames, and in archaeological evidence of occupation and use. Urupā and battlegrounds are also located along the length of the awa, including Te Kauae Whakatoro (downstream of Tuapeka), which marks the place of the confrontation between Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Mamoe that led to the armistice established by Te Hautapunui o Tū. It is through these associations that whānau connect with the ancestral landscape experienced by our tupuna (ancestors).
30. Ngāi Tahu's association with the Mata-au (Clutha River) is recognised by the Crown and provided for as a Statutory Acknowledgement Area in schedule 40 of the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
31. The Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 gives effect to the Deed of Settlement signed by the Crown and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu on 21 November 1997. The documents:

- acknowledge the Crown’s apology to Ngāi Tahu for the Crown’s “...past failures to acknowledge Ngāi Tahu rangatiratanga and mana over the South Island lands within its boundaries, and, in fulfilment of its Treaty obligations”; and
 - Enable Ngāi Tahu to express a traditional relationship with the natural environment and to exercise kaitiaki responsibilities.
- 32.** Under s211 of the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and any member of Ngāi Tahu Whānui may cite a statutory acknowledgement as evidence of the association of Ngāi Tahu to that area. The recognition also enables the Minister of Crown Lands to enter into a Deed of Recognition with Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu in relation to the area.
- 33.** The Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 also requires consent authorities to provide a summary of any resource consent pertaining to the area to the iwi authority and to have regard to this Statutory Acknowledgement Area.
- 34.** The Mata-au is also mapped as a wāhi tūpuna under the Queenstown Lakes District Plan.
- 35.** As outlined in the Cultural Impact Assessment, the Mata-au and mana whenua connection to the Mata-au has been impacted by human activities post-colonisation. Within the catchment of the Mata-au these impacts include:
- Loss of access to and connection with ancestral whenua (land) and the awa (river), mahinga kai and kā ara tawhito (traditional paths and trails) as land was surveyed, sold and settled for farming.
 - Modification of water bodies, loss of access to water bodies and effects on mahinga kai from gold mining which began in the catchment in the 1860s. Gold dredging began in the area in 1890, and at one stage, there were four dredges operating between the Luggate Punt and Albert Town.
 - Introduction of freshwater fish species including trout and salmon in the nineteenth century which has impacted significantly on indigenous fisheries.

- Modification of the awa and associate impacts on mahinag kai from damming of the Mata-au at Hawea in the 1950s and later storage for hydro-electricity generation at Roxborough and Clyde.
36. Modification of the whenua (land), awa (river) and te taiao (environment) and associated impacts on mana whenua continue today through practices including dredging. However, the impacts of these activities on the awa does not diminish the cultural significance of the Mata-au for mana whenua. The fact that an area has been modified or degraded by human activities does not make it any less culturally significant for mana whenua. Rather it imposes a duty on mana whenua as kaitiakitanga to address that degradation and restore mauri and mahinga kai. (These two concepts of mauri and mahinga kai are explained in the next section of my evidence.)
37. In my view, this is a fundamental difference from the way in which effects of an activity may be assessed in other disciplines. In relation to matters such as effects on landscape, amenity values, even ecology, the starting premise is often the physical state of the environment. The presence of environmental degradation may be given as a reason to conclude that the impacts of further human action may not be as significant as if they are occurring in an area that was not degraded or modified.

WAI MĀORI, MAURI AND MAHINGA KAI

38. For mana whenua, wai māori (freshwater) is more than the molecule H₂O manifesting in different physical forms within a catchment (groundwater, surface water, rainfall). Water is fundamental to whakapapa as it forms the link between the physical and metaphysical worlds. It is the lifeblood of the whenua (land) and the many life forms that depend on it. If you want to know who someone is in Te Reo you ask, kō wai koe? This enquiry literally translates as, 'what water are you?'
39. Wai māori is highly significant for mana whenua, both for its practical applications, and for the spiritual meaning it embodies. Within that context, each waterbody is a distinct entity with its own whakapapa, values and uses; and is inextricably linked with the whakapapa of the whenua (land).
40. Mana whenua do not distinguish between water and land or between component parts of an awa such as the bed, flowing water, ecosystems and riparian margins. Rather the awa is understood as one, and mana

whenua are integrally connected to and identify with the awa to which they whakapapa.

41. This whakapapa connection carries rangatiratanga rights and imposes obligations on mana whenua as kaitiakitanga to protect wai māori in accordance with mātauranga (knowledge) and tikanga (practices) developed over many generations.

Mauri

42. For mana whenua, all objects both animate and inanimate have mauri. Mauri is often translated as 'lifeforce' but, like many things, the ontological essence of the concept is not easily translated. I can best describe mauri as a measure of the health and well-being of something such as an awa, gauged by how closely it resembles its optimal natural state.
43. Water bodies with high mauri are characterised by good quality water that flows with energy and life, expression of natural geomorphic processes, and the presence of healthy ecosystems which support mahinga kai and other cultural values.
44. Human activities and modifications of natural processes can degrade the mauri of an awa by interfering with or modifying natural processes, eg damming, diversions, altered flow regimes, discharges, and activities that impact on the riverbed.
45. Mauri is a critical element of the spiritual relationship of Kāi Tahu with wai māori. A core component of exercising kaitiakitanga is to protect the mauri of a resource from desecration or, where it is degraded, restore it.
46. Mauri can be restored or enhanced by improving flow and quality, enhancing biodiversity, restoring ecosystem processes and by reducing or minimising human interventions in natural processes. This is a fundamental difference between the concept of mauri and environmental restoration in a 'western conservation' sense: the methods by which the restoration occurs is as fundamental as the outcome to restoring mauri.
47. An example of this point would be when the mauri of a lowland stream is degraded because the stream has poor water quality exacerbated by low flows. The water quality in the awa could be improved by managed aquifer recharge – artificially putting water into the aquifer to both increase the water table and dilute concentrations of contaminants. Another approach would be to reduce the amount of water abstraction and discharge

contaminants upstream. Both actions will improve water quality and flow in the lowland stream; but the latter approach will better enhance its mauri.

48. A cornerstone for mana whenua in exercising kaitiakitanga in the Mata-au (Clutha River) is to avoid activities which further degrade the mauri of the river and to seek to improve or restore it.

Mahinga Kai

49. Our cultural identity as whānau and hapū is tied to our resources. Fundamental to our culture is our ability to learn and practise customary gathering of food and other resources, to put kai on the table at the marae and at home and to ensure that the knowledge of customary practices is passed on from generation to generation.
50. Mahinga kai is the resource system of mana whenua and underpins Ngāi Tahu whānui relationships with rivers, lakes, wetlands, moana and the broader environment. The rights to mahinga kai are held by mana whenua – those who hold customary authority over an area. Those rights are determined by whakapapa and maintained by ahi kā or continuous occupation and use.
51. Ngāi Tahu whānui maintain that Article 2 of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi guarantees mahinga kai. The sale or confiscation and settlement of land within the Ngāi Tahu takiwā and consequent use of natural resources has had a detrimental and ongoing deleterious impact on mahinga kai. Consequently, mahinga kai formed the ninth tree of Te Kereme – the Ngāi Tahu claim to the Waitangi Tribunal (the other eight ‘trees’ pertained to land loss).
52. In my experience, mahinga kai is often misunderstood in environmental planning as being restricted to traditional fishing or harvesting sites. While such sites are mahinga kai, the concept is broader. Mahinga kai means the resources – food and fibre, that sustain mana whenua, the places where those resources are located, the ecosystems and habitats that support them, access to those places and resources, the mātauranga (knowledge) and tikanga (practices) and the act of undertaking mahinga kai.
53. For mahinga kai to be sustained, populations of species must be present across all life stages and must be plentiful enough for long term sustainable harvest. Safe access to mahinga kai sites must be available, kai must be safe to gather, safe to harvest and safe to eat, and management and harvesting practices must be able to be carried out in accordance with

tikanga.

- 54.** As outlined in the Cultural Impact Assessment and noted in the previous section of my evidence, the Mata-au (Clutha) supported a wealth of mahinga kai prior to colonisation. Today the making kai is much depleted and a significant role for mana whenua in exercising kaitiakitanga is to enhance mahinga kai.
- 55.** An example of our work to enhance mahinga kai within the Mata-au is the work we are commencing around the trap and transfer of kanakana. Kanakana (*Geotonia australis*) is an eel-like fish which is found in Te Waipounamu, Rakiura and the Chatham Islands, and is a traditional mahinga kai. They are a migratory species and like tuna (eels) get caught behind the dams and structures that now impede the free flow of the upper Mata-au (Clutha River). A photo attached in the appendix shows kanakana trapped before the Roxburgh dam, and to date, there has been no ability for kanakana to migrate above the dams.
- 56.** The project involves trap and transfer of kanakana and installation of a Lamprey Passage System (LPS) to aid in the successful migration above the dams. The projects are in partnership with Contact Energy, NIWA, the Department of Conservation, and the Mata-au Trust which consists of seven papatipu rūnanga. The project goal is to reinstate kanakana back into the upper reaches of the Mata-au where spawning can occur and mahinga kai can be practices.

EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY ON WAI MĀORI

- 57.** I fundamentally disagree with the assessment Mr Sycamore provides in his evidence of the effects of the proposed activity on cultural values and his reasoning. I will address this matter shortly, but first I wish to comment on a matter raised in paragraphs 16 and 17 of Mr Sycamore's evidence.
- 58.** Mr Sycamore refers to a hui he had with staff from Aukaha on 24th October and 'mana whenua' representatives and the suggestion that no matters within the ambit of cultural values were raised. I was unavailable for that hui. Dr Lynda Murchison, a planner and principal advisor to Hokonui Rūnanga Inc and Hokonui Rūnanga Kaupapa Taiao attended as a courtesy. I understand Dr Murchison made it clear she is not mana whenua and listened but and did not partake in the discussion.

Assessing Effects Wai Māori

- 59.** Wai māori determines how effects of activities are assessed; and how freshwater is managed. In particular, effects of activities on freshwater must be understood contextually.
- 60.** To that end, extrapolating the results from studies or assessments of effects of activities in water bodies elsewhere and suggesting the effects may be the same or similar elsewhere is not an appropriate approach to manage effects on cultural values. Rather, any assessment of cultural values or effects of activities on cultural values needs to be deduced from knowledge, research, and monitoring of the Mata-au.
- 61.** Secondly, because the cultural values associated with an awa are not diminished as a result of degradation of the water body, it is inappropriate to determine effects on cultural values from a starting point of whether the activity is likely to result in significant changes from the existing environment, or the current state of the awa. Rather, any effects on cultural values ought to be assessed in relation to their alignment with wai māori.
- 62.** Therefore, I fundamentally disagree with Mr Sycamore's conclusion in paragraph 17 of his evidence that he can "apply scientific conclusions of Mr Hamer, and analysis from Ms McKenzie (to the) matters of concern raised by mana whenua."
- 63.** The starting premise for assessing cultural values is not an assessment of the current state of the awa using specific parameters measured using

western scientific disciplines such water quality, flow or ecology coupled with an assessment of the degree to which the proposed activity is deemed to alter that current state. That is an assessment of the hydrology, ecology or water quality of the awa. The fundamental starting point for assessing the effects on cultural values is a comprehensive understanding of those cultural values, and assessing whether and to what degree the proposed activity aligns with those values.

64. In paragraphs 31 to 36 of his evidence, Mr Sycamore provides an assessment of the proposal against cultural values. That assessment is couched within a framework Mr Sycamore refers to as 'te mana o te wai'.
65. At paragraph 32 Mr Sycamore states, "I understand that the concept of mauri is central to te mana o te wai" and proceeds to undertake an assessment of the cultural values of the proposed activity relying on his interpretation of written reports and evidence from the Southland Land and Water Regional Plan process.
66. I do not agree with this approach for several reasons which I will discuss below.

Ngāi Tahu Ki Murihiku

67. Firstly, this is a proposal that pertains to a resource consent for an activity in Ōtākou/Otago. Any views mana whenua representatives may or may not express in relation to a regional plan in Murihiku are not relevant. The cultural values of Kāi Tahu ki Ōtākou in relation to the Mata-au and how this proposal may impact on those values are set out in the Cultural Impact Assessment prepared by Aukaha Ltd for the applicant.

Te Mana o Te Wai

68. Secondly, I assume Mr Sycamore is referring to 'te mana o te wai' as outlined in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020. 'Te mana o te wai' is not a traditional Ngāi Tahu whānui concept nor a framework to assess the impact of a proposed activity on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. Rather 'te mana o te wai' is a planning construct for managing freshwater in New Zealand devised by the Ministry for the Environment.
69. I understand the concept of te mana o te wai includes six principles: three of which are mana whakahaere, kaitiakitanga and manaakitanga. These three principles are shared ethics among many whānau and hapū which

inform the national policy statement and its implementation. The principles are not a framework for assessing the impact of a proposed activity on wai māori. Rather, my understanding is that those principles provide the rationale for why local authorities must engage with mana whenua in developing their freshwater plans.

- 70.** Ngāi Tahu whānui manage te taiao in accordance with an ethic of ki uta ki tai. This principle is often misunderstood as meaning integrated catchment management from the mountains to the sea, which is the literal translation. However, the concept is a recognition of whakawhanaukataka (kinship, relationships, connectedness) of all aspects of te taiao (natural environment) including tangata whenua (people) as part of the natural world.
- 71.** When mana whenua consider the hauora or health of the waterbody, they will not separate it from consideration to the hauora or health of whenua, te taiao and mana whenua.

Mauri

- 72.** At paragraphs 35 to 36 of his evidence. Mr Sycamore lists a set of criteria for assessing impact on mauri which he identifies as taken from a report 'Wai' in relation to development of the Southland Land and Water Regional Plan. He separates out the components in his list and identifies the proposed activity against each criterion.
- 73.** Mr Sycamore concludes that that the activity will not affect the mauri of the Mata-au (Clutha River), though in undertaking that assessment he acknowledges he is not an expert in the 'spiritual aspects' of mauri and can only talk about the physical aspects.
- 74.** The fact Mr Sycamore has attempted to discern between physical and spiritual aspects of mauri suggests that he does not share my understanding of mauri.
- 75.** Mr Sycamore's assessment also misses the fundamental point about mauri outlined in the Cultural Impact Assessment and reiterated in my evidence; the action of the putting a dredge in the upper Mata-au where no such dredge currently exists will affect the mauri of the awa. My understanding is the dredge operates like a vacuum cleaner, sucking in water, bed material, and flora and fauna within its path. Water and gravels may pass through the dredge, but the bed is disturbed, and riverine ecology modified by these actions.

76. In my view, the key issue is not whether the activity will adversely affect the mauri of the river – it will. Rather, the matter for decision is where these effects sit relative to all matters to be considered under the Resource Management Act 1991. I defer to Mr Vial’s evidence on those matters.

Mahinga Kai

77. At paragraph 37, bullet point 7 of his evidence, Mr Sycamore concludes that the proposed activity will not affect mahinga kai relying on Mr Hamer’s ecological evidence. I do not agree with Mr Sycamore’s assessment for two reasons.
78. Firstly, I understand the applicant has considered overseas studies to assess effects of the proposed activities on ecological values. Those studies have not included any assessment of impact of the proposed activity on kanakana and no assessments of the impact of the proposed activity on mahinga kai within the Mata-au.
79. Secondly, the assessment limits mahinga kai to effects on ecosystems. As outlined in my evidence, mahinga kai is much broader than ecosystems, and ecological effects is one matter that would contribute to an understanding of effects on mahinga kai.

Cultural Impact Assessment

80. Finally, in the 4th bullet point of paragraph 36 of his evidence Mr Sycamore states. “With regard to protecting traditional cultural values and uses, the applicant is conscious of the cultural values of the Clutha/ Mata-Au to Rūnaka. They have carefully considered the CIA prepared by Aukaha and will ensure it forms part of any staff induction.”
81. I am unclear how Mr Sycamore can deduce that staff reading the Cultural Impact Assessment as part of their induction will in any way mitigate effects of the activity on mana whenua values. Knowledge of those values is not in itself, mitigation of any effects of an activity.

CONCLUSIONS

82. I consider that the proposed activity will adversely affect cultural values associated with the Mata-au (Clutha River).
83. In my view, the activity will affect the mauri of the awa as it is introducing more human activity and intervention into natural processes in the awa.

- 84.** I do not agree the applicant has appropriate information to conclude that there will be no adverse effects on mahinga kai, and the approach taken to understanding mahinga kai in making that assessment is too narrow.
- 85.** I do not agree that the activity or the framework used to assess effects on cultural values aligns with wai māori.

Riki Parata

3rd November 2023

Appendix

