

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?: Individual

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Smith

Trade Competition (please choose whichever applies): I/we could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

Postal address: 78 Brougham St
Westport

Email address: kevinsmith.kiwi@gmail.com

Phone number: 021 1515011

Variation being submitted on: Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping

My submission: I oppose and will be speaking to my submission which is as follows.

My submission will be based on the politics and science of the exercise.

We all have different skills, views and backgrounds. I have worked as an instrument technician and have also worked for Geoscience companies.

As a born and bred Bullerite, I have seen the area change and develop over the decades.

I have a strong interest in the flooding and coastal erosion, both from a historical perspective and also with the impact it will have on myself and my community in the future.

I have attended many of the TTPP Coastal Hazard meetings since November 2023. I have seen what was said and I have listened to the people hosting and presenting.

One thing that really struck me was the depth of knowledge, there was little apparent.

At the very start of the Ngakawau meeting the PowerPoint presentation kicked off with an opening screen, Coastal Hazards. The photo was of Lake Moana.

The show never got any better.

There was little knowledge, certainly local knowledge.

There was very little science evident.

I attended the following meeting that afternoon, at Carter's Beach. Basically two people turned up. The show was still just as vague.

I went to the meeting the next morning at Punakaiki. These were all concerning the TTPP Coastal Hazards variation and also the Future Buller side show.

I was appalled at the attitude and the method of delivery. Indeed I filed two Formal Complaints, one to CEO BDC and the other to CEO WCRC. My complaints were based on Effectiveness, Efficiency and Intent.

Fast forward to the current stage of the proceedings, We are seeing much the same.

The community is confused and probably upset.

I will be speaking to this submission. I have attended many of the public meetings that were held in Westport in the past few months.

I spoke at one and had a PowerPoint presentation of about 15 slides.

That talk was about the science of modelling and the problems associated with measurement systems.

I had submitted OIA requests for details of the Charleston and Westport sites. The replies confirmed that lack of calibration and compensation and hence their unsuitability for any sea level determinations.

With my background and local knowledge, I can see the flaws in the charts as submitted.

We know that not only has measurement been used, including LiDAR, but those results were then blended with assumptions, random corrections and finally, long term predictions.

Hardly any definitive science and indeed all very marginal.

I have also been an RNZAF Officer, an Engineer, and I have also worked as a Commercial Pilot.

Aviation is a precise science, very exact, and no room for exaggeration or personal bias.

I feel that the TTPP agenda has been more political than anything related to science. I have serious concerns about the competence levels within NIWA, WCRC and BDC.

I feel the Coastal Hazard topic is a political agenda that has been passed down.

The councils have not had the resources available to cope and prepare a sound business case.

The whole project is flawed.

I give the example where there is a narrative at play. Fact and truth may be difficult to find.

NIWA, WCRC and BDC all are advising the community that the region has had a tsunami history.

I have researched the tsunami history, as I knew much of what was being said was news to me. I had never heard of them before.

The WCRC have stated that the 1929 Karamea tsunami was the worst in the region, in recent years anyway.

I went to school in Karamea. I lived with my grandparents, and heard the local tales of the 1929 earthquake. There was never a mention of any wave.

I have researched the 1929 Karamea situation and now have five eye-witness accounts.

There was never a mention of any wave, not from the records nor the newspapers of the time.

There was no wave.

Why then are the councils distorting the truth ?

This is a disinformation campaign.

I believe we are seeing the same with the Coastal Hazards. I have serious misgivings about the competence and intent of some of the people involved.

The community has every right to be wary and distrustful.

This has been a political exercise, from the previous Government.

The current Government is reassessing the situation. We should all know changes are in the wind.

There should be no urgency with the TTPP Coastal Hazards review.

There have been calls for a delay, to allow the central Government to provide the new directives.

The West Coast communities will be affected by rates and insurance levies as a result of the modelling.

We have seen the other councils about NZ raise similar concerns.

The entire Climate Change and sea level rise agenda has been brought back to the new coalition Govt.

The local and regional councils need to challenge the Govt and not burden the community further.

This exercise has had an adverse impact on the ratepayers and they need help, the Councils need to respond and assist.

Politics is a game that should be played in Wellington.

I would like the following decision(s) to be made with respect to this Variation:

I request the TTPP Council delay proceedings, pending further direction from the coalition Government.

Please indicate if you wish to speak to your submission:

I wish to speak to my submission

If any others making similar submissions wish to be heard:

No, I would prefer to present my own individual case

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?: Individual

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Smith

Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission: No

Postal address: 2 Riverside Terrace
Westport 7892

Email address: kevin.smith.kiwi@gmail.com

Phone number: 021 1515011

My submission: I oppose the Coastal Hazards variation as presented.
I have previously submitted and would like this to be an extension of my earlier objection.

I have a technical background and have previously questioned the sea level and LiDAR techniques and measurements being used.

The TTPP process is using a formula that only considers vertical sea level measurements and is determined by the use of various tables.

One example. $Z_{1\%AEP} = MHS7 * 1.32 + 0.28 + Z_{DATUM} + W_{setup} + SLR$

What we are seeing is sea level projections with vertical estimates of sea levels at various times in the future.

We are then seeing emphasis on LiDAR elevations for the datum and for any overlays.

The LiDAR data is only valid for a given point in time. It is like a snap shot.

When estimating sea levels we should also be seeing a corresponding estimate for landform changes over the period.

There is an admission of vertical land movement not being taken into consideration for relative sea level rise, but there is more.

The West Coast is earthquake prone and also has the littoral drift which is unique.

Both of these can give a rapidly changing landscape over a period or time.

With Westport and Carter's Beach the undersea conditions could change with the addition of hundreds of thousands of Cubic metres of sediment being dropped by the littoral drift. The state of the Westport harbour breakwater also has to be a factor for all shoreline, Steeples to Karamea.

If we compare the TTPP modelling with that of Jeremy Gibb, we will see he has taken into consideration other factors.

Gibb coincidentally also wrote about the Buller and along with Furkert would be the prime historic references for that coastline.

Certainly the erosion and accretion of land.

Gibb considers many other factors and many are relevant to parts of the Buller coastline.

More attention to detail is required where settlements are near the coast.

$$CHZ = [(X + R) T + S + D] F + L$$

Factor X

Is the Rate in metres per year of shore retreat in response to local relative sea-level rise.

Factor R

Is the Rate in metres per year of long-term (historic) net shoreline advance, retreat or dynamic equilibrium for sand and gravel shores and seacliffs.

Factor T

Is the Planning Horizon in years extending from the present up to the years 2050 and 2100 A.D. for which CHZ assessments are made.

Factor S

Is the Magnitude in metres of either the maximum recorded short-term historic shoreline fluctuation along coasts of unconsolidated sand or gravel,

Factor D

Is the Magnitude in metres of retreat of the top seaward edge of the erosion scarp cut into sand dunes as a result of slumping to attain a stable slope.

Factor F

Is the Safety Factor that is expressed on a scale from 1.0 (0%) to 2.0 (100%),.

Factor L

Is the Horizontal distance of representative, relatively unmodified natural features such as the beach, shore platform, foredune complex.

I mention this because this is where we are seeing historical considerations.

Places along the Buller coastline are massively impacted by the Westport breakwaters and the sea floor, shoreline, and even land gain are distated almost solely by that environment. Relative sea level rise may prove to be a very minor factor.

We also see where the coast line features are considered. Beach gradient and form, such as dunes are included in calculations.

For example the dunes that will be established along the beaches East and West of Westport would affect both Erosion and Flood Hazard Zones.

The Tonkin and Taylor peer review dated 2022 also raised many points.

Review of NIWA coastal hazards assessment for West Coast Region.

The peer review was thorough and yet although multiple failings were addressed we have seen that not all have been rectified in the TTPP documents.

Between Gibb's work in other regions and the Tonkin and Taylor review it is apparent the TTPP sea level estimates are not fit for purpose.

The West Coast shoreline is uninhabited in parts and wild guesswork may suffice.

For populated stretches however the onus is on the researcher to be far more accurate, especially in lower socio-economic

areas where the population does not have the ability to challenge to the same extent.

We have seen this covered in the hazard assessments in other regions.

There is a human factor and it would be unfair to impose a flawed procedure when it would cause unnecessary harm and hurt.

None of these guestimates should be used as a basis for managed retreat.

If we are considering 50 and 100 year future forecasting, then there needs to be progress steps.

In the case of Buller a 10 year review period would provide an opportunity to review the revised LiDAR data, the sea buoy data, and the International and IPCC climate of the day.

I will be speaking at the hearing and the above will be the basis of my submission.

I would like the following decision(s) to be made with respect to this Variation:

An acceptance that the TTPP Coastal Hazards process is flawed. This is apparent when the process is having to be repeated with the renotification.

The same people are involved and we will likely be seeing the same outcome again.

Given that the process is flawed we then have a methodology that is too crude for the populated areas of coastline.

There is too much emphasis on a LiDAR elevation when it may be little more than a datum.

Overlaying a sea level rise onto a LiDAR derived chart can only work when the chart, with land features, is estimated forward at the same rate.

Sea level can not be projected and overlaid onto a 2025 chart, or map.

The year 2050 sea level estimates must be overlaid onto a 2050 map, or best forward projection of it.

This is essential in the region where the coastline can be advancing, or retreating, hundreds of metres over a 10 to 20 year period.

The variation needs to be set with a review period.
The much touted LiDAR elevations are already out of date.
LiDAR generated contours can only be a datum. They would
have to be recalculated along with any sea level rise projection.

Any such variation must have a review period.

There needs to be clarity over the use of the document for
planning, consent and insurance purposes.

We should not be seeing talk of managed retreat on the basis of
some projected estimate.

Please indicate if you
wish to speak to your
submission:

I wish to speak to my submission

If any others making
similar submissions wish
to be heard:

No, I would prefer to present my
own individual case