

Emails Ian (stakeholders) and TCDC

Selected emails

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 1:48 PM
To: 'Anouska Greene' <anouska.greene@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'Jen Amner' <Jennifer.Amner@tcdc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: LGOIMA request - Williamson Pond

Hi Anouska

Thank you for advising me my request for information has been received. You have correctly made the distinction about my personal requests and those I do on behalf of the stakeholders. Thank you for that.

With respect to this being my 'second large request' and that I should 'be mindful of this if filing any further requests':

1. If council staff were correctly engaging with the stakeholders in the stormwater workshops, I would already have this information and requests would not be needed
2. The requests are not 'large' as they relate to singular subjects which I was advised by Alison I am entitled to make
3. Stormwater is a very diverse project covering many localised spots and much of our infrastructure so if information is not already in the public domain and I need it and not getting it through the workshops TCDC has itself to blame.
4. I have probably another 20-30 yet to lodge so on that basis how do you want to proceed?

I agreed to refrain from lodging requests at Governance insistence in late November last year following I presume complaints from staff to Governance – my agreeing to not lodge requests and not file my complaint to the Ombudsman would according to Governance, free up staff to complete the 'master plan'. If the 'master plan' was completed during the past 5 months it could be made available to me so I can see what we were meant to be discussing and what decisions were made that we apparently missed when we attended the workshops.

Staff claim they have recruited 5 new staff for stormwater so I do not see how my requests can be of any hindrance as everything I am seeking is what should have been prepared and provided to us already so the workshops could function properly to create the 'master plan'. If this is all new information that would be very disturbing. Most of it should already be in the public domain.

If you are concerned about our requests perhaps this time around whoever asked Governance to get me to stop can meet with us – that way that person can then see our side and then make a decision

whether they will request the stormwater staff to properly engage with us and give us the information they have but won't divulge? As I say above if we were being given access to information and being engaged as per the TCDC Engagement Policy I would have no need to request information.

Make sense?

Ian 021067611

From: Anouska Greene <anouska.greene@tcdc.govt.nz>

Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 1:09 PM

To: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>

Cc:

Subject: RE: LGOIMA request - Williamson Pond

Dear Mr Holyoake,

Thank you for your below email. Your request for official information has been received. A response will be with you as soon as possible and within the statutory timeframes.

This request is the second large request to be processed by our water services team on top of their daily operational duties. I ask that you please be mindful of this if filing any further requests in the immediate future.

Kind regards,

Anouska Greene

Legal Technical Specialist (LGOIMA)

Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday

Thames-Coromandel District Council

p: 07 868 0200

e: anouska.greene@tcdc.govt.nz

w: www.tcdc.govt.nz



The content of this e-mail may be CONFIDENTIAL OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED, and is intended only for the persons named above. If this e-mail is not addressed to you, you must not use, read, distribute or copy this document. If you have received this document by mistake, please call us and destroy the original

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 12:31 AM
To: Jen Amner <Jennifer.Amner@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: Anouska Greene <anouska.greene@tcdc.govt.nz>
Subject: LGOIMA request - Williamson Pond

Hi Jen

Please find my information request:

Williamson Pond:

What I am seeking is some background information of the Williamson Park pond.

So far I have talked with councils engineer in the 1970's and been told the pond was created some time in the late 1970's when the pipes from Williamson Road were cut off and removed from the foreshore as they were getting eroded and damaged by the sea. The pipes were cut back to the current discharge point, the land was bulldozed to form a detention area for stormwater to collect and then drain into the surrounding water table. The large sand dune towards the surf club was formed with the sand dug out to make the detention area.

It did not have a weir.

Sometime afterwards a weir was installed because in heavy rain the detention device was inadequate to hold the water and it overtopped and eroded allowing the sea to breach in back to the pipes. Work was done to restore the shoreline and build the first weir. No-one has been able to date this, and it does not matter.

In 2017/2018 Opus were consulted to report on the function of the pond. We understand that following that report the initial weir was part removed (as it had become damaged) and a second weir built about 2-3 meters back towards the pond. The then spillway to the weir was filled with some sort of soakage device, had Geotech cloth wrapped around and covered in a type of gravel grid to stop erosion when the pond overflows into the ocean. Residents describe this as large round cages but I think it is more likely a Cirtex type of product wrapped in Geotech with a gravel matt protection on top. For the purposes of these questions, I will call the Cirtex the soakage medium which pond water is meant to flow through to then flow through the weir itself to discharge into the Ocean. The

Cirtex for these purposes is set on the spillway to reduce soakage rates to the Ocean to prevent erosion.

Information requested:

Please provide me with:

1. The drawings of the weir and the devices behind the weir.
2. This to include the mRL of the weir height and base foundations, the ground level mRL the Cirtex or whatever that forms the soakage sits on, and the Cirtex mRL for the spillway height.
3. The pond end of the Cirtex design showing the pond basin batter and basin depth in mRL to determine design depth of pond water
4. The discharge pipes invert to mRL. I will assume for the moment the design will have the 1050mm diameter pipes as upgraded. If not please provide the before the 1050mm Dia pipes (the 700mm Dia pipes) and the post 1050mm Dia pipes. I want the mRL of both if possible.
5. The catchment area of the 1050mm diameter pipes split into the direct catchment area of the impermeable road curb and channels and to the wider catchment areas when the AEP exceeds 10%AEP. This can include both roading impermeable and permeable areas. If the recent modelling shows this better please provide all possible catchment size in the same units.
6. The area of the pond in the same unit measure.
7. Any forebay design to collect sediments like sand that gets into the pipe system
8. The specifications being the infiltration calculations of the pond into the surrounding water table. This should be from a series of bore holes to test infiltration rates. I believe up to 5 would have been required. Please provide the test results as required for VM/E1
9. The maintenance requirements for
 - a. The weir face to the Ocean ie sand blow, debris removal, erosion control, adverse effects of erosion to the beach
 - b. The manner of cleaning the organic and sludge build up in the pond basin and walls when the water level is high
 - c. Where is this to be dumped?
 - d. The manner in which pond water is to be removed to clean and maintain the pond basin and walls
 - e. Where is this to be dumped
 - f. The manner in which the Cirtex devices will be maintained – for the entry to the spillway base (the mRL) to the gravel protection top
 - g. The manner in which any sediments and solids are to be removed from the forebay
10. The pond has recently been cleaned twice since Gabrielle. Please provide:
 - a. The mRL of the base of the pond before the maintenance of each maintenance
 - b. The mRL of the base of the pond after each of the maintenances ie as it is now
 - c. The maintenance done to the spillway base
 - d. The maintenance done to the Cirtex devices
 - e. The maintenance done to the gravel protection and sand protection from the weir over the Cirtex to the pond
 - f. The mRL of the spillway base as it is now if it has changed?
11. Please provide any contractor feedback following the maintenance of the pond. EPL did this work – did they provide any advice as to mRL of the pond base now being lower than the sea level?

12. Has council studied the reasons of failure of the pond to drain
13. If not why not.
14. Could it be possible for the spillway to drain the pond if the base of the pond was at least at the same mRL as the pond itself but the Cirtex was upgraded or properly maintained? I accept LGOIMA do not require councils to provide reason but it is foreseeable if council did undertake a review of the failure to come to some conclusion. Therefore, I am seeking the written conclusions to the investigation. If no investigation took place, please state that.

Thank you.

Ian

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 12:40 AM
To: 'Brett Houston' <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'rob.boston50@gmail.com' <rob.boston50@gmail.com>
Subject: LGOIMA request

Hi Brett

I know LGOIMA must go through the appropriate channels, but I am seeking your reconsideration of the 'wetland decision'. We joined the workshops in good faith to toss ideas into the pot and thoroughly test what could work. You promised a master plan by 23 November 2023. We agreed with Governance in December to stop LGOIMA and not file our complaint with the Ombudsman so staff could be free to prepare the master plan. Instead council staff have secretly made decisions (wetland) and not produced the master plan.

It is our position if council agreed to engagement with us to hammer out the best options so these could be tested it may avert the need for the LGOIMA and the divisiveness now in the workshops.

We have met with governance and are now very concerned even more as they have been told the workshops agreed to a wetland. That is untrue. We did not.

Workshops do NOT make decisions – I have already provided the Ombudsman’s review called ‘Open for Business’. This should be adequate grounds to rescind the decision – but if not, you are directly challenging the Ombudsman.

Workshops are intended to gather evidence, have debate, chose options, with sometimes a preferred option, then taken to a full council meeting for governance to chose what to take to the consultation process. This process places no liability on the non-members because all decisions are meant to be made by councillors who fall under councils indemnity.

By making the decision to ‘wetland’ you have exposed Eric, Rob and myself to the possible liability consequence if the decision is wrong, negligent, too costly, has blow-outs, fails, or needs redoing later. If it is a failure for any reason insurance companies may not cover claims, or seek remedy from the decision makers – that’s us. You have exposed us to this liability. Ratepayers will taint us and the Whangamata Ratepayers Association as the people who said yes to wetlands. That will injure us personally and all ratepayers.

When we first met I was impressed you attended my RFS in person. Brett we need strong and capable staff we can place trust in. Rob and I will be around for at least 20 years. If the decision stands that trust is gone and we will be lodging a complaint with the Ombudsman and requesting a full indemnity for the Whangamata Ratepayers Association, the members of the Whangamata Stormwater Action Group and in particular Eric, Rob and myself on the basis we are not representing ourselves but these associations.

Please think about this and withdraw the decision immediately. Please advise me ASAP.

Thanks:

LGOIMA request:

1. At the recent workshops you claimed council has a letter from WRC stating WRC required a wetland for Williamson Park and that we could have a copy. Please provide an unredacted copy.
2. If the WRC letter exists, please include any background correspondence between TCDC and WRC leading up to the letter regarding a ‘wetland’ proposal, concept or intention or other options that could be applied to improve the current situation. To remove doubt did TCDC include my alternate proposals in the discussions with WRC, or other concepts. If so please provide copies of all documents relating to and resulting in the WRC letter in 1 above.
3. If there are any limitations or requirements by WRC, or proposed by TCDC please provide these as well.
4. Has TCDC even discussed a ‘wetland’ for Williamson Park with WRC?

5. Please provide the application and or request for 'wetland' from TCDC showing how the 'wetland' would meet the current 2020 version of the WRC Stormwater Management Guidelines pages 190-205. I have a copy of this document so you can use that document for reference sake.
6. Has there been any subsequent amendments to this guide in relation to 'wetlands'. If so please provide a link for me.
7. In relation to the Metis proposal please provide answers to all the requirements in the WRC Stormwater Management Guidelines pages 190-205. In particular I have selected these:
 - a. The catchment areas to wetland ratio (3% for impermeable and 4% for permeable)
 - b. The management of the wetland when the water table rises above the invert
 - c. The bypass design and encroachment to low lying nearby properties
 - d. For floods above 5%AEP and 10%AEP,
 - e. How the bypass water is to be treated,
 - f. Size of forbay (I presume the defender is an alternate solution so please provide WRC approval of this departure),
 - g. Fire risk,
 - h. Rodent control like rats,
 - i. Mosquitoes management
 - j. Organics and plants that wash onto the beach,
 - k. The slope of the wetland,
 - l. Placing of maintenance strips,
 - m. Placing of access strips
 - n. Maintenance proposal to keep plants healthy,
 - o. What happens in dry spells,
 - p. How will oil spills be cleaned,
 - q. How will the wetland boundary be enforced for child safety until the weeds become impenetrable
 - r. Guarantee by Metis that a wetland is appropriate in sandy soils (note WRC says silty and clay, not sandy)
 - s. Plus about 20 other items
8. I see the LTP includes extending Williamson Rd and Achilles Rd pipe systems presumably to then include Mary, Sylvia, Bellona, Tui and Kiwi. Does the 3% include all this additional catchment?
9. I have checked with the Friends of Williamson Park Society. They have not been approached for permission for the permanent set-aside of land for a wetland. Please advise what steps has council taken to obtain this approval
10. Please provide one economic reason why any part of Williamson Park should be deemed unusable by the public in preference to a wetland
11. Whangamata has been deemed by council as the most resilient coastal area to sea level rise and as the population grows we will need this land for public use. Is this true?
12. Please provide any public consultation to ratepayers and users of Williamson Park that supports a 'wetland'
13. Please provide any consultant report that has taken into account the prime value and public use of Williamson Park, its attributes as clear land beside the Ocean for recreation, playing, events, parking etc that shows Whangamata would be better off with the land being turned into wetlands.
14. Who within TCDC actually made the decision for a wetland?
15. What is being proposed for Island View
16. The LTP includes pipes to 4 road networks. Are these still on the table? If so when do we get to discuss these?

Thank you.

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 12:37 PM
To: Brett Houston <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: Robert Boston <rob.boston50@gmail.com>; Terry Walker <terry.walker@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; Dave Ryan <dave.ryan@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; Eric <eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz>; Jagdeep Singh <Jagdeep.Singh@tcdc.govt.nz>; Anjana Krishnan <anjana@metisconsultants.co.nz>
Subject: Re: Williamson pond alternate design 2

Hi Brett.

Not acceptable.

I will take the matter of making decisions in workshops without council approval up with Governance. I have already voiced this concern and we moved on with the first of our workarounds and expecting the debate on Williamson at either the next or the one after that. Then all these will go to a master plan that governance can discuss and make the decisions.

Ian

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 10:09 AM
To: 'Brett Houston' <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'rob.boston50@gmail.com' <rob.boston50@gmail.com>; 'Terry Walker' <terry.walker@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; 'Dave Ryan' <dave.ryan@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; 'Eric' <eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz>; 'Jagdeep Singh' <Jagdeep.Singh@tcdc.govt.nz>; 'Anjana Krishnan' <anjana@metisconsultants.co.nz>
Subject: RE: Williamson pond alternate design 2

Thank you Brett

There is little point in 'forcing through a design' until we have basic facts why it needs any redesign in the first place.

If we work hard to 'reduce the catchment area into the pond' – by that I mean in 'normal 10%AEP the roading network of channels, cesspits and pipes is easily handled by the existing design before it

was dug out with maintenance so 'in my view' based on the last 50 years of service it just needs some minor work and possibly the soakage devices inspected and maintained.

When we have excessive rains and surface water this drains into the catchment area of the piped roads so greatly increases the catchment area – that is the immediate area because we have created more impervious areas with roofs and more roads – so we get the run off which then goes to the pond – that did not have this allowance in the 1970's.

Therefore our focus should be on managing that catchment margin so it does not get to the pond – it can go down Otahu and to Park. Same with the Golf course.

The original thought was to upgrade pipe dia along Williamson – that means digging things up – so still do that but run the fall to Otahu from the Williamson walk way with the new pipe. That would take probably half the catchment margin in one go. Golf course, Tui, Kiwi etc.

Don't get too far into the planning stage yet. Let's see the overall picture and how smart we can make it before tenders are even considered. Don't see the point in spending \$1M or half a mill on changing the pond when we want to move catchment away to rivers not oceans.

Ian

From: Brett Houston <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 9:31 AM
To: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Cc: rob.boston50@gmail.com; Terry Walker <terry.walker@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; Dave Ryan <dave.ryan@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; Eric <eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz>; Jagdeep Singh <Jagdeep.Singh@tcdc.govt.nz>; Anjana Krishnan <anjana@metisconsultants.co.nz>
Subject: RE: Williamson pond alternate design 2

Ian

Thank you for this information. Some points

1. WRC

- We need to work closely with WRC so undertake discussions to determine what the requirements are concerning complying with current Resource Consents (RC) or the need to apply for a new RC
 - In this case we do not need a new RC
 - However WRC are saying that they we should install a wetland area to provide some Stormwater “cleaning” to improve the quality of the water discharge
 - By working together with WRC we are able to reach a consensus on approach which provides a win-win solution
2. Your questions “What needs review is”
- I will get Metis to respond to these questions
 - Is the soakage mechanism through the weir sufficient - can it cope with the catchment discharge within a reasonable time after rain? Does the soakage device need opening to be maintained and reducing in length to speed up flows
 - Is the weir wide enough to discharge the pond water in flood
 - How can the new design be maintained so that its operation does not get affected at each maintenance cycle.
 - If the pond basin was lifted up to the invert would the pond water then affect the surrounding watertable
 - If the pond could drain at sufficient rate through the soakage devices would the pipes still remain choked?
 - When the water table level lifted above the pond basin depth water would bleed into the basin – how will this be drained?

We are progressing with the current Metis design and looking to tender this work soon to allow for completion before end of June as we cannot keep reviewing this design.

Thanks

Brett Houston

Water Services Manager

Thames-Coromandel District Council

Private Bag, 515 Mackay Street, Thames

e: brett.houston@tcdc.govt.nz

w: www.tcdc.govt.nz





The contents of this e-mail may be CONFIDENTIAL OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED and is intended only for the persons named above. If this e-mail is not addressed to you, you must not use, read, distribute, or copy this document. If you have received this document by mistake, please call us and destroy the original.

Please consider the planet before printing out this email.

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 8:11 AM
To: Brett Houston <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: rob.boston50@gmail.com; Terry Walker <terry.walker@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; Dave Ryan <dave.ryan@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; Eric <eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz>
Subject: Williamson pond alternate design 2

Hi Brett

What's annoying (like you are probably finding as well as a newbie at council) is the drip feed of information means ideas and thoughts get superseded and outdated.

I challenge you that WRC will not and cannot tell you (TCDC) what to do. Outside their remit. They can only review what we (you TCDC) propose – just like BC.

I am convinced now I've read and watched is we don't need a pipe outfall.

OK now all the engineers are disagreeing already – but their job is to work within our instructions.

I have put together the following alternate (2) proposal that we can discuss on the site visit.

Cheers

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 12:28 PM
To: 'Brett Houston' <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'rob.boston50@gmail.com' <rob.boston50@gmail.com>; 'Terry Walker' <terry.walker@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; 'Dave Ryan' <dave.ryan@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; 'eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz' <eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz>
Subject: Williamson addendum report

Hi Brett.

The attached is an addendum report for the Williamson Pond.

The last minutes stated I was to respond within 2-3 days. You will recall that instead we agreed I would discuss this with Metis following the workshop and not need to do the report as envisaged. What transpired was Metis agreed that my plan was how it was going to proceed but with a wetland. Metis agreed they would rethink the concept of wetland because when the base of the pond is lifted as intended (remember Bruce of EPL stated that each clean out lowered the base 150-200mm) to its rightful level at invert and then be sloped gradually up to the sides (eg BBQ area) the base would be 400-500mm above the water table so would be dry to walk on and wetland weeds may not survive. Grass is easier to manage than wetlands.

Since the meeting we had a 40mm rain event. This showed the pond in a new light – probably how it was originally planned. I now believe we are really overcomplicating what needs to be done. In the 40mm rain event no water overtopped the weir. This means the original engineering to create the pond basin was for detention to then soak away. This means first flush is contained. No defender needed. Cost savings and maintenance savings.

In basic terms we need to return the pond to a detention device only. Lift the base to the invert and remove the material behind the weir to allow easy drain away when the surrounding water table is higher than the invert discharge level. That's it.

I have included some reasoning in my report.

I don't expect the engineers to agree with me – to remain professionally – legally untouchable – they will always over engineer. But what can be done is a minimal plan that won't be making flooding worse for Whangamata if we take these 2 steps. The pond as it is now acts as a recharge and reduction device for the surrounding water table plus short-term detention when rain events create surface water that enters pipes and takes time to infiltrate into the surrounding water table at the pond. If we focus more on reducing the catchment area into the pond, and allowing rapid escape

through the weir (no pipe through the weir) that will be an improvement to what we have and certainly cannot have an adverse effect.

We can always do a bit more in 5 years time.

That way we can keep more of the money for the wider flooding issues.

Ian

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:21 PM
To: 'Brett Houston' <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'Mohamed Imtiaz' <mohamed.imtiaz@tcdc.govt.nz>; 'Terry Walker' <terry.walker@council.tcdc.govt.nz>; 'rob.boston50@gmail.com' <rob.boston50@gmail.com>; 'eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz' <eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz>
Subject: 12 February Workshop.

Hi Brett.

PS Seasons greetings.

Just to assist and put on record my expectations for the 12 February workshop.

1. I do not accept the minutes as a lawful representation of our last workshop on 11 December 2023. Workshops are not entitled to make decisions – I have recorded you stated I was outvoted – but it is unlawful to attempt to make decisions in workshops. Decisions must be made by our councillors in a full public meeting. Please have these minutes amended.
2. I understand from Terry that council has \$9.54M (approx.) in the Whangamata Stormwater Infrastructure Improvements account. I thought it was just \$6.36M. I would like this recorded in the minutes as acknowledged by council.
3. The wording ***'we need to move ahead, if the money is not spent this year we will lose it'*** must be changed. This statement as written is called 'duress'. You will know it as a legal term. If your intent was to point out that the OPEX budget in the 2023/2024 Annual Plan may not extend beyond 2024 unless we get councillors to bring this up in council meetings then we would know how to deal with it. The point here is council staff are running the workshop, excluding us from expert reports and drafts of the Master Plan, resulting in zero work scopes and nothing happening, so if we do ***'lose it'*** the fault lies directly with staff failing to make the plans. We can't. This is a self-admission of doing nothing. Ie then what? Staff get to spend our money on something else? Of will ratepayers get a rebate?
4. Teams meeting 12 February 2024. Doesn't work for me. I will drive to Thames so I can see the monitors so I can contribute purposely to the Master Plan. The bridge is up and running so its no longer an arduous trip.

5. Preparation for 12 February 2024 workshop. Terry has included you both in our recent emails. I expect as a member of the workshop to have full copies of presentation material at least 3 days prior to the meeting. This time do not remove pages from reports – the METIS proposals for Williamson Pond excluded the cost sheets. Do not do this again.
6. Background information required for the 12 February 2024 meeting. Please include all the monitoring work. So far you have stated its too contentious for ratepayers and at the last meeting you were going to discuss with other councils how they broke the reports to ratepayers. Its time to be transparent.

Thank you.

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, December 7, 2023 6:37 AM
To: 'Brett Houston' <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'rob.boston50@gmail.com' <rob.boston50@gmail.com>; 'eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz' <eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz>
Subject: Williamson Pond

Hi Brett

Eric and I managed a catchup yesterday to debate the Metis proposal and my alternate proposal. I am not an engineer – Eric is of the view (without being asked to check the maths) that the Metis 400dia outlet should be sufficient provided the pipes length is small. BUT discharge to the Ocean in such a way is prone to blockages, breakage, wear and will need a proper commitment to maintenance which will not be cheap.

I am NOT convinced any long-term master plan for increasing the catchment to Williamson Pond is a sustainable model as we work to deal with Tui, Kiwi, Bellona, Sylvia, Mary, upper Archilles, the Golf Course, rising sea levels (???) and the influence the pond water has on the surrounding water table.

Will the modelling be ready for Monday?

Ian

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, December 5, 2023 11:39 PM
To: 'Brett Houston' <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'rob.boston50@gmail.com' <rob.boston50@gmail.com>; 'eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz' <eric.thorn@xtra.co.nz>
Subject: Alternate proposal and Metis discussion Williamson Pond

Hi Brett

Thanks for forewarning us of the Metis proposal

Rob and I have been working on Williamson for a while. Its not complete but is to a standard it can be debated on Monday.

I will leave it to you whether you want it distributed prior to the meeting.

Rob and I would like some private time with you and elected members of the stakeholders group (minus outside experts) if that is acceptable. Can be before or after.

The attached report is NOT complete yet but I am away on business now until the end of the week so it would be unfair to drop this to everyone over the weekend.

These reports I do are online HTML so if you want full resolutions of images (or more) I just set you up just like Dropbox does. It's my secure personal cloud system.

Regards Ian