

Social & Environmental Limited

PO Box 125, Otorohanga
Waikato, New Zealand

2B, 23 George Street, Newmarket
Auckland, New Zealand

P +64 7 873 8385
F +64 7 873 8876
E jmr@actrix.co.nz

M +64 27 4947 514
www.juliemeaderose.com

Social and Environmental
Planning Consultants

For MWH New Zealand Limited

TURITEA WIND FARM CALL-IN s42A REPORT

**Julie Meade Rose
June 2009**

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Scope of work	3
3	Methodology	3
4	Approach	4
5	Resource consent applications	4
6	Primary evidence for applicant	5
	a. Mr Pollock	5
	b. Mr Kalafetelis	6
7	Evidence from submitters	6
	a. Mr Baines	6
	b. Mr Baker	7
	c. Mr Hindrup	8
8	Rebuttal evidence for applicant	8
	a. Mr Pollock	8
	b. Mr Kalafetelis	8
	c. Ms Burns	9
	d. Dr Phillips	9
	e. Dr Black	9
	f. Mr Hegley	10
	g. Mr Day	10
	h. Mr Wyatt	11
9	Concluding comments	11

Appendices

- 1 Statement of qualifications and expertise
- 2 Statement of conflict of interest

1 Introduction

MWH New Zealand Limited (MWH) has contracted me to prepare a section 42A report regarding social effects for the Board of Inquiry hearing the resource consent application by Mighty River Power to construct and operate a wind farm 10kms south of Palmerston North in Turitea Reserve.

2 Scope of Work

The scope of work is a review and assessment of social effects discussed in the following documents.

- The resource consent applications by Mighty River Power for the Turitea Wind Farm Proposal
- Expert witness evidence (including rebuttal evidence) by Mighty River Power
 - a. Mr Pollock (Planning: Primary and Rebuttal)
 - b. Mr Kalafetelis (Public Perception: Primary and Rebuttal)
 - c. Ms Burns (Social/Public Perception: Rebuttal)
 - d. Dr Phillips (Social/Public Perception: Rebuttal)
 - e. Dr Black (Health: Rebuttal)
 - f. Mr Hegley (Noise: Rebuttal)
 - g. Mr Day (Noise: Rebuttal)
 - h. Mr Wyatt (Visual: Rebuttal)
- Evidence from submitters
 - a. Mr Baines (Social – Palmerston North City Council)
 - b. Mr Baker (Planning – Palmerston North City Council)
 - c. Mr Hindrup (Planning – Horizons Regional Council)
- section 42A report prepared by URS
- Expert caucusing: Meetings to discuss social survey matters in relation to the proposed Turitea Wind Farm including
 - a. Meeting between Dr Thorne and Dr Phillips by telephone on 18th June 2009
 - b. Memorandum 19 June 2009 from Emanuel Kakafetelis to James Baines.

3 Methodology

Two methods have been used. They are a review and assessment of relevant information, and a site visit undertaken on Friday 12th June 2009.

The review and assessment of information is made from my experience and expertise in social assessment of over thirty years and site visit undertaken. My experience and expertise is in the statement attached.

4 Approach

I have been asked to discuss the validity of the applications and evidence concerning social effects, form opinions on the conclusions drawn, and any short comings or gaps. I discuss these matters under three headings

- The validity of information. This section includes the basis on which the documentation and evidence is made and interpreted.
- Opinion on conclusions drawn. This section includes my professional opinion and conclusions that follow on from the data sources.
- Short comings or gaps. This section includes additional information that would assist the understanding of a point in question or information that would fill a gap.

My comments about the applications and evidence under discussion are confined to matters that are within my area of expertise which is social assessment.

I do not comment on every point raised concerning social effects, but rather focus on the more significant matters in the applications and evidence reviewed.

Also, I do not comment on social issues in evidence that are addressed from a planning, public health, noise or visual and landscaping perspective.

The review and assessment of the applications and evidence is presented in the order it was read.

5 Resource consent applications

Turitea Wind Farm Resource Consent Applications and Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE)
--

Validity of information

The social effects information that is included in the AEE is valid.

In Section 5 Statutory Requirements – Resource Management Act 1991, there is acknowledgement of ‘local communities that will be potentially adversely affected’ [b] *Providing for Social, Economic and Cultural Wellbeing* paragraph 2, page 128].

Discussion about social effects included in planning, noise, visual and public health assessments is valid.

The consultation information in Section 8 Consultation is valid.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

Overall the conclusions are sound. However an assessment of effects would have provided more robustness to discussion on the social environment and social effects, and to conclusions drawn.

I note the conclusions state that the AEE has been prepared to meet the requirements of Schedule 4 of the RMA (AEE Section 9 Conclusions paragraph 4, page 157). In my opinion an assessment of the social environment is necessary to meet these requirements. One has to know who the neighbourhood and wider community is to make such an assessment.

Short comings or gaps

A social assessment has not been undertaken for the resource consent applications.

Section 2 Existing Environment does not include information on the social environment. The existing environment includes the 'local communities that will be potentially adversely affected' as stated in the AEE Section 5 page 128 as stated above. In my professional opinion a scoping and profiling of the social environment is required.

Scoping the social environment includes four tasks: identifying the affected people, communities and institutions; assessing community and interest group concerns; assessing beneficiary, stakeholder and community needs and wants; and assessing the absorptive capacity of people and communities in relation to the proposed project.

Profiling the social environment includes two tasks: compiling and analysing a baseline of data of the socio-economic context of those affected; and identifying possible indicators to measure effects on beneficiaries, the immediate community and the wider area.

Knowing the people, communities and institutions that may be affected, and benchmarks against which to measure effects, would have enabled a more robust assessment of social effects to be made. Such an assessment is a gap in Section 6 Assessment of Effects.

6 Primary evidence for applicant

a) Mr Pollock

Validity of information

The social effects information included in Mr Pollock's evidence is valid.

Social effects in the planning information mainly relate to electricity generation and security of supply, visual amenity and landscape, noise, public health, construction, and recreation and tourism.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Mr Pollock's conclusions relating to social effects.

Short comings or gaps

In my opinion, Section 4 Statutory Context and Analysis should have included a brief assessment of social effects and reference to Schedule 4 of the RMA.

b) Mr Kalafetelis

Validity of information

Information about the public perceptions survey is valid. I note that this information is a perception survey and not a social assessment.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

The conclusions drawn are robust.

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Mr Kalafetelis's evidence.

7 Evidence from submitters

a) Mr Baines

Validity of information

Mr Baines uses a variety of information sources which is an important part of a social assessment or social impact assessment (SIA) to assess the range of anticipated social effects from a proposal.

However, in my opinion, there are flaws in some of the sources of data Mr Baines has used. Also Mr Baines has inappropriately interpreted some data.

Flaws in sources of data include the following.

- a. The Citizen's Panel survey is not a random sample. Thus there is no statistical base to say the survey results are representative of the population.
- a. The introduction to the Ex-Post Survey and the focus groups are not included in evidence. The influence of the introductions on responses is thus unknown and cannot be assessed.

Inappropriate interpretation of data includes the following.

- a. In the Citizens Panel Survey Tables 5, 17, 18, 20 & 23, Mr Baines has over emphasised results where small numbers are involved.
- b. The following statements are made without statistical certainty

"I interpret this to mean that the wider community of Palmerston North is saying 'Enough is enough' (2.5.15).

"...that in a cumulative sense the balance of public attitudes is clearly at a tipping point." (2.5.16).

“The residents of Palmerston North are not rejecting wind farms, but they are beginning to reject the idea of more wind farms nearby.” (9.1.9).

Opinion on conclusions drawn

Mr Baines’s conclusion is consistent with his discussion presented.

However, I do not concur with his conclusion that community support for wind farming in the Manawatu is “at a tipping point”.

In my opinion, the source of information on which Mr Baines’s conclusion relies heavily, the Citizens Panel Survey, is not a representative sample and some of the survey results have been interpreted inappropriately as mentioned above.

Short comings or gaps

Gaps in information include the following.

- a. There is an absence of a baseline of data on local and regional populations against which to measure social effects. In my opinion, this local and regional population data should be included in 3 Social and Community Setting.
- b. There are a lack of raw survey data as a reference and check.

Short comings in information include the following.

- a. The range of social effects identified in 4.2 have not all been systematically assessed
- b. Data is confusing in the cross analysis tables as it does not clearly show positive and negative opinions.

b) Mr Baker

Validity of information

Mr Baker has relied on Mr Baines evidence to make statements about social effects of the Turitea Wind Farm proposal. In my opinion, as some of Mr Baines’s evidence is unreliable, Mr Baker’s information about social effects thus has questionable validity.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I do not concur with Mr Baker’s conclusion concerning social effects as Mr Baker has relied on Mr Baines’s evidence which is unreliable.

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Mr Baker’s evidence concerning social effects.

c) Mr Hindrup

Mr Hindrup's evidence is from a planning perspective and not a social effects perspective. Therefore I do not consider it appropriate for me to comment.

8 Rebuttal evidence for applicant

a) Mr Pollock

Validity of information

Points discussed by Mr Pollock from a social effects perspective include 9.1 Dwellings Assessment, and 9.3 Nature of Receiving Environment. Information in these discussions is valid.

Other social issues are discussed but Mr Pollock has responded from a planning perspective, for example, 9.2 Dwellings Near Wind Farms and 10.3 Eco-Park, therefore I do not consider it appropriate for me to comment.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Mr Pollock's conclusion in 9.1 that 'there are no dwellings within 1km of a turbine'.

Under 9.3, I agree that Mr Baker may have possibly overstated the level of adverse effects experienced by adjoining property owners.

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Mr Pollock's rebuttal evidence concerning social effects.

b) Mr Kalafatelis

Validity of information

Mr Kalafatelis's information is valid.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Mr Kalafatelis's conclusion that 'results of the Research New Zealand Public Perception Survey more accurately reflect current public perceptions than any of the other surveys referred to by Mr Baines'.

I concur with Mr Kalafatelis's conclusion that 'there is no evidence of the "tipping point" that Mr Baines refers to.'

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Mr Kalafatelis's rebuttal evidence.

c) Ms Burns

Validity of information

In my opinion, Ms Burns's information is valid.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Ms Burn's conclusion that there are flaws in Mr Baines's evidence as presented.

I also concur with Ms Burn's conclusion that "in terms of measuring community effects as input to a social impact assessment, in my opinion, the RNZ Survey provides more robust sampling, methodology and questionnaire design, and hence the more reliable data."

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Ms Burn's evidence.

d) Dr Phillips

Validity of information

Information in Dr Phillip's rebuttal evidence is valid.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Dr Phillip's conclusions.

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Dr Phillip's rebuttal evidence.

e) Dr Black

Validity of information

In my opinion, information relating to social impact in Dr Black's rebuttal evidence is valid.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Dr Black's conclusions in his rebuttal evidence that there are no risks to public health from the proposed wind farm.

I also note and concur with Dr Black's evidence in chief where he concludes "I cannot identify any actual or potential adverse effect on public health or wellbeing unless misunderstanding or misinformation cause unjustified fear or concern and sensitises individuals to the ongoing presence on the wind farm." Refer to 8.7 Conclusion in Dr Black's evidence.

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Dr Black's rebuttal evidence concerning social effects.

f) Mr Hegley

Validity of information

Information by Mr Hegley's on Dr Thorne's (on behalf of TAG and FOTR, and on behalf of Huatau marae) and Mr Lloyd's evidence concerning social effects is valid.

Matters about Mr Pringle's and Mr Baker's evidence are assessed from a noise perspective. Accordingly, I do not comment on these matters.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Mr Hegley's conclusion that issues raised on behalf of submitters do not alter the conclusions made in his evidence in chief. In his evidence in chief he concludes that "Construction noise from the wind turbines will be within the requirements of NZS 6803 at all times." He also concludes that "Once operational, the noise from the wind farm will be able to be managed to ensure compliance with the noise requirements of NZS6808: 1998, *Acoustics – the Assessment and Measurement of Sound from Wind Turbine Generator.*"

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Mr Hegley's rebuttal evidence concerning social effects.

g) Mr Day

Validity of information

Mr Day addresses social effects of noise raised in Mr Lloyd's, Mr Baker's, Mr Pringle's and Dr Thorne's evidence. In my opinion Mr Day addresses these social effects primarily by way of his expertise in noise. However, I confirm the validity of information about social effects.

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Mr Day's conclusion that "the proposed Turitea Wind Farm project can be designed and managed to achieve compliance with NZS 6808: 1998 and ensure the activity does not exceed a reasonable level of noise at the surrounding residences."

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Mr Day's rebuttal evidence concerning social effects.

h) Mr Wyatt

Validity of information

Mr Wyatt assesses social effects of the Turitea Wind Farm proposal from road user view points, public spaces and residences, and as a result of tracking and earthworks. He also assesses social effects under 5 Cumulative Effects. I concur with the overall validity of this information from a social effects perspective. I have a reservation about the following statement as it has no supporting documentation.

"...and one would rightly expect (for example) that a significant proportion would be single occupant vehicles, with the drivers attention focussed primarily, if not solely, on the road and other road users. Again, I do not consider that the prospect of visual effects on such occupants carries much weight."

Opinion on conclusions drawn

I concur with Mr Wyatt's conclusions about social effects.

Short comings or gaps

There are no short comings or gaps in Mr Wyatt's rebuttal evidence.

9 Concluding comments

The AEE did not include a social assessment report. The absence of this information was identified as a gap in information provided. Some social effects assessment was undertaken in planning, consultation, noise, visual and public health discussions in the AEE.

In my professional opinion, I concur with conclusions made in the evidence in chief and rebuttal evidence relating to social effects by Mighty River Power. However, the absence of an assessment of social effects in the planning evidence was noted. Also a statement in the visual rebuttal evidence did not have supporting documentation.

Of the submitters' evidence given for review, a social assessment report was included for Palmerston North City Council. In my opinion, there are flaws in sources of information and inappropriate interpretation of data in the social assessment report. Social effects discussion was also included in the Palmerston North City Council planning evidence. Some of this information has questionable validity as it is based on the flawed information in the social assessment report.

Julie Meade Rose



25 June 2009

APPENDICES

1 Statement concerning qualifications and experience

I am a social anthropologist with over thirty years experience in social and environmental planning. My qualifications include BA Honours and an MA in Social Anthropology from Victoria University of Wellington. I am a member of the New Zealand Planning Institute, the New Zealand Association for Impact Assessment, the Association of Social Science Researchers and the Resource Management Law Association. I also hold a certificate under the Making Good Decisions programme and have undertaken training in Resource Management Mediation.

The focus of my work has been on social assessment. I returned to consultancy work over two years ago having been Environmental Services Manager at Otorohanga District Council for two and a half years. Prior to that I had a consultancy business for sixteen years and worked for Murray North Ltd, an engineering based company, for eight years. During these periods I worked on social and environmental planning projects for several companies where identifying, assessing, managing and reviewing social effects of development projects have been key elements. My experience also includes working in seventeen countries outside New Zealand over a period of twenty two years. This work was for the World Bank, Asian Development and the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The focus of this work was on social assessment of effects of projects and policies on communities in several sectors including planning, infrastructural projects, energy, roading and forestry. In addition to the above, I undertook post graduate research, was a research assistant for the Huntly monitoring project, and tutored in social anthropology at Waikato University and Victoria University of Wellington.

Recent social assessment work has included assisting Waikato and Franklin District Councils assess social effects documented in Contact's Waikato Wind Farm resource consent application, peer reviewing social assessment reports for the North Island Grid Upgrade proposal and giving evidence at the Court of Inquiry. I have also provided an independent peer review of the socio-economic assessment for the proposed rehabilitation of Puketutu Island, provided a sociological opinion for PowerCo about the social effects of a proposed substation in Tauranga and prepared an assessment of effects of the Pac'n Save supermarket at Wairau Road, North Shore. The Pac'n Save project is one of many for which I have given evidence at the Environment Court.

As well as social assessment being an integral part of my project work, I also wrote (and later updated) a Social Impact Assessment Course for a degree and diploma for the Open Polytechnic of New Zealand and assessed all students assignments over seven years. I have given lectures on Social Assessment at six universities and polytechnics around New Zealand. I have also given seminars on Social Assessment to seven forestry companies in New Zealand to assist them gain Forestry Stewardship Council certification and to District Council and consultancy company staff.

Currently I am director and owner of the company Social & Environmental Limited. My responsibilities include undertaking aspects of sociological work and overall management of the consultancy company.

2 Statement concerning conflict of interest

To my knowledge, I have no conflict of interest to undertake this review and assessment of social effects of the Turitea Farm proposal for the Ministry for the Environment.